**U.S. Army Corps of Engineers**
**Spring Valley Restoration Advisory Board Meeting**
**St. David's Episcopal Church**
**Minutes of the February 12, 2008 RAB Meeting**

| **RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT AT THIS MEETING** | |
|---|---|
| Dan Noble | Military Co-Chair/USACE, Spring Valley MMRP Manager |
| Greg Beumel | Community Co-Chair |
| Malcolm Pritzker | Community Member |
| Lee Monsein | Community Member |
| Ambassador Howard Schaffer | Community Member |
| Bernard Schulz | American University |
| James Sweeney | District of Columbia, Department of the Environment |
| George Vassiliou | Horace Mann School |
| John Wheeler | Community Member |
| **RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEMBERS NOT PRESENT** | |
| Steven Hirsh | EPA Region 3 |
| Mario Aguilar | Community Member |
| Mary Bresnahan | Community Member |
| Dr. Peter deFur | Environmental Stewardship Concepts/RAB TAPP Consultant |
| David Feary | Community Member |
| William Krebs | Community Member |
| Lawrence Miller | Community Member |
| **ATTENDING PROJECT PERSONNEL** | |
| Ed Hughes | USACE, Spring Valley Program Manager |
| Maya Courtney | ERT, Spring Valley Community Outreach Program |
| Demaree Hopkins | Weston Solutions, Inc. |
| **HANDOUTS FROM THE MEETING** | |
| I. Final Agenda for the February 2008 RAB meeting.<br>II. Handout of Corps of Engineers Presentation. | |

## I. Administrative Issues

**A. Co-Chair Updates** – Greg Beumel, Community Co-Chair, welcomed the group and turned the meeting over to Dan Noble, Military Co-Chair/USACE, Spring Valley Military Munitions Response Program (MMRP) Manager, who presented the agenda.

D. Noble introduced Officer Anthony McElwee of the Second District, District of Columbia Metropolitan Police Department (MPDCC). Officer McElwee said he could not speak for the Special Operations Division (SOD), but noted that if an event required emergency shelter-in-place (SIP), MPDC will respond to certain areas around the perimeter of the SIP area. Patrol officers will stop traffic and won't let anyone into the area. The officers will also stop cars leaving and obtain identification or if they are not able to stop a car, to write down the license plate number and determine the identification of the owner through the registration database.

If the intrusion alarm sounds when the site is shut down, MPDC will mount a Code 1 Response with lights and sirens. The responding officers will verify whether it is a false alarm.

Question from Ambassador Howard Schaffer, RAB member – When is the police car at the site?

Officer McElwee said that whenever workers are on-site, SOD officers trained in munitions are present.

John Saunders, Lt. Fire Chief also introduced himself.

**1. Community Meeting on January 8th** – A Community Meeting was held on January 8, 2008 at the Horace Mann School Community Center. D. Noble thanked the RAB for letting the USACE use the RAB meeting time for the community meeting. He noted that the meeting was well attended. The topic was the recent pause in operations at Pit 3. Approval was received on the submission of the amendment to the Site Safety Plan on January 18th and work at the site restarted on January 24th.

Lt. Eric Hayes of the MPDC Second District arrived at the meeting and introduced himself. He is a veteran of the Department and has recently been assigned to the Second District. He briefly reiterated the MPDC's role, including the presence of SOD at all times during site activity, blocking traffic and instituting SIP, and radio broadcasts in the event of an emergency. He noted that he felt that USACE was keeping risk to a minimum as far as public safety is concerned.

Question from Kent Slowinski, Audience Member – What about safety during transport of a munition from the site to the holding facility? What if a bomb goes off?

Lt. Hayes stated that because the munitions are packaged, risk to the community is at a minimum.

Officer McElwee added that SOD is on-site during all work times.

Lt. Hayes said that the munitions have to be taken to the federal facility because they can't be transported to another state.

G. Beumel suggested that the discussion be continued after the meeting.

Lt. Hayes gave the attendees his contact information and promised to try to get answers to any questions posed by the public.

D. Noble said that the RAB meeting minutes for September and October and Partnering meeting minutes for September, October, and November have been posted to the website.

**2. Task Group Updates- Membership Task Group** – The vote for the recommendation to elect new voting member, George Vassiliou, was postponed due to the lack of a quorum of RAB members.

## II. USACE Issues

### A. Monthly Update of Geophysical Survey, Sampling and Residential Arsenic Removal Program

D. Noble stated that a USACE contractor, Weston Solutions, Inc., conducted geophysical surveys at three more properties at Fordham, Tilden, and Quebec Streets.

At the next Partnering meeting, the Anomaly Review Board will convene to review the results from earlier geophysical surveys completed in the summer and decide which anomalies will be intrusively investigated.

Ed Hughes said that one property was screened for arsenic and sampling results would be expected soon.

Residential arsenic removal has been completed at four properties. Last week Sevenson completed a property on Upton Street.

Pictures were shown of work in progress at a property on 52nd Street. A picture was shown of backfilling and compaction with clean fill at the 49th Street property belonging to David Feary.

At the property on 52nd Street, a small bottle containing a clear liquid was found. It appeared to be sealed. The technician recognized it as potentially an early 20th century bottle. The contingency plan was implemented and the bottle was shipped to Edgewood for analysis.

A picture was shown of the cleaned bottle, which proved not to be sealed.

The results of the analysis were negative for chemical agents and breakdown products and it was cleared for volatile organic compounds (VOCs). An archeologist determined that the bottle was made by the Maryland Glass Company in Baltimore after 1916 for the Emerson Drug Company. Most containers made with external screw threads date from the late 1920s and after. It is unlikely that this bottle is related to the WWI-era American University Experiment Station (AUES) activities.

**B. MMRP**

**1. Munitions Disposal Pit 3 Project Update**

D. Noble gave an update on the MMRP-Munitions Disposal Pit 3 activities. Work at Pit 3 resumed on January 24th. DDESB approved the amendment and requested that a filtration unit be placed on the interim holding facility as an extra layer of safety. Although it was a request and not a demand, the filter has been placed on the interim holding facility. Military munitions and munitions debris continue to be found. Very little glassware has been found at this site.

A picture was shown of a 55-gallon drum which was located during the previous Pit 3 dig in 2002, but had to be left in place when the ROE expired. The barrel is encased in the concrete which formed the footer of the retaining wall. The drum was visible, but it was outside the dig box at that point.

A picture was shown of an end-on look at the barrel that had been taken during the previous investigation. The USACE was certain it would be encountered during the current investigation. Pictures were shown of the current progress at the Pit 3 excavation.

The depth in the photo is the same depth that was reached before in this area. The whole barrel is visible, as is the whole footer. The barrel was uncovered, and apparently the concrete poured for the footer flowed into it and molded around it. The picture shows a munition caught between the footer and the barrel. The concrete sealed it there.

A picture was shown of the barrel pulled away from the footer. The clean concrete is visible where the barrel was, as is the munition in the concrete.

The second picture shows the barrel full of concrete. It came apart in pieces as it was removed. The concrete was broken up into pieces smaller than the size of munitions to make sure that there were no more munitions embedded in the concrete.

To date, 549 barrels of soil have been removed from the pit to date. Composite samples of every three barrels were screened for agent, and metals detection analysis was performed. All analyses to date have shown it is non-hazardous waste and may be disposed at a landfill to be used as clean fill on the landfill.

The original estimate of volume of soil that would be removed from the pit was 750 to 1,000 barrels. The lower number (750 barrels) might be close to the real number that will be excavated. Six weeks were lost with the pause in excavations at Pit 3, but USACE is still hoping to finish the dig with the structure in its current location in early March.

USACE is constantly looking to see what is being found. Based on metal detector readings, there is a possibility of additional single munitions or a cluster of munitions near the Pit 3 location. Two different locations of possible munitions are out-of-reach from the current footprint of the structure. The structure was set up on the 4825 Glenbrook Road property site location to clear the areas that were not cleared during the previous Pit 3 dig.

Additional geophysical investigation work has been conducted along the Glenbrook Road corridor. It is almost impossible to get good geophysical information on top of the street because the utility corridors mask any anomalies that might be underneath the pavement. The side of the road where the pits had been was surveyed down along the District of Columbia right-of-way. The geophysical technicians said there were 66 anomalies. The Anomaly Review Board (ARB) reviewed the findings and suggested performing a low-probability dig for 9 of them. Three of the 66 anomalies were within the footprint of the structure. One of those three had originally been selected for digging. With the structure in place, all three were investigated and all were munitions and munitions debris related to AUES activities. These results were presented to the ARB, which agreed with USACE's recommendations to dig all 66 anomalies. The ARB does not decide whether the dig should be conducted as a low or high probability dig. USACE is considering digging at least the portion of the anomalies near the current structure as high-probability because all three anomalies within the structure were munitions or munitions debris. If the investigation is conducted as high-probability, the box would either need to move or have an addition built onto it.

A photograph was shown looking on the back end of the box closest to the house. There is a 2 foot limit on excavation from the side of the box to ensure that the structure remains stable in the unlikely event of an explosion. The structure needs stable soil to sit on and the soil closer to the side of the structure is less stable.

In the back end of the structure near the house, some munitions and munitions debris were recovered between the retaining wall and the house. There were also sidewall detections of anomalies with metal detectors in the same area. The USACE plans to extend the structure back along the side of the house.

As the big concrete footer is broken up to remove items, the concrete along the rest of the retaining wall vibrates. A sinkhole is starting to develop from the vibrations outside the structure opposite the chimney. It could represent an unstable area. As a metal detector was passed along the retaining wall, there is a signal. The retaining wall has metal rebar in its construction. A larger signal was read near the sinkhole, which may mean there is a higher concentration of metal in this area.

As far as the schedule is concerned, there is a good chance the Pit 3 investigation will be finished in early March. It does not mean that the investigation will be finished at the site.

**2. Test Pit Investigation Monthly Update**

E. Hughes, stated that 77 pits are planned at 4835 Glenbrook Road. From October 11th to December 19th, 23 pits were completed. To increase the rate of completion, the work schedule changed to five 10-hour days. With the new schedule, the team has now completed 46 out of the 77 pits planned. It is hoped that that pace will be maintained. Test pitting was paused and the team switched to arsenic grid removal last week because the timing seemed to be right. Some grids are in more than 12 feet of fill and will not be dug. The arsenic grids will continue to be removed from the property. Then the test pits in the back yard will be dug so contaminated soil is not scattered.

An occasional AUES-related item is found. The front yard was the area where glassware was found in the 1990s. The property owner hired a contractor to come in and remove the soil from that area and they seem

to have done a good job because only a few small pieces of glassware were recently recovered in the same area.

At Test Pit 49, two large pieces of AUES debris were recovered. Where this glassware was removed, the scrap metal remains of an empty Livens projectile, with a puncture whole in the side was discovered. The test pit was overdug and nothing else was found.

**3. Update and Discussion of Munition Disposal Options**

Unfired munitions are being removed from Pit 3 and then stored at the federal facility.

The Lenney Siegal study report, distributed to the RAB previously, investigates munitions disposal at Formerly Used Defense Site (FUDS) locations and describes community case studies on how to get the items disposed of in the least problematic way possible.

The report presents the outcomes of possible options used in various communities, including the following: Open detonation, on-site treatment system destruction, stockpile incinerators, and commercial incinerators.

The report emphasized that communities want to be made aware of the options for munitions destruction before a treatment option is selected. Toward that end, USACE would like to invite PM Nonstockpile personnel to attend a RAB meeting to discuss the options available to Spring Valley, potentially in March or April.

The report noted that most communities had a general opposition to incinerators. Most communities preferred bringing in the mobile Explosive Destruction System (EDS) rather than shipping the chemical warfare material (CWM) off-site or out of state. The EDS outcomes were viewed very favorably by the communities familiar with the system. The topic of munitions destruction engendered intense emotional reactions in the communities studied. Any munitions destruction activity must begin early and the planning process and should incorporate open exchange of information. David Feary will discuss the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) Report at the next RAB meeting.

E. Hughes noted that the USACE has taken some actions regarding preparing for munitions destruction. On January 18th, USACE met with the Aberdeen Proving Ground (APG)-Non-Stockpile Program Project Manager. He said that while there are some incinerators that can handle chemical warfare, it is a difficult solution to implement. Also, most state governments will not allow CWM to cross their borders if the intent of the transfer is to destroy the munitions. On January 23rd, the Baltimore District Commander sent a formal request to the APG Non-Stockpile Project Manager to begin the disposal process, requesting a response with options, and a cost estimate and schedule for planning purposes.

Previously, both the EDS system and a Donovan Detonation Chamber were transported to and used in Spring Valley, and successfully destroyed CWM and standard warfare munitions at the Federal Property behind Sibley Hospital.

In preparation for the visit by the head of PM Nonstockpile, the RAB was asked if it wanted to pose questions and concerns so that the PM Nonstockpile can research the answers and address the questions and concerns? The USACE has already asked the PM Nonstockpile to explore the requirements and costs involved in bringing various systems on-site.

G. Beumel asked if the RAB had any questions to forward to the PM Nonstockpile.

Question from Lee Monsein, RAB member – Was arsenic found in the soil that was shipped as nonhazardous material?

D. Noble said yes, but not hazardous levels according to the Toxicity Characteristic Leaching Procedure (TCLP) testing, although there were some high numbers in the soil.

L. Monsein asked for confirmation that there were no arsenic grids over 20 parts per million (ppm).

D. Noble noted that the soil in the pit was nonhazardous waste according to TCLP analysis, and clarified that there were some arsenic grids greater than 20 ppm on the property.

A discussion was held regarding the testing and classification of soil for disposal purposes.

D. Noble clarified that soil containing listed waste, at any concentration, must be properly disposed at a landfill classified to accept hazardous waste. Screened nonhazardous soil may be sent to a landfill to be used as daily cover. In preparation for shipping and disposal, a composite sample is taken from each group of three barrels of soil and subjected to TCLP laboratory tests. The testing mimics landfill leaching conditions, i.e., it simulates in the laboratory the process whereby rainwater causes chemicals to be washed from soil. Thus far, all samples have tested as nonhazardous for shipping and disposal.

Question from Ambassador H. Schaffer – Reviewing what you have dug up at Pit 3, were you surprised by what you found?

D. Noble stated that he was surprised that so many of the items are made of metal, and not wood, ceramic or glass. About 98% of what was found is metal, either munitions or munitions debris.

Question from Ginny Durrin, Audience Member – What other chemicals are tested for in addition to arsenic?

D. Noble said that a number of chemicals are tested for. The list is in the site-specific work plan available on the website.

Question from Nan Wells, ANC Commissioner, Audience Member – Was mustard gas found in some samples?

D. Noble stated that mustard gas breakdown products had previously been detected in soil gas samples, but during this Pit 3 effort they have not been detected in soil or in the pit. There have been no detections of chemical warfare or agent breakdown products during the current effort. Also, a composite sample is collected from a group of three barrels filled with excavated soil, headspaced and heated to see if any offgassing of CWM occurs. If the test is positive, the sample would be sent for additional chemical analysis, and possibly low level extraction. None have been positive.

Question from G. Durrin, Audience Member – How close would the digging get to the foundation of the house?

D. Noble said part of the house is currently exposed. The structure is on top of one window well. The front right corner of the window well is exposed. The excavation is at about 8 feet down at this point; the window well base is 10 to 12 feet below ground surface, so there is another 2 to 4 feet to go before the digging would go below the foundation level of the house.

Question from G. Durrin, Audience Member – When the box is moved, will it be in the same relationship to the house?

D. Noble said the intention is to continue to go back along the side of the house if metallic objects continue to be found in that area. The side of the foundation of the house would potentially be exposed. The soil would have to come out in that area.

Question from G. Durrin, Audience Member – Was going on the other side of the retaining wall ever considered?

D. Noble stated that previously we dug test pits that included the other side of the retaining wall in the back yard. Currently we are removing the portion of the retaining wall in the footprint of the containment structure, the concrete footer and all dirt if metallic objects were being detected in the area.

Question from Charlie Bermpohl, Audience Member – I remember a discussion about the house supposedly sitting on top of the munitions pit and of the house having to come down. I believe Gary

Schilling talked about munitions underneath the house. Is the USACE pretty sure that there are no munitions underneath the house?

D. Noble said he could not speculate about that. It is still an open question.

Question from C. Bermpohl, Audience Member – Are pieces of ceramic being found?

D. Noble stated that ceramic had not been found in Pit 3. Although, small pieces of ceramic, the size of your hand, have been found at 4835 Glenbrook Road.

Question from C. Bermpohl, Audience Member – There are carboys in the Sgt. Maurer pit picture.

D. Noble said that no carboys or ceramic pieces have been found in Pit 3.

Question from K. Slowinski, Audience Member – I understand you have reached the 2001 depth. Where is that at depth in relation to the foundation of the house?

D. Noble stated that is was 8 feet down. The basement is 10 to 12 feet deep.

Question from K. Slowinski, Audience Member – My recollection was that they detected mustard on the 4825 Glenbrook Road property.

D. Noble said that one munition leaking mustard was found a few years ago in one of the pits on the adjacent property, not 4825 Glenbrook.

Question from K. Slowinski, Audience Member – At the meeting next month could we ask Craig Williams from the Nonstockpile Chemical Working Group in Kentucky to attend?

D. Noble noted that the USACE works with the PM Nonstockpile group from Aberdeen. That is the PM Nonstockpile headquarters.

Question from K. Slowinski, Audience Member – Has there been any discussion about more extensive investigation around Test Pit 49 at 4835 Glenbrook Road?

D. Noble said that Test Pit 49 was overexcavated down to 12 feet and it was extended beyond the original 3-ft by 6-ft grid. The Schonstedt instrument was used, and it did not pick up on any other metallic objects in the area. In addition, Test Pit 54 is quite nearby and has not been dug yet.

Question from K. Slowinski, Audience Member – Is the structure near a retaining wall?

D. Noble stated that it was on the upper terrace, which is a flat area with flagstone. The debris was underneath the terrace.

Question from K. Slowinski, Audience Member – If the munition was embedded on top of the 55-gallon drum, did the workers who found this dig it up and cover it up?

D. Noble said that he would be uncomfortable speculating about what the workers did, simply because he wasn't there and could not know.

Question from K. Slowinski, Audience Member – Has any attempt been made to contact the construction workers?

D. Noble stated that EPA had taken the lead on this, and over the years has attempted to talk with the workers about the construction site without success, and that renewing the effort was already under discussion.

G. Beumel asked that further questions be answered individually after the meeting.

**III. Community Issues**

1. **Discussion of Councilmember Cheh's request and Johns Hopkins University (JHU) study recommendations** – D.C. Councilmember Mary M. Cheh requested $750K in the District of Columbia budget to follow up on the JHU study. RAB member Malcolm Pritzker led the discussion.

**JHU Study Recommendations Summary**

- Work with the DDOH to obtain additional years of mortality and cancer registry data.
- Collect additional information on non-cancer outcomes of concern potentially related to AUES-chemical exposures.
- Update and maintain existing SV database to obtain current environmental sampling and health outcome data.
- Analyze data from ATSDR studies and, if warranted, work with DDOH to develop protocol for a systematic exposure study.
- Demonstrate exposure reductions resulting from remediation.
- Conduct continued outreach with community and work with agency partners on future study. Establish communication protocol regarding potential soil disturbance in Spring Valley.
- Continue tracking water sampling results to evaluate potential for water-related exposure pathways.
- Continue public health outreach, responses, and risk communication efforts.
- Reinforce preventive community and household measures to reduce exposure to soil.

M. Pritzker suggested that the RAB discuss the steps that could be taken to obtain funding to implement the recommendations. One idea would be to contact JHU and obtain information regarding the cost and implementation schedule and furnish it to the councilmember.

The steps to follow to obtain additional years of funding might include the following: determining which of the recommendations is the first priority and what is the justification, determining when the additional study could start, when it could be completed, and at what cost, following the same process for the rest of the recommendations, and furnishing the information to Councilmember Cheh's office.

M. Pritzker suggested that the RAB consider passing a commendation for Councilmember Cheh for making the recommendation to continue the study to the Mayor, offer the RAB's support and visit with the council to try to assist her to get funds to follow up on the JHU recommendations.

Patrick Leibach of the councilmember's office thanked the RAB and expressed appreciation for the RAB's efforts on behalf of the councilmember. He explained that the budget process for funding stipulates that each council member lay out a list of funding requests directly before the Mayor. The Spring Valley health study continuation is at the top of Councilmember Cheh's list.

P. Leibach noted that the funding requests for the Mayor's FY 09 budget have already been submitted and that the previous study was conducted under the Department of Health budget, but that any additional study would be under the Department of the Environment and public works budgets.

He noted that the councilmembers generally do not obtain as much funding as they request, however, supplemental funding exists if more money is available than was estimated. Supplemental funds are allocated according to the Mayor's priority list. Councilmembers can request additional funds from that source. "We have not seen the FY 09 budget yet. After we have seen it, we will know if the funds were included. At that point, we can start discussing the supplemental funds. Councilmember Cheh has already approached the Mayor about the JHU health study. If the RAB can provide additional information, it would be helpful."

If the study were to be conducted through the Department of the Environment and public works, Councilmembers Graham, Browser, and Alexander would be on the committee. It must be passed by the Committee and the full Council.

Question from L. Monsein – Where did that estimate come from?

P. Leibach stated that the estimate came from JHU.

M. Pritzker asked the RAB to consider what the main priorities are.

L. Monsein stated that like most academic institutions, JHU is set up to respond to Requests for Proposals (RFPs). Providing a detailed RFP would be the best starting point.

Question from Ambassador H. Schaffer – How long is the budget process?

P. Leibach said that the FY 09 budget has already been written.

Jim Sweeney, DDOE, stated that the budget is first written then submitted to the Mayor.

P. Leibach said that until the budget is passed, things can change. Usually additional revenue is certified.

Question from Ambassador H. Schaffer – When is the best opportunity for the RAB to make an intervention?

P. Leibach said that he had only observed one budget cycle, however, it had been his experience that once the budget was submitted by the Mayor, it would be very difficult to obtain additional funding from the budget unless specific money is picked to be removed from another program.

M. Pritzker said that his sense was that the RAB and the community would like to implement the recommendations. The only question is how can the RAB best assist Ms. Cheh in obtaining the funding. It would seem that the more information the RAB can supply, the more likely it is that the Mayor or the funding committee will agree to fund the study.

L. Monsein said that the RAB needs hard data information based on data from JHU in writing to give to Ms. Cheh and the Mayor.

P. Leibach stated that he had a draft letter to JHU that was never finalized. Councilmember Cheh went ahead with the funding request.

M. Pritzker suggested that the RAB review the letter and Ambassador H. Schaffer agreed.

P. Leibach said that would be helpful.

G. Beumel asked if the RAB should focus its efforts on the Mayor or another contact.

P. Leibach said he would get the names of the contacts to the RAB.

G. Beumel said that possibly Maureen McGowen, who works in the city administration and mayor's office, might be an additional contact.

N. Wells noted that in her experience, academic institutions are willing to negotiate with the funding and requesting parties regarding the scope of the study and how much they could pay. JHU has set out a general outline. Perhaps the RAB could set up a working group to determine what are the most important questions to be answered. JHU could then work with the RAB on the timeline and other aspects of the project.

M. Pritzker stated that a lot of people in this neighborhood know the Mayor and others on the Council. Perhaps people could be encouraged to approach officials whom they know.

G. Beumel said that the ANC is separate from the Mayor's office, and the RAB may want to engage the ANC separately.

P. Leibach said the budget would be submitted to the council in the second or third week in March.

G. Beumel asked about the next steps after the budget was approved.

P. Leibach stated that the best chance for receiving the largest amount was from the original budget. The amounts were not likely to change much after budget submission.

G. Beumel said that because there were not enough voting members present for a quorum, information would need to be sent to the RAB. A letter could be reviewed and formalized and Ambassador Schaffer would then be able review the letter.

**IV. Open Issues and Future Agenda Development**

1. **Next Meeting: March 11, 2008**

The following items were proposed for addition to the March agenda:

- Update on OU-3 project area
- Ongoing discussion of the disposal options – David Feary will lead the discussion of the NAS study.
- PM Nonstockpile will be invited to make a presentation at either the March or April RAB meeting.
- Update on ongoing groundwater study and 2008 planning – E. Hughes noted that a meeting of the Partners' groundwater experts would be held in February.
- Phytoremediation discussion.
- Further discussion of the JHU follow-up study and the Mayor's budget items.
- Vote on admitting G. Vassiliou as a RAB Community member.

**V. Public Comments**

Question from K. Slowinski, Audience Member – Has any thought been given to communicating with the laborers who built the wall at 4825 Glenbrook Road?

D. Noble said that the Partners are considering that. EPA had made an attempts to find and question the workers a number of years ago. Now that that the USACE has specific questions, any recollection they had of things being done could be helpful, however they may be difficult to locate and still may be unwilling to talk with officials.

Question from K. Slowinski, Audience Member – Could a GIS demonstration be put on a future agenda with the focus on 4825 and 4835 Glenbrook Road?

G. Beumel said it was on the agenda at one point.

E. Hughes noted that a GIS presentation was made regarding the fence line in November.

G. Beumel suggested that a GIS operator give a presentation as was done in the past, showing the layers and big database behind the dots for the benefit of the new RAB members.

E. Hughes said that the GIS specialist had come from Parsons previously, and that she has very recently left Parsons. A new GIS specialist will be found soon, and will need a little time to become familiar the project before they can give a presentation.

Question from K. Slowinski, Audience Member – At 4825 Glenbrook Road, the construction workers said they found munitions behind the retaining wall behind the house, not in the driveway. I understand that the previous test pits went only 6 feet deep, but Pit 3 is known to be deeper.

D. Noble mentioned that the USACE will be digging additional test pits in the backyard between the retaining wall and the house.

K. Slowinski, Audience Member said he thought the test pits were only 6 feet deep, according to the Partnering meeting minutes.

D. Noble considered the 6 feet depth and said there must be further details being left out or a misunderstanding, as that would be unusual. He said he would be open to discussing whether an additional effort is needed if that was the concern.

Question from G. Durrin, Audience Member – Serious consideration should be given to talking with the Dartmouth Arsenic Study authors about long-term levels of exposure to low levels of arsenic to see if it could be incorporated into the JHU study. Also, there has been strongly argued discussion in the past about why not much indoor air sampling for arsenic has been conducted, although residents spend most of their time indoors.

M. Pritzker stated that the RAB could ask JHU and possibly include the Dartmouth study with their study.

Question from G. Durrin, Audience Member – It is difficult to understand why the indoor air sampling doesn't get done.

E. Hughes noted that the reason the arsenic investigation and remediation focuses on the soil is because there is a much greater health risk from exposure to contaminated soil than from arsenic in the air. Also, other sources contribute to contaminants showing up in the air. Ambient air in this area has arsenic levels at the low end of the risk-based concentrations (RBCs).

G. Durrin, Audience Member said that the question should be asked and questioned the assertion that there is more risk outside than inside.

Question from N. Wells, ANC Commissioner, Audience Member – What is the process for deciding about disposing of the munitions? Who approves the procedure?

D. Noble said that the decisions are made by PM Nonstockpile. USACE informs them when there are munitions for disposal. They become the owner of the items. They are the USACE's resident experts on options that exist. They inform the USACE what to do with them, but the opportunity exists to obtain community input, operating under CERCLA.

Question from N. Wells, ANC Commissioner, Audience Member – The plan is to seek a response from the community at large, but the options come from PM Nonstockpile?

D. Noble said that PM Nonstockpile relies on the experiences that they have had in the last 1 to 2 years on what has been working.

E. Hughes stated that the last time munitions were disposed of at Spring Valley, a representative of PM Nonstockpile attended a RAB meeting and laid out the options. RAB input was considered in formulating the plan.

Question from N. Wells, ANC Commissioner, Audience Member – What do you do to get community input?

G. Beumel said the CERCLA process may require that a community meeting be held. Until the community knows the options, it is difficult to know what to recommend. Community outreach should begin soon, according to the recommendations in the Siegal report.

G. Durrin, Audience Member noted that the last time the process was done very professionally.

Question from N. Wells, ANC Commissioner, Audience Member – How is the decision made that says when enough of Pit 3 has been dug? The community needs assurance that everything will come out of the ground and, as I understand it, geophysical instruments cannot be used on the roadbed.

D. Noble said USACE will overexcavate the pit. Digging will proceed down to native, undisturbed soil, which will be difficult next to the house because of the fill remaining. The team will have to rely on chemical testing to determine whether the fill is clean. A certified registered geologist will determine what is left, a chemist will test whether the levels of metals and chemicals are below certain amounts, and

metal detectors and sidewall sampling will be used to check for any additional anomalies. Then the regulatory people and technical folks will examine the pit.

Question from N. Wells, ANC Commissioner, Audience Member – Will anyone uninvolved examine the pit?

D. Noble said the regulators will examine the open hole to be assured that it has been completely excavated.

J. Sweeney, DDOE stated that the regulators are invited on-site and can bring in someone else if desired. The lead agency will make the decision on when Pit 3 is complete.

**VI. Adjourn**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:50 p.m.