

**U.S. Army Corps of Engineers  
Spring Valley Restoration Advisory Board Meeting  
St. David's Episcopal Church  
Minutes of the April 8, 2008 RAB Meeting**

<b>RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT AT THIS MEETING</b>	
Dan Noble	Military Co-Chair/USACE, Spring Valley MMRP Manager
Mario Aguilar	Community Member
Mary Bresnahan	Community Member
David Feary	Community Member
Steven Hirsh	US EPA Region 3
William Krebs	Community Member
Lawrence Miller	Community Member
Lee Monsein	Community Member
Ambassador Howard B. Schaffer	Community Member
Bernard Schulz	American University
James Sweeney	District of Columbia, Department of the Environment
George Vassiliou	Community Member
John Wheeler	Community Member
<b>RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEMBERS NOT PRESENT</b>	
Greg Beumel	Community Co-Chair
Dr. Peter deFur	Environmental Stewardship Concepts/RAB TAPP Consultant
Malcolm Pritzker	Community Member
Bert Weintraub	Community Member
<b>ATTENDING PROJECT PERSONNEL</b>	
Ed Hughes	USACE, Spring Valley Program Manager
Emily Devillier	USACE
Maya Courtney	ERT, Spring Valley Community Outreach Team
Jessica Bruland	Earth Resources Technology
Neil Jones	Earth Resources Technology

**HANDOUTS FROM THE MEETING**

- I. Final Agenda for the April 2008 RAB Meeting.
- II. Handout of Corps of Engineers Presentation.

**I. Administrative Issues**

David Feary, Acting Community RAB Co-Chair, noted that the press release distributed to the RAB was provided by Kent Slowinski, Audience Member, not USACE. The press release described an upcoming book focusing on procedures for chemical and explosive munitions cleanup.

**1. Co-Chair Updates**

Dan Noble, Military Co-Chair/USACE, Spring Valley Military Munitions Response Program (MMRP) Manager, welcomed the group and presented the agenda.

Ed Hughes, USACE Spring Valley Program Manager, will be leaving on temporary assignment to work on other projects at the USACE office in Harrisburg, PA. He will return in September.

**a. Introduce Guests**

Officer Anthony McElwee of the District of Columbia Metropolitan Police Department (MPD) introduced himself. He offered to answer questions regarding his involvement with the Spring Valley Project and provided his e-mail address.

Emily Devillier, a former USACE intern on the Spring Valley project, has returned to the Spring Valley Project as a full-time USACE employee.

Jessica Bruland from Earth Resources Technology (ERT) will be taking minutes for the RAB meetings, replacing Demaree Hopkins.

**b. TAPP Funding Update**

E. Hughes said that the request for 2008 TAPP funding may be approved any day. The package is currently at the Pentagon, at the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army's office, and is being prepared for Mr. Addison Davis's signature (the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army for Environment, Safety, and Occupational Health). If the requested budget is approved and signed, it will provide an additional 10K for Dr. Peter deFur's FY08 budget. The TAPP funding will also provide 25K for FY09, 25K for FY2010, and 20K for FY2011.

D. Feary noted that Dr. Peter deFur, Environmental Stewardship Concepts/RAB TAPP Consultant, was not in attendance because the TAPP funding had not yet received final approval, and there was little remaining funding. P. deFur's participation in RAB and Partnering meetings is supported by TAPP funding.

E. Hughes clarified that the entire budget amount for FY08, including the pending \$10K, is \$25K. This additional \$10K will be sufficient for activities through the start of FY09, in September 2008.

**2. RAB Task Group Updates**

No task groups had updates.

**3. Announcements**

A Pit 3 completion video is available on the website. The video shows the inside of the Pit 3 structure on Glenbrook Road. Meeting minutes from recent RAB and Partnering meetings will continue to be posted on the website as they are finalized.

**II. USACE Issues**

**1. Progress Update: Residential Arsenic Removal Program and Phytoremediation**

E. Hughes provided an update on the Residential Arsenic Removal Program and Phytoremediation.

**a. Arsenic Removal**

Two residential arsenic properties have been completed, and work on another property has begun. The completed Indian Lane property is awaiting a final layer of sod to be placed in the front yard. Arsenic removal at the Quebec Street property is currently in progress. Severson is working to complete as many properties as possible during calendar year 2008.

Photographs were shown of the properties in various stages of remediation.

Larry Miller, Community Member commented on the photos showing arsenic removal at a Verplanck Place property. He lives nearby and noted that he was happy the tree was saved in the front yard.

E. Hughes acknowledged that every effort is made to preserve trees. As long as the property owner approves, a tree can be preserved if it meets the alternate cleanup goal of 43 ppm arsenic.

**b. Phytoremediation**

Three study locations are planned for this year – Rockwood, Overlook, and Lot 15 (an area along Van Ness street). The ferns will be planted in May. Mid-May is the optimal time, but the date will be worked out with Edenspace once the contract is finalized.

Question from Ambassador Schaffer, Community Member – How much longer will this residential arsenic removal program last? Does this 2008 work finish the program, or are there additional properties in the queue?

E. Hughes stated that the goal is to complete all of the residential properties by the end of 2008. No new properties are in the queue, but a few properties remain unsampled due to access issues. Access to new properties is occasionally granted for arsenic sampling, and there is roughly a 10% chance that the property will require arsenic soil removal. At least 9 federal and city lots still require arsenic removal, so arsenic digging will likely continue to at least halfway through 2009.

Question from John Wheeler, Community Member – Is Lot 15 the same parcel next to the reservoir that has been part of the phytoremediation project?

E. Hughes confirmed that Lot 15 is located next to the Van Ness Reservoir structure (not next to the water body itself). A grass berm is located there which is on the Washington Aqueduct property.

Question from David Feary, Community Member – Is the objective there to retain those mature trees?

E. Hughes confirmed that the neighbors did not want the trees removed in that location. This prompted the use of phytoremediation in that area, which appears to be working. The arsenic levels are approaching the alternate cleanup goal of 43 ppm, and the denser fern spacing this year will hopefully reduce arsenic to a low enough level that this property will be complete.

Ambassador Howard B. Schaffer, Community Member, noted that one of the phytoremediation areas is his property. He has been impressed with the people who do it; they are very quiet, discreet, and efficient.

Question from Charlie Bermppohl, Audience Member – What was the arsenic concentration prior to the remediation work for the Indian Lane property? Is there any possibility that the arsenic could have gotten up into the large tree and into the bark?

E. Hughes did not know the level offhand. The ferns used for phytoremediation are specifically known to hyperaccumulate arsenic, and are very unique plants in doing so. He was not aware of any trees that hyperaccumulate arsenic in their tissue.

Question from Ginny Durrin, Audience Member – Regarding the two largest properties in Spring Valley, between Woodway Lane and Glenbrook Road: has geophysics and arsenic testing been completed, and do they have a clean bill of health? I understand that an old army map showed a road that accessed the properties from 49<sup>th</sup> street, between Woodway Lane and Glenbrook Road, and in it there were three specific buildings or powder magazines. One was labeled as a powder magazine with ground scars. I wanted to know whether the property has been thoroughly checked because the contamination was described as extending to the furthest reaches of the property, and I believe the properties would have been the furthest reaches of the American University property in those days.

E. Hughes was unsure as to which properties these were.

S. Hirsh, U.S. EPA Region 3, suggested the Spalding/Captain Rankin property and the property next door on Woodway Lane.

E. Hughes replied that if one property is the Spalding/Captain Rankin property, then yes, it had arsenic remediation done and was cleared of geophysical anomalies.

E. Hughes said he was pretty sure that the properties has been accessed and sampled. He requested that they look at the large Spring Valley map together to confirm that they are talking about the same property.

## **2. OU 3 Area Discussion: Test Pit Investigation**

D. Noble gave an update on the Test Pit Investigation progress on Glenbrook Road. 70 test pits and 4 arsenic grids have been completed to date.

Arsenic removal in the driveway area is in progress, and the driveway has been partially removed. All accessible test pits will be completed by April 10. Five test pits on the south side of the house are currently inaccessible, and will be dug after the Pit 3 work is complete.

The workers will receive one week off during the week of April 14. When they return the week of April 21, they will concentrate only on arsenic grid removal. Arsenic grid removal will hopefully be complete by May 16. The work crew plans to move to the Public Safety Building on May 19.

He showed a map of the **test pit and arsenic grid locations**. One test pit will not be excavated due to interference from electrical utilities.

Question from Ambassador Schaffer, Community Member – Where is the AU property boundary? Who owned it?

D. Noble showed the property line and said the owner is the same for both properties.

Question from Charlie Bempohl, Audience Member – Was there any evidence of ceramic shards in the 70 test pits?

D. Noble said that most objects found at the property were glassware and metal, and a few possible AUES-related items. If any ceramics were found, it was just a few pieces.

Question from G. Durrin, Audience Member – When will the 5 test pits that are on the south side of the property be dug?

D. Noble said these 5 test pits will be completed after high probability investigations are completed at the adjacent property.

## **3. OU 3 Area Discussion: Pit 3 Area Investigation**

D. Noble provided an update on the Munitions Disposal / Pit 3 Area Project. The Pit 3 excavation was completed on March 10. The East extension of the ECS was completed on April 3.

A map was shown of the first two **ECS Extensions** that were originally planned at the Pit 3 property (an East extension and a North extension). The North extension is no longer necessary. It was originally proposed after munitions items were removed nearby, and the metal detector indicated that additional metal was buried in the area. After soil excavation was completed, metals were no longer detected in the area. The previous readings may have resulted from rust or small pieces of metal in the soil. There is no evidence that munitions are buried in that location. Test pit work at the Pit 3 property will focus on the front yard, and a test pit is planned where the North ECS extension would have been placed.

A map was shown of the **Current Containment Structure and the East Extension**.

Photographs were shown of the East Extension construction process. The soil fill on the far side of the retaining wall was removed to match the ground level next to the house, and the retaining wall was removed to create room for the East Extension. A manhole was enclosed inside the structure. Additional photographs featured the inside of the East extension.

D. Noble noted that a single item was found during construction of the East Extension. It was a stopper with a little bit of glass tubing still inside. It was headspaced clear, and no chemical agent was detected on the item.

A Chemical Safety Submission amendment was submitted to the U.S. Army Technical Center for Explosives Safety on April 7. This described and explained the modifications to the ECS structure. The Amendment will be reviewed and forwarded to the Department of Defense Explosives Safety Board (DDESB) by April 9. Approval by the DDESB is required in order to begin intrusive work in the East Extension. April 28 is the target date for starting work in the East extension.

A new siren was purchased for the remainder of the high probability investigations around Pit 3, as the old siren was starting to show its age. The new siren uses a solar-powered battery and was mounted 40 feet high on a telephone pole for maximum range. A silent test was completed on April 2, and the siren has been chirped a couple of times. It works well so far.

A full siren test is planned for Wednesday, April 23 at 4:05 PM. This test date is tentative. An e-mail notice will be sent to everyone confirming the date and time of the full siren test, and AU and the DC police/fire/HSEMA will be informed. This siren may be louder than the old siren. The new siren should be effective as far as 2400 feet, but for Pit 3 a radius of only 742 feet is needed.

Question from William Krebs, Community Member – What is the manhole for?

D. Noble described the manhole as part of a storm water drainage system, with a drainage line that extends to Glenbrook Road. They probably put this manhole in when they built the house, because they had to reroute the line around where the house was being built.

Question from W. Krebs, Community Member – So they must have already excavated in this area during the last 10 to 15 years?

D. Noble concurred that they must have dug in that location to put in the manhole and a trench for the line. Some of the line is exposed in the containment structure.

E. Hughes noted that they may not have removed anything during construction of the manhole and drainage system.

Question from N. Wells, ANC Commissioner – Do you know where the storm water goes once it leaves the property, and is it a continuous system that's enclosed?

D. Noble replied that the drainage line has been traced to Glenbrook Road.

Question from K.Slowinski, Audience Member – Was there any effort to contact the workers who installed the storm water line to see if they found anything? It would have been built in the early 1990s, correct?

E. Hughes and D. Noble said no, not that they know of. The EPA has recently been trying to contact some of the workers that built the house, but they were not necessarily the same workers that installed the manhole.

Question from Ambassador Schaffer, Community Member – When was the house built?

E. Hughes and D. Noble answered 1992.

Question from Ambassador Howard B. Schaffer, Community Member – Do you think the Chemical Safety Submission Amendment will be a problem, or is this fairly routine?

D. Noble said it will not be a problem because the structure just requires an extension.

Question from Christopher Cottrell, Audience Member – Is this just a regulation that says you need to amend and resubmit the Chemical Safety Submission, although it was built similar to the rest of the ECS?

D. Noble replied yes. Due to the terrain challenges and where the structure needs to sit, the ECS is a custom structure. The ECS was designed to meet certain specifications, and it was approved based on those specifications. Changing that custom design by enlarging the ECS for the East Extension requires approval for this modification.

Question from G. Durrin, Audience Member – Regarding the bigger picture, do you think that when all investigations are completed on Glenbrook Road, you will know any more about where things were buried?

D. Noble said the purpose of these investigations was to clear Pit 3 and objects found during the investigation. The test pit effort is designed to reveal whether another disposal pit exists on the two properties.

K. Slowinski, Audience Member, stated that there was an interesting article in the AU newspaper last week about President Kerwin lobbying a member Congress to obtain additional funding for Pit 3.

D. Noble said he was unaware of that effort.

K. Slowinski, Audience Member, added that the member of Congress was successful in getting an additional 3.2 million earmarked.

E. Hughes confirmed that USACE did receive 3.2 million earlier this year, and the Congressman's name associated with that was Congressman McGovern. Beyond that, he was unaware of how AU was involved to make that happen. The money was provided by the Pentagon.

Bernard Schulz, American University, said that an AU reporter called and referenced an article in the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, which inaccurately stated that AU received 3.2 million dollars. B. Schulz confirmed that the money was given to the Army Corps of Engineers by the Pentagon. The money happened to have the "AU Formerly Used Defense Site" in the project tagline, but there is no direct AU connection. Congressman Jim McGovern is an alumnus of AU and is familiar with the Spring Valley project.

Question from C. Bermpohl, Audience Member – Is the amount of 3.2 million dollars correct, and was it earmarked for anything specifically?

E. Hughes confirmed that was the correct amount. The money helped sustain Pit 3 activity this year.

Nan Wells, ANC Commissioner, noted that the *Chronicle of Higher Education* considered it an earmark for work on the AU campus. Compared to the median of 400K, this was a surprisingly large earmark for a university.

B. Schulz, American University reiterated that AU did not receive an earmark from the U.S. Congress. The earmark that was referenced in the article went to USACE, and was intended to bring the Spring

Valley project to completion. Spring Valley obviously includes parts of the AU property, but this earmark was intended to bring the entire project to closure.

Question from N. Wells, ANC Commissioner – Did AU request the additional funding?

B. Schulz was not certain, but he explained that this is under the purview of the committee related to the Army Corps of Engineers. The Congressman is on appropriations for this committee.

Question from Christopher Cottrell, Audience Member – Did the funding go to Pit 3, and what is the status? Will you need additional funding for the East addition?

D. Noble confirmed that some of the funding was applied to Pit 3 work. Completing Pit 3 is the top priority for the Military Munitions Response Program, and these additional funds were needed to continue the Pit 3 investigation.

Question from G. Durrin, Audience Member – Have there been earmarks for the same Congressman and AU in previous years?

E. Hughes said he didn't know of any earmarks with that Congressman's name attached to them.

C. Cottrell, Audience Member commented that he spoke to Congressman McGovern's press secretary, who said that President Kerwin approached the Congressman and asked him specifically for an earmark to aid the Pit 3 process. Congressman McGovern is aware that the Pit 3 project has continued for too long.

Question from D. Feary, Community Member – When do you anticipate that the test pits will be completed at the adjacent property?

D. Noble said the ECS extension work is scheduled to continue into late June or early July. After that, the 5 remaining test pits at that property can be completed as well as the test pit work at the Pit 3 property. An additional 9 weeks of effort will be required to complete the test pitting and arsenic removal on the two properties.

Question from G. Durrin, Audience Member – Are the 5 additional test pits in the driveway?

D. Noble clarified that the 5 remaining test pits located between the house and the retaining wall along the property line. There are other test pits located in the driveway at the Pit 3 property.

Question from K. Slowinski, Audience Member – Is this the area where you've detected mustard agents in the past? Will this be open-air test pitting, or will you use extra precautions?

D. Noble confirmed that mustard agent breakdown products were found in soil gas samples. The test pitting will be open-air, but air monitoring will be placed right above the test pit just like in the current test pit operation.

Question from Ambassador Howard B. Schaffer, Community Member – When will work at the two properties on Glenbrook Road, including rehabilitation of the properties, be complete?

D. Noble stated that the military munitions work on those properties should be finished in the fall. This assumes that no large discoveries are made as a result of the test pitting and no further extensions to the ECS are required.

S. Hirsh noted that some arsenic contaminated soil at the property at the corner of Rockwood Parkway and Glenbrook Road still needs to be removed.

#### **4. OU 3 Area Discussion: Upcoming AU Public Safety Building Project**

D. Noble gave an update on the upcoming AU Public Safety Building Project.

The Public Safety Building work is a low-probability investigation, and is an extension of the Lot 18 work. A minimum of 25-30 weeks of investigative effort is planned. Investigative effort will begin the week of May 19.

The Draft Final Work Plan is completed. The work plan is under review by the Partners, the property owner, and the RAB TAPP consultant. A final work plan is desired by April 18.

Two maps were shown of the **Public Safety Building work area** and the **Public Safety Building: Backyard Area**. Three single-anomaly clusters, two large anomalous areas (with three investigative trenches for each), and a utility area with high metal contamination are located in front and to the sides of the building. In the back of the building, an area will be excavated for debris removal, similar to the Lot 18 debris removal effort.

An interceptor trench will be dug first, 10 feet deep, due to fairly shallow groundwater behind the building. Water will be pumped out of the trench to lower the groundwater level. The first debris excavation trench will be dug on the west side of building. Trenches will extend to the building for debris removal. A section of this area was excavated during the Lot 18 effort, and we know that some debris still exists in this area.

Question from G. Durrin, Audience Member – Do you have the arsenic levels from around the Public Safety building? Were they high?

S. Hirsh commented that arsenic levels were pretty high in the bamboo area.

E. Hughes mentioned that remnants of a broken jar were discovered nearby with significant arsenic amounts.

Question from Ambassador Howard B. Schaffer, Community Member – Do operations continue as usual at the Public Safety building while the investigation is going on?

D. Noble said yes, use of the building will continue during the investigation.

## **5. Upcoming Geophysical Investigations for the Spring Valley neighborhood during FY08**

D. Noble presented information on the upcoming geophysical surveys in Spring Valley.

A new contract was awarded to Earth Resources Technology (ERT) to perform geophysical surveys. ERT will perform surveys on up to 40 properties. During these surveys, nonintrusive instruments are moved over a property to determine what is buried in the ground down to certain depths. Data is analyzed, and various anomalies are selected and highlighted.

USACE is putting together a list of 6 properties to be surveyed this fiscal year using FY08 funds. More properties will be added if the schedule and the budget permit.

Survey properties are chosen by overlaying the current property boundaries on top of old aerial photos, to look for certain points of interest. Any property located within areas where a trench, a range fan, or other features may be considered for geophysical survey. The available evidence is discussed with the Partners, a consensus is reached, and property access is requested from the homeowners.

Photographs of a geophysical survey in progress were shown. A 1918 Aerial Photograph of the Spring Valley area overlaid with a current property boundary map was shown.

G. Durrin, Audience Member, commented that it would be great if all of the past and current aerial maps could be put on the website. People could overlay the historical ground scars with the present landscape. I thought that in the past we were able to have these on DVD's.

D. Noble agreed that individual photos and the present day aeriels could potentially be put on the website. He was not sure whether the website is sophisticated enough to enable users to do GIS overlays, with the resolution and detail required.

S. Hirsh suggested that an already-overlaid map like the one shown in the presentation could be put on the website.

G. Durrin, Audience Member acknowledged this idea but said that the actual overlaying process would be the fascinating part. People could access and manipulate the images instead of seeing them in a presentation, and they are public documents.

Question from D. Feary, Community Member – Could overlaying GIS maps be done on the website?

D. Noble said that it would be quite an effort, and he was not sure if it could be done currently on the website. They have a GIS contractor they could ask.

N. Wells, ANC Commissioner, mentioned that a developing Archaeology of Annapolis website allows homeowners to look at their sites and see who has lived there over time and what has been done to the site. She offered to get information from them.

S. Hirsh agreed that N. Wells should find out what tools the Annapolis site uses.

Question from G. Durrin, Audience Member – How can we pursue this? Should we formally ask you?

D. Noble said he would need to talk to their webpage people.

D. Feary, Community Member, added that they need the GIS data layers and a program.

S. Hirsh suggested that they find out what Annapolis is doing and determine from there whether it is feasible to do a similar thing for Spring Valley.

### **III. Community Issues**

#### **1. Health Study Proposal Discussion**

Patrick Leibach from Councilmember Mary M. Cheh's Office, District of Columbia, spoke about the status of the recent health study proposal and about possible future proposals.

P. Leibach said that the budget for the city came out a couple of weeks ago. No money was included for a health study. The amount initially requested was 750K for a 3 year study. This year is a tight budget year, and the money is not available.

Councilmember Cheh is working with other members of the Council to see if there is money to fund a smaller health study. In order to obtain the money for a smaller study, money has to be taken from something else, and everything has its defenders.

By the next RAB meeting the budget will be pretty much set, and it will have been voted on for the first time that day. A firm update with what is and is not in the budget can be provided at that point.

P. Leibach mentioned a memo handed out at the beginning of the meeting, sent from Dr. Glinda Cooper, PhD, to Councilwoman Cheh regarding the public health study proposal.

D. Feary commented that Dr. Cooper's recommendation for a peer review of a health study proposal was a wise suggestion.

P. Leibach said that Councilmember Cheh knows that concern still exists among community members regarding potential health issues, despite the initial study. She would like to allay those concerns, but the constraints of the budget process do not allow additional time to deliberate over the FY09 budget. Our office gets a significant amount of interest in proceeding with a study, and if we are not able to obtain

funding for the FY09 budget using the current proposal, a more concrete proposal should be developed later. It should include the aims of the study, what options would make the most sense, and what the study would cost.

#### **IV. Open Issues & Future RAB Agenda Development**

##### **1. Open issues**

Question from K. Slowinski, Audience Member – After the last RAB meeting, Alma Gates came forward and gave a document to Greg Beumel, a proposal from Johns Hopkins for a tracking study. Was that proposal shared with other members of the RAB? Did they have any comments on it?

L. Miller, Community Member said that the document was shared with the RAB members and was commented upon. He did not see the proposal with dollar amounts and comments.

L. Monsein, Community Member noted that he had not seen the proposal, and that Dr. Cooper's analysis is compelling. He would not want to adopt or fund any proposed study without knowing exactly why it is being done, what the methodology will be, and whether or not it is designed to provide the information that the community wants.

D. Feary, Community Member agreed that although he received an e-mail, it was not a detailed proposal.

George Vassiliou, Community Member, agreed that the document verified that communication took place regarding a study, but it was not a proposal with numbers.

Question from N. Wells, ANC Commissioner – Does Councilwoman Cheh want to go forward with a follow-up study? Would she want the community to work with her to create that request?

P. Leibach said that there is a low probability of FY09 funding for the health study. After the meeting on May 13, the budget will be final. If the study is not included, there should a collaborative process to put together the type of peer review document suggested by Dr. Cooper.

##### **2. Future RAB Agenda Development**

D. Noble introduced the agenda items for the next meeting on May 13, 2008. Items will include:

- GIS presentation
- Glenbrook Road Update
- AU Public Safety Building Update
- Update on the Groundwater Study Plans

D. Noble asked for other agenda items.

J. Wheeler, Community Member – I like having dates on the photos. I would encourage you to do that in the future. Some photos do have dates, and some don't.

D. Noble said that some of the cameras used have a policy on keeping the timestamp on.

E. Hughes noted that the timestamp depends on the camera being used.

J. Wheeler suggested that the dates could be put onto photos digitally after they are taken.

L. Miller, Community Member –If you could make this book available to RAB members to review, it would be interesting. [Regarding the press release on the new book by Dr. Albright: *Cleanup of Chemical and Explosive Munitions*]

D. Noble noted that the book will not be published until mid-May.

G. Durrin, Audience Member – Could a copy of Dr. Albright's book, *Cleanup of Chemical and Explosive Munitions*, be linked to Army Corps website?

E. Hughes replied that the copyright would be an issue.

L. Miller commented that the author and the publisher probably would not grant permission to make the book freely available on a public website.

D. Noble added that it may constitute endorsement.

## **V. Public Comments**

Question from K. Slowinski, Audience Member – In the GIS presentation next week, could you focus on photograph overlays for Pit 3 at 4825/4835 Glenbrook Road?

D. Noble agreed that it was a possibility.

Question from D. Feary, Community Member – Do you propose to bring the GIS system?

E. Hughes said a GIS presentation has been done twice before. The Parsons GIS technician brings their system and shows it on the screen, focusing on certain areas and going through the GIS layers and capabilities. During previous meetings, RAB and Audience Members have suggested particular properties to focus on, and these were included in the GIS presentation if time allowed.

Question from K. Slowinski, Audience Member – Can you schedule a half-hour or 45 minutes after the RAB meeting to show people their property on overlays?

D. Noble and E. Hughes both agreed that it could be done if time allows.

Question from C. Bermpohl, Audience Member – Did the geophysics contract awarded to ERT go through a public bidding process?

D. Noble said yes, all USACE contractors must go through a public bidding process.

Question from C. Bermpohl, Audience Member – Do you advertise the public bidding process in trade publications?

E. Hughes said yes, there is a specific and rigid process for selecting contractors. Contractors are screened and selected based on that process, and a certain amount of capacity is established for each specific contractor.

Question from C. Bermpohl, Audience Member – Does Parsons go through the same public bidding process, or are they on a multi-year rollover contract?

D. Noble confirmed that Parsons has a contract for a specific performance period and capacity, but they originally had to compete for it as a publicly advertised contract. That contract is actually with the Huntsville USACE.

Question from L. Monsein, Community Member – A few years ago we were shown how the technology of prospective contractors was tested. Certain things were buried underground and they had to use their equipment to prove their abilities. Is there anything new with this technology versus previous technologies?

E. Hughes said that a prove-out area is set up on Federal property with inert objects. We have contractors go out with their equipment and their ability to detect and identify anomalies is tested.

S. Hirsh noted that each work plan that involves geophysics requires a geophysical prove-out.

Question from L. Monsein, Community Member – Is this done after they are hired?

S. Hirsh was not sure how they have to show their qualifications before they are hired, but they certainly have to be tested before they begin work.

Question from L. Monsein, Community Member – Is this technology any different than what has been used in the past?

S. Hirsh replied that the actual detection technology is the same. The process used to evaluate the geophysical data and to determine where to dig is changing.

Question from L. Monsein, Community Member – So this new company that has been hired has an advantage over previous companies? What process is involved in choosing them?

E. Hughes said they have already been evaluated as having these capabilities, or else they wouldn't be given the capacity to do this work. The work plan requires a prove-out to verify that they are prepared for the work in Spring Valley. Contractors are constantly evaluated to ensure that they use the best technology and the best process for deciding what needs to be dug.

S. Hirsh added that there are two separate government organizations that review the geophysical data, one in Baltimore and one in Huntsville. The geophysical contractor prepares a report that includes the raw data, a description of how they processed it, and their recommendations. Both Baltimore and Huntsville look at these reports separately.

Question from L. Monsein, Community Member – The contractor doesn't do the analysis, they just provide the raw data?

S. Hirsh clarified that the contractor does analyze the data in accordance with how they are told to do it. They use pre-defined software for data processing, and specifications for what geophysical signals are considered an anomaly in Spring Valley. For this particular site, there is a straightforward set of rules for the analysis and an industry-standard software package (the same one used by Weston).

E. Hughes noted that contractors with new technologies are welcome. They just need to prove that it works. We want to use the best technology we can. A couple of years ago ground-penetrating radar was used to differentiate between glassware and metal, but it did not work for Spring Valley.

L. Monsein, Community Member, commented that only two of the present RAB members were here when this was previously presented. A review of the available technologies, the contractor selection process, and a brief description of how the data is analyzed should be included on a future schedule.

E. Hughes and D. Noble agreed.

Neil Jones, ERT Geophysicist, introduced himself.

Question from L. Monsein, Community Member, to N. Jones – Has your company done similar projects?

N. Jones confirmed that ERT was a subcontractor with Weston for the past three years at Spring Valley doing data collection during the geophysical investigations at Glenbrook Road. ERT will continue to work with Weston, but now Weston will be subcontracted under ERT.

## **VI. Adjourn**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:34 PM.