U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Spring Valley Restoration Advisory Board Meeting
St. David's Episcopal Church
Minutes of the September 9, 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
Mario Aguilar	Community Member
Dr. Peter deFur	Environmental Stewardship Concepts/RAB TAPP Consultant
Steven Hirsh	Agency Representative - US Environmental Protection Agency Region III
William Krebs	Community Member
Lawrence Miller	Community Member
Malcolm Pritzker	Community Member
Ambassador Howard B. Schaffer	Community Member
Bernard Schulz	Community Member
George Vassiliou	Community Member
Bert Weintraub	Community Member
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEMBERS NOT PRESENT	
Mary Bresnahan	Community Member
David Feary	Community Member
Lee Monsein	Community Member
James Sweeney	Agency Representative – DC Department of the Environment
John Wheeler	Community Member
ATTENDING PROJECT PERSONNEL	
Todd Beckwith	USACE, Spring Valley Project Manager
Clem Gaines	USACE, Chief of Public Affairs
Joyce Conant	USACE, Public Affairs
Jessica Bruland	Earth Resources Technology
Karol Hazard	Spring Valley Community Outreach Program
Carrie Johnston	Spring Valley Community Outreach Program Manager
Maya Courtney	Spring Valley Community Outreach Program

HANDOUTS FROM THE MEETING
I. Final Agenda for the September 9, 2008 RAB Meeting II. Handout of Corps of Engineers Presentation

AGENDA

I. Administrative Issues

A. Co-Chair Updates

Greg Beumel, Community Co-Chair, welcomed the group and turned the meeting over to Dan Noble.

Dan Noble, Military Co-Chair, reviewed the agenda for the meeting.

B. Introduce Guests

Todd Beckwith, the new USACE-Baltimore Spring Valley Project Manager, introduced himself. Mr. Beckwith is an environmental engineer who previously worked for the Army Environmental Command as part of the U.S. Army environmental cleanup program. His career experience includes military munition projects at chemical agent disposal sites.

Karol Hazard is a new USACE-Baltimore Community Outreach team member.

Clem Gaines, USACE-Baltimore Chief of Public Affairs, is attending the RAB meeting to become more familiar with the Spring Valley Project.

Officer Kennedy from the Metropolitan Police Department (MPD) 2nd District was present at the RAB meeting, filling in for Officer McElwee. He offered to answer any questions from the RAB or the audience.

C. Announcements

D. Noble announced that the finalized Area of Interest Task Force (AOITF) reports, which have been signed by the Spring Valley Partners, are now available for public viewing. A copy of the AOITF report binder will be available at all future RAB meetings, and is available for review after tonight's meeting. Another copy has been placed at the Palisades Library information repository. The public is welcome to read the finalized reports.

D. Task Group Updates

No task group updates were presented.

II. USACE Topics

A. Residential Arsenic Removal Program

D. Noble provided an update on phytoremediation and arsenic removal progress.

Phytoremediation

The 2008 season marked the fifth year of fern planting and harvesting. Ferns are growing well in all three locations (one non-residential and two residential properties).

Soil samples and fern samples will be collected from each plot in September 2008. The arsenic levels in these samples will be analyzed in October 2008. The project team hopes to find significant arsenic levels in the fern leaves, and to find reduced arsenic concentrations in the soil where the ferns were planted. The goal is to reduce soil arsenic levels to below 20 ppm (parts per million).

In November 2008, following the first frost, the phytoremediation contractor will harvest the ferns and properly dispose of them based on their arsenic levels. The plots where they were planted will be restored.

Three **photographs** featured fern growth at Lot 15 (along Van Ness Street), the Rockwood Parkway property, and the Overlook Lane property. In one photograph, a phytoremediation technician applied fertilizer to the ferns, which is conducted weekly during routine fern monitoring.

Question from Peter deFur, RAB Technical Advisor – Regarding phytoremediation progress, has the contractor Edenspace shared any comparisons of fern growth and watering requirements between the current year and previous years?

D. Noble replied that the ferns have been watered regularly this year, with both residential plots on an automatic timer system, and the project achieved very good fern growth. The contractor is pleased with the results. All ferns were planted using a more tightly-spaced pattern this year, with the hope of extracting more arsenic from the soil than in previous years.

Comment from Ambassador Howard B. Schaffer, Community Member – Phytoremediation is currently conducted on my property, and the activities are conducted very efficiently.

Arsenic remediation

Soil removal was completed on two residential properties (4800 block of Sedgwick Street and 4800 block of Indian Lane) in July 2008. In August 2008, soil removal was completed on one residential property (4800 block of Rodman Street) and at two areas on American University (AU). Restoration is still required for both AU lots.

Completion of the two lots at AU marks a milestone for the Spring Valley project. These two lots are significant because they were the last two areas identified for arsenic removal on the AU campus. Although metal-impacted soils are still under investigation as part of the Public Safety Building project, these two lots complete the general environmental remediation of the campus. Work on these two AU lots progressed slowly due to the presence of numerous pipes, control wires, and irrigation systems. A small amount of damage occurred, and is currently being repaired.

Completion of soil removal is expected for only one residential property (4900 block of Indian Lane) during September 2008 as it has thirteen arsenic grids that will be excavated.

Soil removal on the last residential properties will likely be completed in early 2009. Some city and federal properties still require soil removal, but faster progress on these properties is anticipated. As a result, the arsenic remediation program should completed in the first half of 2009, and the contractor will demobilize and leave the Spring Valley neighborhood.

Several **photographs** featured soil removal activities on recently-completed properties. Various stages of excavation, backfilling with clean soil, and restoration were shown.

Several residents have previously refused access to their properties for arsenic sampling or arsenic removal purposes. The Spring Valley Partners are currently drafting a letter to these residents to inform them that any future arsenic sampling and removal activities will be more easily conducted during the remaining time allotted to the arsenic removal program. Once the contractor has departed from the Spring Valley neighborhood, initiating and conducting arsenic removal activities will be more difficult. Residents still have the opportunity to request initial arsenic sampling, and any required soil removal, prior to the completion of this remediation project.

Question from Ambassador H. B. Schaffer, Community Member – Do you expect the letter to produce responses from the residents who have not previously allowed arsenic sampling or removal?

D. Noble was uncertain of the potential effectiveness of the letter, as some residents have refused arsenic remediation activities since early in the Spring Valley project.

Question from Larry Miller, Community Member – How many previously-tested residential properties possess an unacceptable level of arsenic and still refuse to allow access for remediation or removal?

D. Noble replied that USACE has been denied access to remediate arsenic-contaminated areas on approximately 4 or 5 properties. These residents are primarily concerned about their landscaping, or they are not convinced that the arsenic-contaminated soil is as serious an issue as others believe.

Question from L. Miller, Community Member – How many untested residential properties still refuse to allow arsenic sampling?

D. Noble said that approximately 35 to 40 properties will not permit initial arsenic sampling. Although this number of properties is small relative to the approximate 1600 properties situated within the Spring Valley FUDS boundary, this still could potentially leave a significant amount of arsenic contamination in place.

Question from L. Miller, Community Member – The Spring Valley project budget is limited, and wise choices must be made when determining project expenses. Regarding the Spring Valley residents who will not allow access to their property, will USACE return at any time in the future to conduct arsenic remediation if the residents change their mind and request soil sampling and/or removal?

D. Noble replied that as long as the Spring Valley project is active, and USACE is still present in the neighborhood, sampling and remediation of arsenic-contaminated soil will likely be conducted. Soil sampling is a relatively simple process and can be scheduled easily. However, our thinking right now is that after early 2009, soil removal may not be conducted as quickly as residents would prefer, due to conflicting project schedules and the need for an arsenic remediation contractor.

D. Noble added that once the Spring Valley project reaches closure, official steps related to FUDS sites can be taken to conduct necessary field work if residents have not granted access to their property. The issue would be elevated within the U.S. Army. Possibly, a letter warning residents that they have one final opportunity to grant access to their property may be sent. If the U.S. Army believes that the particular property presents a certain risk level, they may elevate the request for access to the Department of Justice to obtain access to enter the property and to do the work. This scenario has not yet surfaced, and USACE will be present in the Spring Valley neighborhood for the next couple of years. Residents should simply be aware that USACE's ability to respond to requests later, during the project's last phases, will be less timely than for requests that surface during the remainder of the residential arsenic removal program.

Comment from P. deFur, RAB Technical Advisor – Has the U.S. Army considered how they will respond if, once the Spring Valley project is completed, a resident or their real estate agent requests that soil sampling and/or removal be conducted for a pending sale in the Spring Valley neighborhood? Very little research is required to discover that properties within the Spring Valley FUDS boundary were tested and remediated, and real estate agents will expect the resident to possess a letter stating that the property is clear of contamination. Residents should be aware of this possible scenario.

Comment from L. Miller, Community Member – Prior RAB discussions on real estate have established that Spring Valley properties cannot legally be sold without providing a disclosure on the existence of contamination on the property. Any residents who refuse to grant property access for arsenic soil sampling will have a substantial issue when they attempt to sell their property, and an even greater issue will surface for residents who will not allow removal of arsenic-contaminated soil on their property.

Suggestion from Larry Miller, Community Member – As part of the letter sent to the residents, it would be helpful to provide an estimate of the soil sampling and remediation costs for a private contractor, in the event that a resident desires these activities to be conducted more quickly than USACE is able to provide.

D. Noble said that the letter will be reviewed by the USACE-Baltimore Office of Counsel. Strong statements may be included if legal representatives agree that they are appropriate or necessary. The

letter's primary focus is to inform residents that the residential arsenic removal program is almost complete.

B. Military Munitions Response Program (MMRP)

D. Noble presented an update on the Pit 3 area investigations and the AU Public Safety Building project.

Pit 3 Area Project Update

Excavation in the East Extension was completed on Monday, July 28, 2008, and clearance samples were obtained. Two geologists, one from USACE-Baltimore and one from the contractor, confirmed that the excavation reached saprolite (weathered bedrock), and they will write a report verifying that saprolite was reached. The property owner toured the excavation on the same day.

Construction of the South Extension is almost complete, and intrusive work will hopefully begin in late September or early October. Nineteen (19) single-point anomalies will be investigated. One (1) trench will be dug in a small area where there was a higher concentration of geophysical anomalies. All anomalies will be dug by hand, and relatively small amounts of soil will be removed in comparison to the full excavations in the original Pit 3 structure and the East Extension. Approximately 1 to 2 weeks of field effort will be required to complete the investigation in the South Extension.

Results from the South Extension will help determine how to approach the remaining 45 anomalies that extend along the 4800 block of Glenbrook Road, within the D.C. right-of-way. Depending on the identities of the South Extension anomalies, these additional anomalies may be investigated under high-probability conditions (requiring a protective ECS structure) or under low-probability conditions.

He presented a **map** representing the locations of the original Pit 3 structure and the South Extension. All 19 anomalies were marked on the map, and the planned trench location was shown.

A **diagram** revealed the future location and size of the Second East Extension (hereafter referred to as the East Extension II). Once the South Extension is complete, the East Extension II will be built using parts of the original structure and the South Extension. The containment structure in the Pit 3 Area will recede, becoming less visible from the street, and the front of the containment structure will match up with the front of the house. The new extension will expand just past the back foundation wall of the house.

The purpose of the East Extension II was described, using a **diagram** of the original Pit 3 structure and the East Extension for reference. Munitions were primarily found close to the house footer in the original structure and in the East Extension. After the East Extension excavation reached saprolite on July 28, two geophysical contacts were discovered along the back wall of the East Extension. A metal object is buried within the east wall of the extension, close to the house. A second metal object of fairly significant size was detected at approximately 8 feet below ground surface, beneath the end of the retaining wall and concrete footer. Based on locations of AUES-related items found close to the house and underneath portions of the retaining wall in the Pit 3 Area, these two new anomalies must be investigated under high-probability conditions.

A third geophysical contact in the East Extension, which indicated the presence of metal close to the house footer, turned out to be exposed rebar and metal wire that is a part of the concrete foundation wall of the house. It is possible that the unknown metal object beyond the east wall of the extension may be resolved as cultural debris, but since AUES-related items were also found close to the house, the East Extension II is necessary to safely clear the area of all anomalies. The East Extension II will help ensure that all items associated with Pit 3 have been removed from the property, by exposing the entire south foundation wall down to saprolite (weathered bedrock).

D. Noble briefly reviewed two diagrams that reveal elevation data for the house structure, surrounding elements, and AUES-related items that were found in the original structure and in the East Extension.

These diagrams were discussed at a previous RAB meeting. Based on these elevations, AUES-related items are probably not buried underneath the house foundation. The deepest munition items found in Pit 3 were located above the depth of the basement floor. It appears that the builder dug into saprolite before pouring the concrete house foundation, and any AUES items previously located in that area were probably moved out of the way. The builder may not have realized that AUES-related items were present in the excavated soil, which could explain why so many items have been recovered in the fill dirt surrounding the house foundation

The **Pit 3 Area tentative schedule** includes 1 to 2 weeks of South Extension intrusive effort, likely starting between late September and mid-October. Site preparation and construction of the East Extension II will require 6 weeks, likely extending through late November. Intrusive investigation in the East Extension II will be conducted over a 10 week period which is expected to begin in late November and continue into early 2009, allowing 8 weeks for the investigation and 2 weeks for the holiday break.

Several **photographs** revealed construction progress for the South Extension. A doorway into the South Extension will be created by cutting into the original Pit 3 containment structure, providing access from the property on the opposite side of the original structure. A steep slope creates an elevation change within the South Extension, and the structure walls are 12 feet tall at the curb and 6 feet tall further from the street. Anomalies in the South Extension are marked with small flags. Currently, a small section of the South Extension still needs to be built, but the rest of the structure is fully constructed and covered with aluminum plating. Final structural details are being discussed by the engineers who supervise the structure's design and construction.

Question from P. deFur, RAB Technical Advisor – The results of the South Extension investigation will determine the best course of action for investigating anomalies in the adjoining area along Glenbrook Road, correct?

D. Noble said yes.

Question from P. deFur, RAB Technical Advisor – If all South Extension anomalies are resolved as munition items, then the remaining Glenbrook Road anomalies will be investigated under high-probability conditions. If none of the anomalies are muniton items, then low-probability conditions will likely be used. However, as the South Extension investigation will most likely reveal a combination of cultural debris and AUES items, what is the decision point for choosing low-probability or high-probability?

D. Noble replied that if some South Extension anomalies are resolved as munition items, a judgment call will have to be made. The Spring Valley Partners and the USACE-Huntsville site safety personnel will be consulted. Based on the South Extension anomaly identifications, the geophysicists can analyze the Glenbrook Road anomalies to better estimate the likelihood of munitions items continuing along Glenbrook Road. The decision will also be influenced by where munition items, if any, are found in the South Extension. It is possible that more munition items may be found closer to Pit 3, and more cultural debris and other less-significant items may predominate toward the other end of the South Extension.

Question from P. deFur, RAB Technical Advisor – Has USACE-Huntsville expressed any opinions regarding the criteria for making the low-probability versus high-probability decision?

D. Noble said that USACE-Huntsville, like USACE-Baltimore, is waiting to see what is found in the South Extension.

Question from Ambassador H. B. Schaffer, Community Member – The additional 45 anomalies extend toward the property on the corner of Glenbrook Road and Rockwood Parkway, correct?

D. Noble confirmed that these anomalies extend along Glenbrook Road toward the intersection of Glenbrook Road and Rockwood Parkway.

Question from George Vassiliou, Community Member – Are you able to estimate the depths of the South Extension anomalies relative to the depths of anomalies found in the original structure and in the East Extension?

D. Noble replied that specific depths cannot be determined with precision, but the estimated depth is one factor used to classify an anomaly into one of four prioritized groups (A, B, C, and D). The geophysical survey data indicates whether the anomaly is potentially a metal item buried between 0-2 feet deep, or whether it may be buried deeper than 2 feet. However, a small metal item buried very close to the surface can be misinterpreted as a large metal item buried much deeper. The process of sorting anomalies into prioritized groups will undergo quality control checks, where the actual anomaly identifications will be compared to the reports predicting their identities.

Question from P. deFur, RAB Technical Advisor – At this time, do you anticipate starting intrusive work in the South Extension next week?

D. Noble replied that the South Extension intrusive investigation is now expected to begin on at the end of September or early October timeframe.

Carrie Johnston, Spring Valley Community Outreach Program Manager, noted that in a recent project update, the South Extension investigation was expected to begin earlier in September. She suggested that D. Noble clarify the reason for the schedule change, for the benefit of the RAB and the audience.

D. Noble explained that the anticipated schedule was delayed due to structural modifications and final approval for the South Extension structure.

The South Extension structure is designed by blast engineers, a profession which is in high demand at project sites nationwide. Whenever possible, the Spring Valley Project team builds structures ahead of time, using knowledge of what specifications blast engineers require. This allows most of the structural work to be completed while waiting to receive a complete, signed and sealed design document. However, changes to the structure may be requested by the engineers before it can be approved. Blast engineers (from the U.S. Army and from the contractor) are currently deciding such issues as whether the South Extension should be an independent structure or whether it should be attached to the original Pit 3 structure. They also requested small structural modifications, such as turning around the pins on some of the structure's support columns. In addition, once the South Extension is fully-designed and constructed, DDESB approval of the structure design must be obtained prior to beginning the intrusive investigation.

Question from G. Beumel, Community Co-Chair – The East Extension II only covers the remaining portion of the south foundation wall. Is it possible that additional munitions are located along the back foundation wall of the house, which has not been investigated?

Steve Hirsh, U.S. EPA, replied that test pits will be dug in the backyard, and that at least one test pit extends underneath the backyard patio.

D. Noble added that the test pits will be dug according to a grid pattern in the backyard, and that some test pits will be situated close to the house. There is some concern regarding the possibility of munitions located along the back foundation wall, and the test pits should resolve those concerns or indicate that additional excavation is required. Test pits are also planned in the front yard and the driveway, where a significant amount of the foundation wall is already exposed due to elevation changes.

Question from Charlie Bermpohl, Audience Member – As you search for munition items buried in the ground, are you able to determine whether ceramic or glass containers are buried alongside metal items?

D. Noble said no. Ceramic and glass items cannot be identified until they are dug out of the ground.

Question from C. Bermpohl, Audience Member – Regarding the diagrams of the Pit 3 Original and East Extensions, munition items were found within concentrated areas, correct?

D. Noble confirmed that munition items were generally found concentrated in distinct areas. He also pointed out locations where other AUES-related items were recovered.

Question from Kent Slowinski, Audience Member – Regarding the possibility of munition items located underneath the house, has progress been made in contacting the construction workers or other workers who may have buried munitions on the property?

D. Noble said no. The USACE-Baltimore Office of Counsel and the EPA Office of Counsel are developing a formal letter that will be sent to the builder. At this time, USACE-Baltimore and EPA are not planning to contact the workers. The first step involves sending a letter to the builder.

AU Public Safety Building Project

The Public Safety Building investigation is located on the AU campus, adjacent to where the Lot 18 debris field excavation took place. When Lot 18 was completed, contamination appeared to extend further toward the Public Safety Building. The USACE developed a plan taking into account the need to maintain building stability and deal with the excessive water discharge in the area before the current phase of the investigation was initiated.

A **map** was shown of the investigation areas surrounding the Public Safety Building.

Twelve (12) single-point anomalies were identified as cultural debris items. Trenches in two (2) anomalous areas contained cultural debris items and utility pipes, and were backfilled. Elevated metal concentrations in the utility trench area will be investigated following excavation of the debris area trenches.

Trenches are currently being excavated in the back patio debris field. These trenches are dug and backfilled one at a time to ensure that the building foundation stability is not compromised. This will continue as far as necessary in order to clear all AUES-related items and debris, and then a second row of trenches will be excavated further from the building. A triangle-shaped area, which was partially excavated during Lot 18, will be fully excavated during the Public Safety Building effort.

To date, 4 trenches have been completed (Trenches C1, C2, C4 and C6). Trench C3 excavation is in progress.

Two **photographs** featured the trench excavation and soil-sifting process. All trenches are excavated to a minimum of 8 feet deep, and to a maximum of 10 feet deep if necessary. The excavated soil is deposited on a sorting table, where workers sift the soil by hand and remove any items buried within it, including AUES-related items. The sifted soil is taken to roll-offs, tested for contaminants, and appropriately disposed of based on the testing results.

One munition debris item, an empty open-cavity 3-inch Stokes mortar round, was found in the trenches. This item was taken to the federal property, headspaced ‘clear,’ and categorized as scrap metal. Pieces of laboratory glassware and ceramic pieces were also recovered. All items are collected in plastic bags, sealed, and sent to the federal property. If an item headspaces ‘clear’ and does not contain any chemical agent, it is placed in a barrel and saved for final disposal at the end of the Spring Valley project.

An active terra cotta drainage pipe with a broken end was discovered extending from underneath the building. The water empties underground at a rate of 85 gallons per hour, and this may be the source of previous shallow water issues during the trench excavations and during previous field efforts in the area. The water was tested for chemicals and contaminants, and it is not associated with a public water supply or sewage discharge. The terra cotta pipe most likely drains an area of shallow groundwater located on the other side of the Public Safety Building. Once the Public Safety Building investigation is complete, the pipe will be connected to an aboveground water drainage feature that runs through Lot 18.

Several **photographs** featured items found in the debris area trenches, including the end of the terra cotta pipe, the 3-inch Stokes mortar round munition debris item, fragments of glass laboratory pipettes, and

ceramic pieces. Other items included an empty, broken-topped bottle with a concentrated sulfuric acid label. A sealed glass ampule was found, and laboratory testing detected no chemical agent or any other substance inside.

One **photograph** revealed the bottom half of a small broken bottle containing a green substance that looked like green sand. Extensive laboratory tests were negative for chemical agent and organic material. All of the substance was used during laboratory testing (ie, testing of the material led to no material being left over), and it remains an unknown.

III. USACE Upcoming Fall/Winter Activities

Geophysical Surveys

Six (6) residential properties will be surveyed during September 2008 by ERT. A review of the geophysical survey process was previously presented by ERT at the July 2008 RAB meeting. Initial site visits for these properties began last week, and geophysical surveys will begin on September 15. A geophysical survey typically requires 1 to 2 days of effort per property, depending on the property size and the extent of landscaping. The goal is to complete all 6 properties by the end of September.

During late fall or winter, an additional 7 properties will be geophysically surveyed. These properties are funded and under contract with ERT, and the work plans are currently in preparation.

A total of 13 properties will be geophysically surveyed during the upcoming fall and winter seasons.

Geophysical Anomaly Removals

Anomaly removals will be conducted on 13 residential properties during fall 2008 and winter 2008-2009. These properties have already been geophysically surveyed, and the survey reports have been finalized. A set of anomalies have been selected for investigation at each property.

Anomaly removals are scheduled to be conducted on the first 3 properties, located on the 4800 block of Glenbrook Road, during October and November 2008.

The remaining properties have not been scheduled for anomaly removal, and will hopefully be completed in late fall 2008 or winter 2008-2009. Three (3) federal lots located in Dalecarlia Woods are included in this group, and they are the first federal lots to be intrusively investigated during recent project activities.

2008 Groundwater study preparations

Well drilling plans for the new groundwater wells are currently being finalized. The Draft Final work plan for the groundwater study will be submitted to the Spring Valley Partners by late September 2008.

Seven new wells (4 deep wells and 3 shallow wells) will be installed. Drilling is currently scheduled to begin in November 2008, and each well could require approximately 1 week. Once all new wells are installed, another round of groundwater sampling data will be collected from all existing and new wells in the study area.

Test Pit Investigation

Low-probability test pit investigations are expected to resume in early 2009. The remaining test pits are located in the staging area for the Pit 3 Area investigation equipment on the 4800 block of Glenbrook Road, and are currently on hold until the high-probability Pit 3 Area effort is complete.

Five test pits remain on the property adjacent to the Pit 3 Area investigation, and approximately 30 test pits remain on the property where most of the Pit 3 Area field effort has taken place.

IV. Community Items

A. Community Outreach

C. Johnston presented an update on the Shelter-in-Place (SIP) Zone and the Glenbrook Road Outreach activities.

Bookmark for Children within the Shelter-in-Place Community

A bookmark designed for children attending schools or living within the Shelter-in-Place (SIP) community was presented The bookmark features three basic steps in the event of an emergency siren sounding in the Spring Valley project area: go inside quickly, close all windows and doors, and listen for the all-clear instructions on the radio or TV. This bookmark was distributed at Horace Mann Elementary School, and will be given to families living within the Shelter-in-Place zone.

Glenbrook Road Sidewalk Access (Horace Mann Elementary School and Residents)

Multiple Spring Valley project operations will be conducted on the 4800 block of Glenbrook Road from September through December 2008. Anomaly removals will be conducted on 3 properties, 1 deep groundwater well will be drilled, and the Pit 3 Area investigation will continue. This residential block is part of the Shelter-in-Place zone, and safe right-of-way access must be provided to residents while Spring Valley Project activities are underway.

One primary concern involves a walking school bus associated with Horace Mann Elementary School. A group of elementary school children walk to school and are led by a couple of parents. The walking school bus route passes through several points in the Spring Valley neighborhood, including the 4800 block of Glenbrook Road. Community Outreach is currently working to ensure that the Spring Valley site safety personnel and the road crew are fully aware of the timing and frequency of this walking school bus, so that operations can be paused as necessary to provide safe, easy access for schoolchildren. This approach worked successfully during fall 2007. Community Outreach met with the principal of Horace Mann Elementary School to ensure that everyone is aware of the safety issues presented by Spring Valley Project activities, and to discuss other issues in preparing for the new school year.

Question from Ambassador H. B. Schaffer, Community Member – The sidewalk across the street from the Pit 3 Area operation provides open access for residents, correct?

C. Johnston confirmed this, but added that anomaly removal activities will be conducted at properties along that sidewalk. The Community Outreach team is coordinating with the field team and neighborhood residents to ensure that Spring Valley project activities do not negatively impact the safety and accessibility of the sidewalk. In addition, the quality of life for residents using the sidewalk is an important concern, particularly for residents in wheelchairs.

C. Johnston mentioned a sidewalk issue unrelated to the Spring Valley project. A tree root pushing up on the sidewalk created difficult terrain for schoolchildren and other residents, and the residents and the city of D.C. assisted with providing temporary black asphalt to correct the issue.

Comment from Ambassador H. B. Schaffer, Community Member – The sidewalk along Glenbrook Road appears to be an obstacle course for local residents.

C. Johnston agreed. The D.C. sidewalk issues present a significant safety concern for the community.

Upcoming Neighborhood Meeting

A Shelter-in-Place neighborhood meeting will be planned for fall 2008. C. Johnston spoke with the Horace Mann Elementary school principal, and elementary school parents may feel that they need to be involved with the meeting.

V. Open Discussion and Future RAB Agenda Development

Question from K. Slowinski, Audience Member – What is the procedure required for RAB members who move outside of the FUDS boundary? Do these individuals remain as RAB members, or do they resign from the RAB and notify USACE that they have moved?

G. Beumel replied that if a RAB community member moves outside of the FUDS boundary, they must notify the RAB. The rules governing the Restoration Advisory Board state that RAB community members are required to live inside the Spring Valley FUDS boundary.

Both D. Noble and L. Miller confirmed that RAB community members are required to live inside the FUDS boundary.

A. Next Meeting: October 14, 2008

B. November 2008 meeting rescheduled

The November RAB meeting will not be held on the second Tuesday of the month, due to the Veterans Day holiday. The RAB members tentatively agreed to meet on Wednesday evening, November 12. The meeting location will be announced at the October RAB meeting.

C. Future agenda topics

- Encore of Dr. Monsein's Presentation on Arsenic Issues: Chemistry, Medical Aspects, and Risk Management (tentatively scheduled for October 2008)
- History of Chemicals and Munitions used in WWI and AUES (tentatively scheduled for November 2008)
- Johns Hopkins University (JHU) Presentation on Draft Work Plan for Health Study Update (schedule to be determined)

The RAB agreed that the potential future agenda topic "Legal Requirements for Real Estate Disclosures" has been sufficiently discussed in previous meetings.

Regarding Dr. Monsein's presentation on arsenic issues, G. Beumel noted that this topic was originally presented some time ago and it will be repeated for the benefit of new RAB members and audience members. Issues surrounding lead toxicity could be added to the presentation or discussed in a separate presentation, as requested at a previous RAB meeting. D. Noble added that lead was found at Lot 18 and at the Public Safety Building. P. deFur noted that lead, including a high lead/arsenic concentration, was discovered in several Spring Valley locations.

The JHU Health Study presentation may be scheduled for a RAB meeting in early 2009. C. Johnston said that Councilwoman Cheh's office has said it will notify the RAB when JHU is ready to proceed.

Suggestion from G. Beumel, Community Co-Chair – The Spring Valley Project Schedule could be reviewed, as the new fiscal year will begin in October 2008. Many aspects of the project are nearing completion or have been completed since the last schedule review.

Suggestion from S. Hirsh, Community Member – The RAB could invite an EPA toxicologist to explain the Superfund risk assessment (RA) process. The Spring Valley team is currently beginning to conduct baseline risk assessments.

C. Johnston asked whether this topic could be combined with the presentation on arsenic and lead issues.

S. Hirsh replied that the EPA toxicologist will probably not be prepared to present during fall 2008. In addition, the arsenic and lead toxicity presentation is a separate topic, as the risk assessment presentation will focus on what actions are taken once the toxicity information has been obtained.

Question from K. Slowinski, Audience Member – Would it be possible to present information on Conceptual Site Models, also known as CSMs?

G. Beumel said that the baseline risk assessor would be a good candidate to share information about conceptual site models. The modeling process is simple, minimalistic, and easy to discuss.

Suggestion from K. Slowinski, Audience Member – Additional chemicals could be added to Dr. Monsein's presentation on chemical toxicities. I believe that toxic levels of mercury and vanadium were detected at Lot 18, and munitions containing arsine and mustard agent were recovered. In addition, a bottle containing lewisite breakdown products was discovered at Lot 18.

G. Beumel commented that Dr. Monsein may not be an expert on these additional chemicals, but the RAB will pass along the request.

S. Hirsh noted that the EPA screening values on some chemicals have changed. In the case of vanadium, the acceptable level is now higher than before, indicating that vanadium is no longer a concern at Lot 18. The EPA toxicologist could discuss the changes in screening levels.

G. Beumel agreed, and added that this topic can be integrated with the baseline risk assessment presentation

Question from G. Vassiliou, Community Member – Have you obtained any test results from the soil that is currently being excavated and sifted at the AU Public Safety Building?

D. Noble replied that all excavated soil has been established as non-hazardous. The soil was tested prior to engaging in intrusive work at the Public Safety Building, to ensure that the workers could safely excavate and sift the material. Additional soil testing is conducted for soil placed in roll-offs before they are taken offsite to a landfill, which typically uses non-hazardous disposed soil to cover daily landfill waste.

VI. Public Comments

Question from K. Slowinski, Audience Member – Regarding the Area of Interest (AOI) reports mentioned earlier, what is the total number of AOI reports? How many of these reports have been finalized?

D. Noble said that there are 28 AOI reports.

[Editor's Note: A binder of the finalized AOI reports is available at the Information Repository at the Palisades Library. This binder has the complete files of 3 AOIs where "no further action was required", and of 6 AOIs where all investigation and remediation has been completed.
The Inter-agency Spring Valley Partners determined that the remaining reports would be listed when all work was completed at each AOI, as these remaining AOI's are 'in-process' and the privacy of the homeowners involved is being protected until the work is completed.]

Question from K. Slowinski, Audience Member – Can you please explain the process and the current schedule for finalizing the remaining AOI reports?

D. Noble replied that the Spring Valley Partners intend to finalize or close out 1 AOI report at each Partnering meeting. Although no AOI reports were finalized at the August 2008 Partnering meeting, Mark Baker (USACE-Baltimore Project Historian) is currently preparing a couple of AOI reports. These reports will be reviewed by the Partners, discussed, and signed by the Partners. The Partners expect to make steady progress on finalizing the remaining draft AOI reports.

Question from K. Slowinski, Audience Member – Based on that schedule, all reports could be finalized within the next 2 years, correct?

D. Noble agreed that 2 years sounds like an accurate estimate of the time required to finalize all of the remaining AOI reports.

Question from Allen Hengst, Audience Member – Will the minutes for recent Partnering meetings be posted on the Spring Valley project website? No recent meeting minutes have been posted.

D. Noble confirmed that recent meeting minutes will be posted in the future. This is part of the reason that Karol Hazard joined the Community Outreach team, to provide assistance with Community Outreach updates that have fallen behind schedule.

Question from K. Slowinski, Audience Member – Is there a particular reason that recent Partnering meeting minutes have not been posted? Does Pit 3 confidentiality play a role?

D. Noble clarified that the recent meeting minutes have simply not been finalized, and that Pit 3 confidentiality is not a factor. The same operational security issues that apply to RAB meetings also apply to Partnering meetings.

Question from K. Slowinski, Audience Member – During a future RAB meeting, would it be possible to include a discussion regarding the geophysical anomaly removals in the Dalecarlia Woods?

D. Noble agreed that the results of the geophysical investigations can be shared at RAB meetings as the anomalies are identified.

Question from S. Hirsh, Community Member – Has anyone briefed the RAB on the Wide Area Assessment, which analyzed the Dalecarlia Woods for the presence of metallic anomalies? This was an interesting report.

P. deFur and K. Slowinski both agreed that this would be a good agenda item for a future meeting.

VII. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 8:27 PM.