

**Spring Valley Partnering Meeting
February 9, 2017
Conference Call**

Name	Organization/Address	
Sherri Anderson-Hudgins	USACE - Huntsville	X
Thomas Bachovchin	ERT	X
Brenda Barber	USACE - Baltimore	X
Todd Beckwith	USACE - Baltimore	X
Janelle Boncal	Parsons	
Bethany Bridgham	American University	X
Sean Buckley	Parsons	X
Paul Chrostowski	CPF Associates, American University Consultant	
Tom Colozza	USACE - Baltimore	
Jennifer Conklin	DOEE	
Kathy Davies	EPA – Region III	
Dr. Peter deFur	Environmental Stewardship Concepts/RAB TAPP Consultant	X
Diane Douglas	DOEE	
Bill Eaton	URS	
Chris Gardner	USACE – Corporate Communications Office	X
Steven Hirsh	EPA –Region III	X
Holly Hostetler	ERT	X
Dawn Iovan	EPA – Region III	
Carrie Johnston	ERT – Community Outreach Team	X
Dan Noble	USACE - Baltimore	
Cliff Opdyke	USACE - Baltimore	
Randall Patrick	Parsons	X
Lattie Smart	ERT - Community Outreach Team	
Jim Sweeney	DOEE	X

Tenkasi Viswanathan	USACE – Washington Aqueduct	
Kellie Williams	USACE - Huntsville	
Bruce Whisenant	USACE - Huntsville	
Rebecca Yahiel	ERT – Community Outreach Team	
Alex Zahl	USACE - Baltimore	

Summary of 9 February 2017 Spring Valley Partnering Meeting

Consensus Decisions

- None

Action Items

- Parsons will distribute a corrected 4825 Glenbrook Road presentation to ERT Community Outreach Team after the meeting.

A. 4825 Glenbrook Road Remedial Action

The goal of this segment of the meeting was to review the status of the Remedial Action at 4825 Glenbrook Road.

USACE Baltimore and Parsons provided a brief update on the status of the remedial action at 4825 Glenbrook Road.

1. Recent Activities

Low probability operations began on October 26, 2016. Work began with identifying the location of the sewer line and what might be located upstream and downstream from the sewer line. Some soil was removed during excavation of the sewer line.

On November 15, ACI visited the site, placed a camera in the sewer line, and confirmed that the sewer line only serviced 4825 Glenbrook Road and 4835 Glenbrook Road. The sewer line from 4825 Glenbrook is the only active lateral into the secondary lateral. Activities focused on preparing the site because Parsons did not want to start an excavation and then leave the excavation open during the Thanksgiving and Christmas holidays and presidential inauguration. This plan also avoided any stress to the emergency response system during the inauguration should there be a find. Intrusive work did not begin until after the inauguration. Previously staged and covered soil from Area A was removed, placed in roll-offs, and transported to federal property.

On November 28, Parsons began sewer reroute work which entailed excavating a trench from where the lateral contacted the main and then excavating that trench out to former high probability areas. PVC pipe was then installed to reroute the line. The only sewer lines that run through the low probability site are the two laterals; one coming out of 4825 Glenbrook Road, and the reroute pipe back to where the line bends across 4825 Glenbrook Road.

On January 10, a new truck gate was installed to accommodate roll-off trucks. The former driveway gate could not be used because excavation was ongoing in that area.

On January 18, Parsons removed AC units from the side of 4835 Glenbrook Road.

On January 26, Parsons removed the brick façade of the wall that bulges away from 4835 Glenbrook Road. The cinder block wall also has a footer that has not yet been removed.

On January 30, intrusive work began in earnest in Area B, starting from the base of the driveway and working up. Scattered pieces of scrap glass were found. As of the end of last week the scrap glass totaled approximately 2 pounds. No burial pit evidence was encountered. The finds have been similar to the low probability section of Area A in the back yard behind the retaining wall. Plastic lining was encountered, believed to be from the 1996 debris area backfill.

Last week 1 roll-off was removed from Area A. The total to date is 42 roll-offs which include 16 roll-offs that were initially removed in Area A by the street. A single disposal characterization sample was collected, which has likely cleared headspace. All the scrap glass was collected from the most recent excavation work. No scrap glass was encountered when excavating the Area A section parallel to the street. Excavation has totaled 336 cubic yards out of the 668 cubic yards expected, or 50.3 percent complete. Saprolite has been encountered where expected.

During the week of February 13, Parsons will excavate grid by grid, collect confirmation samples, and backfill; similar to the method used in Area A. The work is completed in stages, confirmation samples will be collected when a significant portions of the wall are removed to prevent cross contamination and other concerns with open excavations.

2. Future activities

The crew continue to excavate Area A. The footer that bowed outwards from the back retaining wall will be removed beginning next week. Parsons plans to expose and score the footer with a concrete demo saw so the footer may be pulled away. If the footer does not easily pull away, Parsons plans to use a jackhammer attachment from the excavator and knock at the scored area to quickly break the footer and minimize vibration.

During the week of February 13, confirmation samples will be collected as excavation continues in Area B. [Ed. Parsons noted there was a typo in the presentation. The presentation should read Area 'B,' not 'A.' Parsons will distribute a corrected presentation to ERT Community Outreach Team after the meeting.] Work will continue working northeast along the retaining wall.

3. Schedule

- Complete low probability operations in late March of 2017. The majority of schedule float time has been used with different events, but Parsons does not want to adjust the schedule until progress has been evaluated.
- Complete restoration of 4825 Glenbrook Road mid-summer of 2017 as previously scheduled.

In response to a question from American University (AU) concerning clarification of the factors Parsons is considering for revising the schedule, Parsons explained that the main factor is to evaluate how fast the next section will be excavated and how fast the footers are removed. Timing of work beyond the next tasks would be an educated guess. Once the next section is completed and timing is evaluated, then the rest of the schedule may be extrapolated.

USACE Baltimore added that USACE is anticipating the February 21 meeting with AU President Dr. Kerwin. USACE will provide AU with any updates or extensions to the schedule at that time. The 2 week interval will allow Parsons to focus on the next effort and make determinations about productivity.

B. Pilot Project

The goal of this segment of the meeting was to provide an update on Pilot Project.

USACE Baltimore provided a brief update on the Pilot Project.

Restoration of all three Pilot Project properties has been completed. USACE extended the Period of Performance for ERT through the end of June 2017 to allow for replacement of transplanted vegetation that may not survive and will need to be replaced in the spring.

All of the Pilot Project property owners were sent interim assurance letters in early December 2016 that detailed the work that was performed. The final assurance letters will be provided after the Pilot Project report is approved by the Partners and the Decision Document (DD) is signed.

The Pilot Study report is in draft format and has been reviewed by the USACE Baltimore team, the National Research Laboratory (NRL) and Black Tusk Geophysics team members that assisted with the project. Several conference calls have been conducted to discuss results in detail. ERT is currently working on revisions to the report. USACE plans to submit the draft to the Partners by February 15.

Overall, the summary of the Pilot Project results did confirm that Advanced Geophysical Classification (AGC) is more effective at munitions detection than the current conventional EM-61 Digital Geophysical Mapping (DGM) methods used, but that there were some challenges. It was also concluded that Advance Geophysical Classification (AGC) should be used with the G-858 magnetometer in order to detect large items at deeper depths. The report concluded that the Time-domain Electromagnetic Multi-sensor Tower Array Detection System (TEMTADS) and the Man Portable Vector (MPV) each have their own advantages and disadvantages, but that either instrument could be efficiently used for the full scale munitions remediation throughout Spring Valley. The AGC method would provide the highest level of confidence in the geophysical surveys. USACE expects the AGC method will provide less anomaly investigation throughout the Remedial Action (RA) for the Spring Valley FUDS.

In response to a question from Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Region III, USACE and ERT clarified that the report focuses on the success of AGC, in general, as opposed to a specific AGC instrument, although a comparative analysis of the two instruments is included in the report.

ERT added that comments were also received from the USACE's Amy Walker. That was the most recent set of comments and ERT plans to have the latest revised report to USACE by February 13.

USACE Huntsville clarified that Amy Walker works for USACE Huntsville.

In response to a question from Dr. Peter deFur, Environmental Stewardship Concepts/RAB TAPP Consultant, USACE Baltimore explained that the report on the Pilot Project will be submitted to the Partners by February 15.

ERT noted that the report will likely be submitted on February 13. While the comments from USACE, NRL, and Black Tusk have been discussed, the regulators have not seen ERT's responses to Amy Walker's comments yet. There may be a couple days for the regulators to review the revised report before the report is submitted to the Partners on the target date of February 15.

C. Groundwater Feasibility Study

The goal of this segment of the meeting was to review the status of the Groundwater Feasibility Study (FS).

USACE Baltimore provided a brief update on the status of the Groundwater FS.

USACE recently received and are working through comments from the EM/CX on the Groundwater FS. USACE plans to provide the draft final Groundwater FS to the Partners in mid-March. USACE is prepared to give a presentation on the Groundwater FS at the April Partner meeting to help facilitate the Partners' review. USACE suggested inviting Diane Douglas, District Department of Energy and Environment (DOEE) and Kathy Davies, EPA Region III to that meeting.

EPA Region III and DOEE agreed to the idea of the presentation and special invitees to the April Partners meeting.

USACE will plan to v provide a presentation on the Groundwater FS, and invite D. Douglas, K. Davies, and Paul Chrostowski, CPF Associates, American University Consultant.

D. Site-Wide Decision Document (DD)

The goal of this segment of the meeting was to review the status of the Site-Wide Decision Document.

USACE provided a brief update on the Site-Wide DD.

USACE has been working very closely on the Site-Wide DD. The document has been provided to the Partners and to the review team. USACE is working to resolve comments from EPA Region III and DOEE concerning the principal threat waste issue. Charlie Howland, David Jerger, and the attorney for DOEE conducted a conference call to discuss this issue. C. Halloran recommended preparing draft language that he would provide and forward to USACE Baltimore Headquarters (HQ). D. Jerger followed up with USACE HQ on this issue, but USACE has not heard back from them yet. The Department of Defense (DoD) has had some concerns in the past with principal threat waste for Munitions and Explosives of Concern (MEC).

In response to a question from USACE, EPA Region III explained that the proposed language update received from C. Halloran indicated that a paragraph would be added or take the place of a paragraph in that part of the Site-Wide DD. The update was sent to EPA Region III on February 7 and was returned February 8. EPA Region III believed that C. Halloran would also send the update to USACE's attorney and DOEE.

The only potential delay is to obtain concurrence and agreement on the principle threat waste question. USACE is prepared to accept all comments and recommendations provided by EPA Region III, DOEE, and P. deFur. USACE had planned to begin the concurrence letter process prior to the discussion on principle threat waste. USACE suggested that DOEE and EPA Region III begin drafting the language to prepare for concurrence in anticipation of agreement concerning the principal threat waste issue.

EPA Region III and DOEE agreed that the concurrence letters will be short and not take very much time to draft.

Once USACE has the concurrence letters from EPA Region III and DOEE, USACE will prepare the Site-Wide DD package. The document will be signed at USACE Baltimore, then sent to the 2-star General at USACE HQ, and then on to the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army (DASA). This means the Site-Wide DD will be subject to further legal review and comments from various levels within USACE and the Army. This can be a challenging process similar to the process undertaken for 4825 Glenbrook Road.

P. deFur thanked USACE for providing the update and inquired if the signatures would take 6 months or more to obtain based on the process USACE described.

USACE explained that the DD process for the project at 4825 Glenbrook Road took 6 months to complete. B. Barber shared lessons learned concerning this process with Dan Noble, USACE. The legal review roadblock encountered for 4825 Glenbrook Road occurred at the Pentagon level. B. Barber recommended that once USACE resolves the issue concerning principal threat waste, USACE may shorten the signature process by conducting reviews and approvals concurrently. This plan may shorten the process by 2 to 4 months. All of the senior staff are aware that the Site-Wide DD is about to enter this process, so the senior staff are briefing on the key components in order to shorten the process as much as possible.

The risk assessor for USACE received an email from EPA stating that EPA is adjusting levels for polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs). USACE will review the adjustment and determine if the adjustment has any impact on the Site-Wide DD. USACE suggested this could result in the removal of PAHs as a risk driver from the document. USACE inquired if EPA Region III had any inputs and thoughts on this development.

EPA region III explained that this is a small change. He did not believe there was much contaminated soil that has to be removed solely because of PAHs. USACE and ERT agreed.

ERT added that USACE asked ERT to look into that data and has not been able to do that in detail yet. Probably at most this type of contamination would only occur at a single outlier location on a property that

may not need to be considered further. Even that is not clear because contamination in that location may be because of PAHs, but may also be a location because of metals and might still have to be excavated.

EPA Region III explained that EPA will leave the decision up to USACE. If USACE decides to go back, recalculate risk, and make changes to the document, that is acceptable to EPA; if USACE decides to leave the document the way it is, that is acceptable as well.

E. Site-Wide Remedial Action (RA)

The goal of this segment of the meeting was to review the status of the Site-Wide RA.

USACE briefly reviewed the Site-Wide RA.

In anticipation of the Site-Wide DD being signed this year, the team has begun the solicitation process for the Site-Wide RA contract. USACE is still targeting a June 30 date to award that task order. There is a 3-year window stated in the Site-Wide DD, but that does not impact Site-Wide RA activities. The 3-year window was primarily related to the Public Safety Building at AU. USACE is prepared to start RA work in late calendar year 2017 if each process goes according to schedule.

There is a property on the 3900 block of Fordham Road where the range fan just barely touches a portion of that particular property. It is currently included in the property listing for the RA activity area. USACE proposed that the property could potentially be excluded if the property owners are in agreement, since the range fan only touches a very small portion of that property. Also, a significant amount of fill was placed on this property, and the geophysical instrumentation is unlikely to detect an item on the property at the depth beneath the fill in any case. USACE is interested in feedback from the Partners concerning this particular property. DOEE noted that the section is a very tiny portion of the range fan.

If the Partners are in agreement, USACE could approach the property owner and explain the situation with respect to their particular property. USACE could leave the decision up to the property owner in this particular instance. Then USACE would not have to create significant disturbance to the property. If in fact the property owners do have a desire to have a thorough check of their property, USACE is willing to conduct that action. If the homeowner pushes back and really does not want this done to their property, USACE asks for the Partners' concurrence that removing the property from the list would be appropriate.

In response to a question from DOEE, USACE explained that even if a property is only slightly touched by the range fan boundaries, USACE will offer to remediate the entire property rather than only a small portion. However, remediating only the delineated section is another potential option. Remediating only a small section would be difficult, but USACE would consider that option if the Partners were in agreement with offering that amount of flexibility to that particular property owner.

Dr. P. deFur pointed out that the flexibility makes sense, however an important factor was if something were found in the vicinity immediately adjacent to that sliver of property. The proximity to a found item of interest may influence the options. DOEE and EPA Region III agreed with Dr. P. deFur's point.

F. Open Issues and New Data

None

G. Future Agenda Items

1. Groundwater FS.
2. 4825 Glenbrook Road.
3. Site-Wide DD.
4. Site-Wide RA.
5. Pilot Project

H. Agenda Building

The next meeting was scheduled for Thursday, April 20, 2017.

I. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 10:04 a.m.