Spring Valley Partnering Meeting
October 19, 2017
Spring Valley Project Federal Property Conference Room

Name	**Organization/Address**	
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	AECOM	
Chris Gardner	USACE – Corporate Communications Office	
Alma Gates	RAB Member – Horace Mann Representative	
John Gerhard	Weston Solutions	**X**
Whitney Gross	ERT – Community Outreach Team	**X**
Steven Hirsh	EPA –Region III	**X**
Holly Hostetler	ERT	**X**
Dawn Iovan	EPA – Region III	
Carrie Johnston	ERT – Community Outreach Team	
Carlos Lazo	USACE – Government Affairs Liaison	
Lowell (J.R.) Martin	USACE – Site Operations Officer	
Chris Moran	Weston Solutions	**X**

Steve Norman	ECBC	
Dan Noble	USACE – Baltimore	**X**
Cliff Opdyke	USACE – Baltimore	
Randall Patrick	Parsons	**X**
Amy Rosenstein	ERT – Risk Assessor, Independent Consultant	
Tom Rosso	ECBC	
Jim Sweeney	DOEE	**X**
Tenkasi Viswanathan	USACE – Washington Aqueduct	
Ethan Weikel	USACE – Baltimore	
Kellie Williams	USACE – Huntsville	
Bruce Whisenant	USACE – Huntsville	**X**
Rebecca Yahiel	ERT – Community Outreach Team	**X**
Alex Zahl	USACE – Baltimore	**X**

Summary of 19 October 2017 Spring Valley Partnering Meeting

Consensus Decisions

- None

19 October 2017 Action Items

- Parsons will send a copy of the 4825 Glenbrook Road presentation to Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Region III.
- DOEE and EPA Region III will sign concurrence letters for the Site-Wide DD, and send the letters to USACE Baltimore.

Thursday 19 October 2017

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.

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

1. Recent Activities

On August 9th, an exposure incident occurred, involving one team member that vomited and other team members reporting symptoms. The symptoms cleared as soon as the teams processed through the Personnel Decontamination Station (PDS), and the teams have not experienced the symptoms since the incident. Out of an abundance of caution, the two onsite teams and the equipment operator were sent to the hospital. A Board of Investigation (BOI) was convened and is finalizing a report on the incident.

Depot Area Air Monitoring System (DAAMS) tubes were placed underneath the mitigation to analyze for mustard (HD) or lewisite (L) and a full gas chromatography-mass spectrometry (GCMS) analysis. No HD or L was detected on the DAAMS tubes; however no agent or data could be analyzed from the Tenax resin due to excess moisture due to the weather during that period**.** Excess rainwater in the area has been pumped out and stored on site.

Because the DAAMS tubes did not yield analysis beyond agent, on August 18 Edgewood Chemical Biological Center (ECBC) collected additional in-situ soil samples. The soil samples were analyzed for agent and agent breakdown products (ABPs) and hazardous and toxic waste (HTW) grab characterization analysis for the Spring Valley parameters list. The volatile organic compounds (VOC) samples were not properly collected by ECBC and were recollected by Parsons on September 7th. No agent or agent breakdown products were detected in the soil samples. 2-Butanone and acetone were detected in samples, but below the site comparison values. Tellurium and iodide were not detected. Zirconium was detected in all samples, but well below the project comparison value. The remaining results were either non-detect or below the comparison value with the exception of metals. Metals detected at concentrations above the comparison value were aluminum, arsenic, cobalt, and vanadium. The stockpile soil will eventually be disposed of, and depending on the path forward, the in-situ soil will be remediated as well because Parsons has not yet reached saprolite in that area.

Parsons cannot conclusively determine what may have caused the exposure incident.

On September 6th, Parsons covered and backfilled the excavation area due to the risk of heavy rain from hurricanes. The excavation area is now covered with geotextile fabric, clean soil, and gravel, which prevents access for sampling.

On September 12th and 13th, concrete samples were collected from the four sections of the concrete retaining wall. The concrete was sitting on top of chemical agent contaminated media (CACM) soil. The concrete appeared to have been poured directly onto the contaminated soil and chemical agent was entrained into the footers as the concrete dried.

In response to a question from EPA Region III, Parsons explained that it is unclear if the bottom of the concrete was contaminated based on composite sampling. The concrete followed the contours of the soil, which leads Parsons to believe that the concrete was poured directly onto the soil.

In response to a question from Peter deFur, Environmental Stewardship Concepts/RAB TAPP Consultant, Parsons explained that the core samples were completely concrete, and collected from all three surfaces of the retaining wall.

In response to a question from EPA Region III, Parsons and USACE Baltimore confirmed that this was the first time a concrete sample detected chemical agent.

In response to a question from P. deFur, Parsons explained that the sampling result in the concrete was dithiane. USACE Baltimore noted that there was no HD detected in the samples.

In response to a question from EPA Region III, Parsons explained that the only section one of the retaining wall was contaminated, but all of the sections will be treated as contaminated. Each section was divided into four smaller sections. Four core samples were taken from each smaller section, and four composites were made from the core samples.

In response to a question from EPA Region III, Parsons and USACE Baltimore explained that some disposable characterization samples have been taken from the area underneath the former retaining wall. The soil will be removed because saprolite has not been reached in that area. Sampling at the site may not resume until the site is cleared for intrusive work.

The concrete will be broken down into 6x6x6-inch pieces, with water used for dust suppression. A shoring frame was constructed to collect the water. The frame was lined with a pond liner, topped with a layer of sand, and covered with construction mats on top of the sand. Spraying water on demolition in the sump pond area allows a jackhammer to be used on the concrete sections, to suppress dust.

In response to a question from EPA Region III, Parsons and USACE Baltimore explained that there have been no complaints about noise; likely due to the activities occurring during school hours and the presence of construction taking place in the neighborhood. The Partners agreed noise is still a concern since demolition is not complete and may take several weeks.

USACE Baltimore and Parsons confirmed that once the concrete is broken down the pieces will be transported to Port Arthur, Texas for incineration.

2. Summary of 4835 Glenbrook Road

Based on the findings of chemical agent contaminated media (CACM) against the foundation wall, characterization samples will be taken inside the basement. The plan is to collect samples from under three rooms in the basement, along the shared property line. The sample locations are a family room, an entertainment area wine closet, and the catering kitchen. All tile, carpeting, or stonework will be removed; berms created around boring holes; and a ~4" hole cored into the basement floor. Parsons expects to encounter a vapor barrier at 4835 Glenbrook Road comparable to the vapor barrier found at 4825 Glenbrook Road.

In response to a question from EPA Region III, Parsons explained that a vapor barrier is sheet plastic, likely with gravel below the vapor barrier.

A Geoprobe sampler will be hand-advanced. The Geoprobe must be advanced 3' to fill the 2' sample sleeve. For the necessary parameters, each 2' sleeve may represent 3'.

The Geoprobe will continuously sample until it reaches 2' past the fill/saprolite boundary as determined by the geologist or Geoprobe refusal, whichever occurs first.

The Geoprobe was selected because the Geoprobe provides a better representation of the lithology than a hand-auger method and Parsons may use relative blow counts to determine the saprolite boundary.

a. Safety Considerations

Sampling will be conducted as a Level B operation, therefore requiring the presence of a personnel decontamination station (PDS), ambulance, cascade, dress out tent out in the driveway, and use of the garage as a direct access point.

Coring will be conducted in Modified Level D personal protective equipment (PPE). All or many of the locations will be cored first with concrete plugs left in place. Parsons will then return in Level B PPE to remove the concrete plugs, vapor barrier, and gravel, sample with the Geoprobe, and then take the sample sleeve to the geologist at the hotline so the geologist does not have to be dressed in Level B PPE. The geologist will log the sleeve and then the sleeve will be containerized.

An ambulance will be present and chemical warfare materiel (CWM) protocols will be applied. Ambulance crew training will begin soon and George Washington University (GW) Hospital will be back on contract. The statement of work (SOW) given to the ambulance crew is specifically clear about how the crew will be supporting the project and GW Hospital. The level of support has not changed, but is now codified in the SOW.

In response to a question from EPA Region III, Parsons confirmed that the CWM training will be the same and will include training for a physician at GW Hospital.

Miniature chemical agent monitoring system (MINICAMS) and DAAMS will be collected inside the rooms to be sampled. The MINICAMS will be at the hole along with an A-point DAAMS (there will be a DAAMS tube at the MINICAMS sample port) and four-perimeter DAAMS around the room. No added engineering controls will apply to the house itself.

b. Sump Sampling

In response to a question from P. deFur, AU confirmed that interior air sampling was conducted in the house the entire time the house was occupied.

Parsons and USACE discussed a plan to leave a polyvinyl chloride (PVC) sleeve in the hole to collect soil gas samples at a later date, with a cover in the interim. Leaving such an apparatus in place does pose the low risk of water seeping through the hole into the basement.

Parsons and USACE Baltimore explained that ECBC suggested contacting Beacon Environmental, which has technology that has demonstrated success on similar projects. Contractually, USACE Baltimore may not conduct soil gas testing at this time. The soil gas assessment would be conducted in a second phase.

DAAMS tubes will be run for four hours at the sump area in the wine cellar and water samples will be taken. The condition of plastic in the area would be checked and replaced if necessary.

In response to a question from USACE Baltimore, Parsons explained that the temperature of the ground near the sub-surface and the air temperature in a French drain system average to be about 60° F, in relation to the temperature at which HD volatizes, 55° F.

USACE Baltimore noted that there may be HD in the sub-surface; perhaps not in the vapor, but possibly in the soil. EPA Region III agreed, but pointed out that degradation products or hydrolyzed products in the water would be detected.

Parsons added that those findings would relate more to a positive detection sub-slab. If there is a non-detect that non-detect may not be conclusive.

The sump is the same configuration as the sump found at 4825 Glenbrook Road. There is drainage into the sump but there is no known drainage point out of the sump. The sump has a gravel bottom and was built as a contingency plan for the basement; a sump-pump system that did not generate enough water to necessitate a pump. During sampling Parsons will drain the sump to confirm the depth and look for a gravel bottom. Water will be sampled on site, then pumped through a peristaltic pump to see if the water recharges. Both the recharge water and uncharged water will be sampled.

c. Comments on Basement Sampling Standard of Procedure

Parsons addressed comments received from EPA Region III and AU on the Basement Sampling Standard of Procedure (SOP).

- Air monitoring will be performed inside the rooms.
- EPA Region III recommended that additional perimeter DAAMS tubes be run in the basement after the sampling to monitor for changes in addition to the DAAMS tubes and MINICAMS run during coring. Parsons will consult ECBC on how best to run DAAMS tubes overnight in the house to monitor for changes. In response to a question from USACE Baltimore, Parsons explained that epoxy will be used when the plugs go back in if a sleeve for soil gas will not be left in place. Restoration would occur later if DAAMS tubes are left to collect soil gas.
- All the hand held monitoring conducted at 4835 Glenbrook Road will be the same used at 4825 Glenbrook Road.

- If an American University Experiment Station (AUES) item is found in the hole, Parsons will sand bag the item and convene a Project Delivery Team (PDT). If the hole cannot be cleared with a magnetometer, then the hole will be abandoned and another sample point will be used in the floor. In response to a question from EPA Region III, Parsons explained that if a glass container or munition is found, a sheet of plastic would be placed on top of the item and a sandbag or 4" expandable well plug placed on top of the plastic for a relatively air tight seal. USACE Baltimore and Parsons agreed to develop a contingency plan for the SOP concerning procedure if an item is encountered. There is an estimated 6" of gravel and an excessive amount of rebar below the foundation based on findings at 4825 Glenbrook Road. Parsons plans to visually inspect until 2' to 3' down, where the magnetometer signal will not be saturated and may work effectively.
- In response to a question from EPA Region III, Parsons explained that semi-volatile organic compound (SVOC) samples are composited without mixing, and that whole cores may be taken and mixed in order to get a better representation of the soil layers. EPA Region III agreed to what was described. EPA Region III wanted to make sure there is a full representation of the soil, making sure that the method was not going to be exactly like the volatile organic compounds (VOCs). EPA Region III added that the volatile sample/plug can be preserved and then mixed, so all of the samples would essentially be sampling the same material. EPA Region III added that by splicing the samples one could miss something that is in a layer that was not tested; if a particular layer is missed, then one could miss everything. Parsons agreed and added that the sample could be called a composite of the core. The teams will be on the lookout for CACM.

Sampling will begin when EPA Region III gives the lead time and everyone has concurrence on the sampling plan.

All Partners agreed to the Basement Sampling SOP with the responses to comments.

USACE Baltimore explained that Phase 2 soil gas sampling is a contractual issue to be worked out with USACE Huntsville, but if Phase 1 sampling comes back conclusively with clear issues there will not be a need to take soil gas samples. If Phase 1 results do not give a conclusive path forward, USACE Baltimore will sample the whole basement and include soil gas sampling.

USACE Baltimore suggested that if the first set of samples came back conclusively, a plan might need to be devised to discuss with the previous occupants, what those results mean, and how the results apply to when the previous occupants were living there. Some indoor sampling might show how the problem stayed beneath the slab. This sampling would need to be conducted before any potential demolition as a result of a conclusive test result.

AU noted that sampling had been conducted the entire time the previous occupants were living inside the house and nothing was detected.

In response to a question from USACE Baltimore, AU could not confirm sampling for HD was performed, but would research the question.

3. Future Activities

- Ambulance training to be completed and the Interspiro self-contained breathing apparatuses (SCBAs) are out for recertification.
- Additional sampling will determine how the shared property line is handled for 4835 Glenbrook Road and 4825 Glenbrook Road.
- Over-excavate areas of elevated arsenic in the former high probability areas.
- The BOI report will determine if there is a site shut-down.

- The Partners will be notified of the sampling start date.

After the sampling event, the site will likely shut down. A small staff will remain at the site and conduct site maintenance, security, and small projects if found to be cost effective. Security will remain the same during the off-hours. A return-to-work plan will be developed, which will be consistent with the BOI findings and the sampling data.

B. PRP Investigation

USACE Baltimore provided a brief update on the Potentially Responsible Party (PRP) Investigation.

The PRP Investigation report is almost final. There will be an internal meeting with the USACE Baltimore commander and a recommendation will be made whether or not the report will be sent to the Department of Justice (DOJ).

In the case DOJ receives the report, DOJ will make a determination whether or not to pursue the PRP.

There is no public aspect to the PRP Investigation and it will not be discussed in a public forum.

C. Groundwater Feasibility Study

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

USACE received responses from all Partners during the last round of Response to Comments and is addressing those responses and some technical issues.

There is a policy disagreement between Department of Defense (DoD) and the EPA regarding the restoration of groundwater to beneficial use. At this point, EPA and DOEE will deliver a non-concurrence if USACE proceeds with Alternative 2 as written in the Groundwater FS. The issue is now with USACE Headquarters, which will decide how to proceed.

In response to a question from T. Beckwith, EPA Region III and DOEE confirmed that EPA and DOEE have not changed their position regarding Alternative 2 as written in the Groundwater FS.

EPA Region III noted that the Superfund Task Force is looking at the EPA's groundwater policy and there may be some new guidance; the time frame for policy changes may likely take up to a year.

USACE will send out additional responses to comments.

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 Baltimore provided a brief update on the Site-Wide Decision Document (DD).

USACE Baltimore needs concurrence letters from the EPA Region III and the DOEE. DOEE and EPA Region III agreed to work together, sign concurrence letters for the Site-Wide DD, and send the letters to USACE Baltimore.

E. Site-Wide Remedial Action (RA)

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

USACE Baltimore provided a brief update on the Site-Wide Remedial Action (RA).

The RA contract was awarded in June. USACE has received and finalized some internal project management documents with the contractor. Currently, USACE Baltimore is reviewing a Land Use Control Implementation Plan (LUCIP) and has sent comments back to Weston Solutions. Once those

comments are addressed and Weston Solutions produces a draft final of the LUCIP, the draft final LUCIP will be sent to all of the Partners.

USACE Baltimore and USACE Huntsville are reviewing the Uniform Federal Policy for Quality Assurance Project Plan (UFP/QAPP) for advance geophysical classification. USACE Baltimore expects a long review time because of the complexity of the document. The draft final UFP/QAPP may not be available before the end of the year.

In response to a question from EPA Region III, Weston Solutions explained that the UFP/QAPP for geophysics has a munitions constituents (MC) component. Weston Solutions and Black Tusk Geophysics wrote the UFP/QAPP for geophysics together.

There will be a Public Safety Building (PSB) work plan and a Soil Removal work plan.

Weston Solutions plans to maximize coverage by grouping properties into manageable bundles as Right of Entries (ROEs) are obtained. After completing the first group of residences, the project will go street by street. The federal properties will be used as fall back work to keep the schedule moving.

Department of General Services will need to be consulted for a long term blanket ROE for the 12 city/federal properties.

USACE Baltimore described the strategy in managing the first 19 priority properties. USACE Baltimore will be collecting the ROEs and other details from that group. The goal is to minimize the time spent on each property. Community meetings will be focused on the first group of homeowners, but will be open to the community to inform the homeowners on what may be expected in the process. USACE Baltimore anticipates this may make the ROE process easier.

In response to a question from EPA Region III, Weston Solutions confirmed that there will be individual property reports upon completion but no individual work plans for each property.

EPA Region III suggested briefing the community on the timing plan for grouping properties based on schedules of availability for the properties.

USACE Baltimore added that a community meeting can be held after the first group is completed to sort out how the remainder may be tentatively organized.

The QAPP has a flow chart addressing scheduling challenges and community meetings to address the challenges of transplanting or replacing landscaping during the seasons that are not workable.

The Outreach Team will be updating contact information for the affected residents.

The soil removal plan for the Spaulding/ Captain Rankin Exposure Unit, the Southern AU Exposure Unit, and the AU PSB are combined together in the UFP/QAPP for planning purposes. Once the UFP/QAPP is approved Weston Solutions will begin work on the permits, check on the ROEs, and establish pre-characterization of the locations to determine what tools are best suited for the excavations with additional input from the landscaping evaluations and the AU calendar to minimize impacts.

A site visit was conducted in August at the AU PSB. The UFP/QAPP is being drafted with the understanding that the PSB is a sensitive location.

Tentative start date is February/March 2018, depending on review of the work plans.

USACE Baltimore added that an ROE will be needed for the PSB and the possible rental of the Rockwood Building.

In response to a question from USACE Baltimore, AU will continue to be the point of contact for the AU campus. Paul Chrostowski, CPF Associates, American University Consultant will lead community

outreach for the AU community. USACE Baltimore will share information with AU to help educate students about the USACE project. The group that was in the Rockwood Building are now gone.

DC Watson are finalizing work plans to start this winter on the Rockwood Building. USACE Baltimore will have to review the time line for that work.

AU will resend the asbestos and lead-based paint results to USACE Baltimore and Weston Solutions.

USACE Baltimore and Weston Solutions are concerned about utility and gas lines running to the financial aid building. USACE Baltimore will contact AU for additional utility drawings so a plan may be developed to address or work around the utilities.

In response to a question from Weston Solutions, AU explained that there are no plans to build a dorm on the property at this time.

F. Open Issues and New Data

1. American University Alumni Class Action

G. Future Agenda Items

1. BOI report
2. Groundwater FS
3. 4825 Glenbrook Road
4. 4835 Glenbrook Road
5. Site-Wide DD
6. Site-Wide RA

H. Agenda Building

The next meeting was scheduled for Thursday, December 7, 2017.

I. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 11:53.