

**U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Spring Valley Restoration Advisory Board
Conference Call
Minutes of the July 2022 Meeting**

RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT AT THIS MEETING	
Dan Noble	Military Co-Chair/USACE, Spring Valley MMRP Manager
Kelsey Tharp	Agency Representative - Department of Energy & Environment
Joe Vitello	Agency Representative – Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Region III
Paul Bermingham	Community Member
Mary Bresnahan	Community Member
William Krebs	Community Member
Lawrence Miller	Community Member
Lee Monsein	Community Member
John Wheeler	Community Member
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEMBERS NOT PRESENT AT THIS MEETING	
Greg Beumel	Community Co-Chair
Devamita Chattopadhyay	RAB Technical Assistance for Public Participation (TAPP)
Marguerite Clarkson	At Large Representative - Horace Mann Elementary School
Alma Gates	Community Advisor to the RAB
Jonathan Harms	Community Member
Helen Lyons	Community Member
Dan Nichols	At Large Representative - American University
ATTENDING PROJECT PERSONNEL	
Julie Kaiser	USACE Baltimore
Sarah Donahue	Spring Valley Community Outreach Team
Holly Hostetler	Spring Valley Community Outreach Team
HANDOUTS FROM THE MEETING	

I. Army Corps of Engineers Presentation (emailed PDF)

AGENDA

Starting Time: The July 2022 Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) conference call began at 7:05 PM.

I. Administrative Items

Dan Noble, U. S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) Spring Valley Project Manager, welcomed everyone and opened the meeting.

A. Co-Chair Updates

1. Introductions

2. General Announcements

Question from Allen Hengst, Audience Member: I have a quick question. I put it in the chat box, but I will read it out loud. I visited the Spring Valley FUDS information repository at Tenley Public Library last Friday and was shocked to see that approximately 90% of the physical documents were gone, including the “master binder” of everything listed chronologically. More importantly, the binder of CDs at the library reference desk was also gone. Was this done on purpose or has the repository been ransacked?

D. Noble explained that USACE did not pull any documents from the library.

Comment from A. Hengst, Audience Member: It has been a great tragedy because not only are the binders gone, but the big binder behind the reference desk with the CDs is gone. We used to be able to take a CD, walk over to the library computer, and copy reports onto a USB drive; that too is gone. I reported it to the library and that is where it stands right now. I also spoke to Holly about it.

D. Noble explained that the library asked USACE to downsize the information repository, which is when the repository went from multiple binders to the larger binder of CDs. Additionally, USACE posted a Google Site Doc on the website that contains many of the documents electronically.

Question from A. Hengst, Audience Member: Can I say one other thing? When I was with the librarian, we went to the Army Corps website and we looked at your master list of documents listed chronologically, and it ends in 2012. The one that was in the library ended in 2019. It had an extra sheet in the front inside the cover with a bunch of documents between 2012 and 2019. So, online at the Army Corps website, you do not have a complete master list (whatever you call that thing,) do you know what I am talking about? A thin binder with the documents listed chronologically.

D. Noble confirmed that he was aware of the binder A. Hengst described.

Question from A. Hengst, Audience Member: Where is it?

D. Noble explained that he did not know where the master list binder is at the library, but USACE can review the website and update the documents chronologically.

Question from A. Hengst, Audience Member: It is important to do this for people who do not use the Army Corps website. It is hard to find stuff; I find the information in the repository a lot easier. I look stuff up in that master list and I can find it with the CDs; it is a tragedy and especially with this contractor leaving, who is going to take care of all of this stuff after they leave? How is it going to stay updated?

D. Noble explained that when ERT's contract ends, the information repository will be less robust. There are specific information repository requirements for Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) projects and there are specific requirements for an Administrative Record. Legally, USACE must keep the Administrative Record available in USACE files. USACE is expected to publicly distribute the Administrative Record Index, which describes the contents of the Administrative Record. If a member of the public wants to view a specific document, then the document must be specifically requested by filing a Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request.

Comment from A. Hengst, Audience Member: Right, I am calling it the master list, the index.

D. Noble confirmed that the master list is the same as the Index. The information repository is usually located somewhere easy for the community to access so the public can see documents that pertain to upcoming decisions. There is no requirement that the repository must be as complete as the Administrative Record. The repository only needs to have key documents that help the community understand upcoming decisions. The current upcoming decision is for the Groundwater project, so at this time the requirement is that the information repository contains the Groundwater documents. This gives the public access to the Groundwater documents to be informed as to the facts and the data as USACE makes decisions about Groundwater.

Question from A. Hengst, Audience Member: If I remember correctly, that CD binder, those CDs do not leave the library. You can use the CDs within the library, you cannot take them out and I have always worried that somebody might take one, but I guess we have been lucky. Now the entire binder is gone, and I am just wondering who could have done that. Would it have been the library?

D. Noble explained that the binder may have been misplaced by library staff or removed by someone.

Comment from A. Hengst, Audience Member: They do not give you the whole binder, you ask for something and they hand you the CD.

D. Noble explained that he would start the presentation, but the RAB can continue the information repository discussion at the end of the presentation.

Website Updates

D. Noble reviewed the website updates, which included the May Site-Wide Monthly Project Updates. The April Site-Wide Project Update link is not working, the communications department is working on getting the April Update uploaded and working. The April RAB meeting minutes and presentation have been posted to the project site. The June Partner meeting was not held, but the project update presentation will be posted in lieu of meeting minutes.

B. Task Group Updates

II. USACE Program Updates

A. Site-Wide Remedial Action (RA)

D. Noble briefly reviewed the Site-Wide Remedial Design (RD)/Remedial Action (RA).

1. COVID-19 Response

The project team continues to implement safety measures in response to COVID-19 including daily health monitoring of all workers, wearing masks, decontaminating tools, frequent hand washing, and social distancing.

2. Recent Activities

- Property Availability: work has been completed at 91 of the 92 properties.
- One property owner declined participation:
 - USACE Baltimore followed guidance from the USACE Office of Counsel for the non-participation of this property.
 - USACE sent a formal letter to each of the regulatory partners to identify this property owner and provided a summary of unsuccessful attempts to gain the property owner's participation.
 - USACE sent a formal close-out letter to the homeowner.
- USACE expects to complete the remedial action with successful activities at 91 out of the 92 properties.
- Three (3) properties were completed during the Pilot Project, bringing the total number to 95 residential properties that were part of the investigation. By the end of the project, USACE will have successfully investigated 94 of the 95 properties.

3. Geophysical Surveys

- Dynamic and cued surveys were completed at 1 property.
- To date, geophysical surveys have been completed at 13 Federal/city lots and 91 residential properties.
- With the refusal of the last property owner, no further geophysical surveys are planned at this time.

Question from Alma Gates, Community Advisor to the RAB: Were you able to geophys' that property that has refused to allow you further access?

D. Noble confirmed that the last property was investigated during the Site-Wide Remedial Investigation (RI). USACE used earlier geophysical survey techniques on this property and believes this played a factor as to why the property owner did not want to allow USACE back onto the property. USACE understands the homeowners believe that since USACE already conducted work on their property, the homeowners do not see any use in USACE returning to the property. During the initial Site-Wide RI, USACE was able to conduct geophysical surveys and investigated quite a few anomalies on the property.

Question from A. Gates, Community Advisor to the RAB: But is there an anomaly of concern left?

D. Noble explained that a more thorough survey would have to be completed to form a list of anomalies to investigate. Since USACE was unable to obtain access to the property, there is no anomaly of concern as far as USACE can determine. The last time USACE remediated the property, the investigation reviewed a few anomalies. At the time, a slightly different method to select the anomalies was being used, and the instruments used were different than the

instruments USACE currently uses. If USACE were to resurvey the property, a new list of anomalies would be formed, but it is not certain if anything would be found until an actual investigation is conducted.

Comment from A. Gates, Community Advisor to the RAB: Thank you.

4. Anomaly Excavations

- Anomaly excavations were completed at the last remaining property. It was quite a large property, and yet no munitions and explosives of concern (MEC) or munition debris (MD) items were found.
- The map on slide #10 of the presentation shows the four Areas of Concern. All the properties of interest are highlighted in blue. The circles indicate items that have been found during the Site-Wide RA. The tan color circles are MD, and the three light purple circles represent the three hazardous items that USACE recovered during the Site-Wide RA effort. This map will be presented in the Closure Report.
- Near the left side of the map on Slide #10, there is an Area of Concern that appears to be a triangle standing up on one of its corners. A strip inside of that Area of Concern falls inside the Federal fence by the Dalecarlia woods area. This is a strip of Federal property that USACE still needs to investigate. There is no public access to this area. Work is expected to start after the residential properties have been completed. Once this piece of Federal lot is completed, the map of WWI items (shown on Slide #10) may change to reflect any new finds. USACE will continue to keep the RAB posted on the latest updates concerning this last sliver of land.

Question from Hannah Umansky, Audience Member: Hi, did you mention where that strip of Federal property was located?

D. Noble confirmed this. There is an area of land that is outlined on the map on Slide #11 of the presentation that looks like a triangle standing on its side. The strip of Federal property is at the base of the triangle, running along the western edge of that polygon. A better map will be provided for the October RAB meeting that highlights the area more clearly.

Comment from H. Umansky, Audience Member: I appreciate it.

D. Noble explained that the area is behind the Federal fence. There is no public access to this area, but it is within the boundaries of the Area of Concern, so it will be remediated.

Question from H. Umansky, Audience Member: Do you have, like, a cross street that it is by? No worries if you do not.

D. Noble explained that the large road running North-South on the map on Slide #11 is Dalecarlia Parkway. If one were to drive along the Dalecarlia Parkway and look towards the Federal property, one would see the Federal fence. The strip of Federal property is located behind the fence.

Comment from H. Umansky, Audience Member: Okay, thank you.

5. The final survey effort continues at the 92 residential properties and 13 Federal/City lots

- Currently working on 1 residential property in the remedial action process.
- 91 civil surveys and 91 arborist surveys have been completed.
- 91 properties have been visited by the geophysicist team, who provide technical recommendations on plant removal.

- Vegetation removal (if needed) performed at 91 private properties and 13 City/Fed lots.
- Geophysical surveys completed at 91 private properties and 13 City/Fed lots off Dalecarlia Parkway.
- Anomaly removal completed at 91 private properties and 13 City/Fed lots off Dalecarlia Parkway.
- Issued 89 Assurance Letters.

The one property where USACE is not going to gain access is highlighted in blue on the map on Slide #11 of the presentation. The property is located in the most western Area of Concern of the project site. At least one item that had a hazard associated with it was found in each of the Areas of Concern; however, there has been no such find in the area where the last remaining property is located. The remaining property has had so much professional landscaping and terracing conducted in the past that it is possible that items may have been moved. If there was anything of interest there at one time, there is nothing there now.

Question from A. Hengst, Audience Member: Quick question. How close is this to the 52nd Court burial pit that started this whole affair in 1993? It looks like it is quite close. Is it not?

D. Noble explained that 52nd Court would be off the map on Slide #11 to the North, probably by several hundred yards. The property at 52nd Court was not included in the four Areas of Concern that the Site-wide Decision Document (DD) addressed.

6. Tentative Schedule

Summer 2022 - continue to work with a handful of homeowners to clear up any restoration issues. There are a few restoration site walks pending and remaining restoration activities that need to be completed.

7. Geophysical Prove-out/Instrument Verification Strip (GPO/IVS) Area Intrusive Investigation:

- The area highlighted in purple on the smaller map on Slide #13 of the presentation is where USACE allowed contractors to set up geophysical prove-out areas to perform instrument verification.
- Over the years, as part of the instrument verification, real munition items were sometimes buried in the ground to test if the instruments are able to detect the items. USACE wants to ensure that no remnants of munition materials or items remain in geophysical prove-out areas prior to closing out the project.
- USACE requested the current contractor to investigate this area with the instruments and conduct anomaly excavation to ensure no items are left in the ground at the Federal property. This work is a housekeeping task, is not required by the Site-Wide DD, and will not appear on the Site-Wide Closure Report.
- The investigation of the GPO/IVS area is complete. Two (2) MD items were found that had been buried years ago (images on Slide #14 of the presentation). One of the items was an intact Stokes mortar and the other was an intact 75mm projectile. These items have been recovered and are being disposed of appropriately.

B. Former Public Safety Building (PSB)

D. Noble provided a brief update on the former Public Safety Building (PSB).

- The Site-Wide DD requires USACE to remove debris that is located under the former PSB. This area is indicated by the rectangular area labelled PSB Slab on the map on Slide #16 of the presentation.
- USACE discovered that some debris extends into the hillside and must design a plan to prop up the hillside to excavate the debris.
- USACE was trying to modify the current contractor's Task Orders to include this work, but with the amount of cost required to conduct this work and the fact that the contractor's Task Order is fairly old, the USACE Contracting Office requested that a new Task Order be created for the hillside Task. This means that it is possible the new Task Order will be completed by a different contractor. The PSB area will be divided into two Tasks, called the "Sub-Slab Effort" and the "Hillside Effort."
- The current contractor has completed the Sub-Slab Effort. The contractors wrote a draft report on the work that confirms all the debris was removed from underneath the slab area. USACE is currently reviewing the draft report and expects to deliver the report to the Partners and Devamita Chattopadhyay, RAB Technical Assistance for Public Participation (TAPP) Consultant, by early August.
- This month, USACE will be working on the new contract action to hire a contractor to perform the hillside phase of the project. USACE expects to get the new Task Order awarded by the end of the calendar year, so that by late winter/early spring 2023, activity can resume at the PSB.
- When the Hillside Effort is complete, the contractor will write a draft report. Once approved, the Sub-Slab Effort and Hillside Effort reports will show that the actions required in the Site-Wide DD were completed and were successful in meeting the Site-Wide RA objectives.
- The RAB can expect to see a report on the work that has been completed to date but the report will note that there are still significant activities that need to occur in the PSB area to meet the requirements of the Site-Wide DD.

C. Groundwater Feasibility Study / Dispute Resolution

D. Noble provided a review of the Groundwater Remedial Investigation (RI) and a brief update on the Groundwater Feasibility Study (FS).

- A contract has been awarded to AECOM to develop the CERCLA documentation, including the Groundwater Addendum to the Remedial Investigation (RI) Report, a No Action Proposed Plan (PP), and a No Action Decision Document (DD).
- The Preliminary Draft RI Addendum has been submitted, and the USACE project team is currently reviewing the document.
- In the next week or so, the team will send the Draft RI Addendum to the Army's Center of Expertise (CX) for the final Army review before moving on to Partner and TAPP Consultant review. The additional groundwater data that has been collected will then be added to the Groundwater RI Report.
- Very quickly after the Groundwater RI Report is completed, the Groundwater No-Action PP will be created. Arrangements will then be made for Todd Beckwith to speak at one of the RAB meetings about the Groundwater efforts and updates.

Question from William Krebs, Community Member: Going back for a second to the Public Safety Building; is it anticipated that the RAB is going to exist as long as that kind of work is being done? Or is the RAB going to be terminated before then?

D. Noble explained that it is possible that either option could happen. There is no requirement in the guidance that the RAB needs to meet while remedial activity is taking place. Generally, the RAB meets while decisions are still being made. USACE would want to keep the RAB together through the Final Groundwater DD. At that point, it depends what progress has been made with the PSB effort. The decision could be left to the RAB if they would like to continue to meet to monitor the progress or if the communication through the monthly updates on the website and milestone stakeholder emails is sufficient without meetings.

USACE must remain fully engaged with the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Region III and Department of Energy & Environment (DOEE) until there are Final Closure Reports on everything and the Site-Wide RA documents and Site-Wide DD have been successfully completed. There will be active communication between all three agencies, but whether the RAB meets and oversees this work can be a decision left up to the RAB.

Comment from W. Krebs, Community Member: Thank you.

III. Community Items

A. RAB Scheduling for 2022

- The RAB schedule has been reduced to four meetings per year. This is the third meeting of 2022, and the fourth meeting is planned for October.
- The topics now would be the successful completion of the 92 residential properties, the PSB, and the Groundwater effort. In October, the two main topics of discussion will be Groundwater and PSB.

B. Future RAB Meetings

- This July 2022 RAB meeting is the final meeting with full ERT Community Outreach Team support, from preparation of meeting materials to preparation of meeting notes and minutes. ERT's contract is set to expire at the end of September.

D. Noble thanked Holly Hostetler, ERT and Sarah Donahue, ERT for all the support to the RAB and the excellent meeting minutes provided for the RAB meetings.

- The October RAB meeting will be the final RAB meeting with partial ERT support, in the preparation of the meeting materials only. Beginning with this meeting, the meeting minutes will be completed by USACE and will become very brief as opposed to the fully-detailed meeting minutes.
- After the October meeting, USACE will not be able to support many RAB meetings in 2023. USACE suggests having two meetings per year in 2023 (April & October).
- It is likely that RAB meetings will be discontinued in 2024.

Question from A. Hengst, Audience Member: Are you still going to have an audio recording of the meeting?

D. Noble explained he believed there will still be audio recordings of the meeting. He will confirm this with the Cooperate Communications Office. USACE records public meetings and keeps an audio tape on file, but the likelihood that USACE will produce a transcript of the recording is unlikely. Someone will take notes during the meeting, and the meeting minutes will likely consist of 2-3 pages of summarized topics and general concerns, questions and answers, and action items.

Question from A. Hengst, Audience Member: Quick hypothetical question. What happens if you find the motherload over at the Public Safety Building? Is there a way of bringing the RAB back if you have a major discovery there? You do not know what you are going to find.

D. Noble confirms that the RAB could be re-convened if necessary. USACE plans to keep the RAB going through 2023. In October 2023, a discussion can take place about what kind of meeting schedule the RAB may want for 2024, if at all. If there is a situation such as a large find at the Public Safety Building and the project suddenly becomes very complex, the RAB can continue to meet and receive updates on the details of what is happening and how things are going.

Comment from A. Hengst, Audience Member: And then I had a long comment I put in the chat box; maybe we can wait until we get to the end of the meeting.

D. Noble confirmed this.

IV. Open Discussion and Future RAB Agenda Development

- It is likely that the electronic meeting format will change. Google Meet has been the platform ERT has been using to conduct the RAB meetings, but moving forward, it is likely that WebEx will become the new meeting platform. WebEx is the meeting platform that USACE typically uses for hosting virtual meetings.
- USACE plans to send the RAB members more details on operating with WebEx.

A. Upcoming Meeting Topics

- Groundwater FS Study/Dispute Resolution
- Site-Wide RD/RA
- Public Safety Building
- Future RAB Planning and Final Document Writing Discussion

B. Next RAB Meeting:

Tuesday, October 11, 2022

C. Open Discussion

Comment from Mary Bresnahan, Community Member: I have a comment, this is Mary. I happen to agree with the possibility of having a couple of meetings in 2023 since we cannot truly predict right now what might come up.

D. Noble confirmed this. If something unexpected does come up and there is a need for a fill-in meeting, USACE will make sure to communicate with the stakeholders and publicize the situation as much as possible. At some point, in addition to the RAB meetings, there will need to be a meeting for the Groundwater PP that would be a separate public meeting, solely for that purpose. The Groundwater PP meeting will likely happen in calendar year 2023.

Comment from M. Bresnahan, Community Member: I think that would be wonderful. I do get questions, on occasion, from various neighbors about what is happening with the RAB and what is going on, because they say they are not hearing a whole lot about it and I tell them, 'yes, it is still active and it is still happening, and they are still looking into things,' and I just want you to know that.

D. Noble noted that he hoped M. Bresnahan is also telling the neighbors that things are winding down.

Comment from M. Bresnahan, Community Member: Yes, they are assuming that, and that is why they are asking the questions, which I think is very healthy, and they are assuming it is winding down. I do, I think that is wonderful.

D. Noble confirmed this.

Question from M. Bresnahan, Community Member: They actually say it is very helpful for Real Estate purposes because I, on occasion, will be asked about the value of their homes in Spring Valley and I send them some records of things that are outstandingly with value, so that makes them very happy. I am not kidding you; it is unbelievable some of the prices here in town, it is unbelievable how wonderful it is. Have you been aware of it?

D. Noble explained that he spoke quite a bit with American University (AU) about the sale of the lot at 4825 Glenbrook Road and that not only did the property sell very quickly, but the property was sold for more than AU was expecting.

Comment from M. Bresnahan, Community Member: Well, you know, I am referring to the people that live in Spring Valley whose houses go on the market. Now, I happen to live in a townhouse here on Massachusetts Avenue. The one next door to me just sold for \$2,300,000; right next to me. The one across the street from me just sold; they listed it for \$1,395,000 and I told her she was going to get substantially more. Not only did she get seven offers, I believe it was \$1,795,000. I mean it is unbelievable what is going on. The one across the street is listed at \$1,800,000. So, that tells me Spring Valley is not hurting when it comes to Real Estate and the value. And I think that helps everyone be positive.

D. Noble thanked M. Bresnahan for her comments.

Comment from John Wheeler, Community Member: Well, I have a comment. Mary was talking about how wonderful it is that the price of housing is what it is. I can understand that from a Real Estate agent perspective, but there are different perspectives on that. I certainly do not want to see the Spring Valley Superfund site lower the price of Real Estate, but some people can argue that housing is just way, way too expensive in D.C.

Comment from M. Bresnahan, Community Member: And I happen to agree with you. Completely. I really do.

Conference Call Chatbox Comment from Marguerite Clarkson, At Large Representative – Horace Mann Elementary School: Thank you, Holly & Sarah!!

Conference Call Chatbox Comment from H. Hostetler, Spring Valley Community Outreach Team: Thank you!

V. Public Comments

Conference Call Chatbox Comment from A. Hengst: I had a long discussion with the staff at Delegate Norton's office last week about the Park Service's so-called investigation of a WWI-era 75mm exposed at Ft. Totten metro station two years ago. That artillery shell with a hex plug was dumped there in 1992 after multiple tons of soil containing munitions debris and lab waste (from the 4825/4835 Glenbrook Road constructions sites) was refused at Lorton Landfill. As you may recall, I am concerned that her March closed-door briefing with NPS, WMATA...WMATA,

USACE and local elected officials somehow persuaded her that a thorough investigation of “the entire area” had been conducted last year.

Comment from A. Hengst, Audience Member: I put a comment in the chat box. I am not going to ask any questions; I am not going to put you on the spot because I understand that the Spring Valley FUDS clean-up team does not want to have anything to do with the contaminated soil which was moved from Glenbrook Road to Fort Totten 30 years ago. I understand that you washed your hands of that responsibility, but I am pursuing it now with Delegate Norton and I wanted you to know that I had a long discussion with her staff last week about the Park Service’s so-called investigation of a WWI-era 75mm exposed at Fort Totten Station two years ago. That artillery shell with a hex plug was dumped in 1992 after multiple tons of soil containing munitions debris and lab waste from the 4825/4835 Glenbrook Road construction site was refused at Lorton Landfill. As you may recall, I am concerned that her March closed-door briefing with the National Park Service, Metropolitan Transit Authority, Army Corps, and local elected officials somehow persuaded her that a thorough investigation of the entire area had been conducted last year. I am going to read from a news article by Neal Augenstein that quotes Eleanor Holmes Norton from March 9, 2022. Quote, this is her: “We had a very in-depth meeting,” with Park Service and Army Corps officials, said Norton. “There has been a thorough search of the entire area and no additional ordnance or issues have been turned up. I hope I can rely on that this time. They have assured me that they have done a very thorough search of the entire area,” Norton added, “when they say the entire area that is what I am going to hold them to.” Well, of course, they did not search the entire area, you have read the report, they searched the footpath, which is about 30 feet wide and 200 feet long. The soil that was moved from the western section of Fort Totten Park on the orders of the Park Service, if it was moved to the area where this footpath is, there is no way on God’s green earth that all of that could have been put in that tiny area. They need to explore to the east and west. So, what I am going to do, and I will probably have something for you in October is, I am going to get a record of that meeting. It is a closed-door meeting; no video, no audio, hopefully there were minutes. I am going to tell her that she has either misunderstood what they said, or they have misled her. The entire area is not the footpath. She thinks that they searched the entire area, and they are probably thinking, ‘well we did search the entire area and the entire area is the footpath.’ Sorry, that is not good enough. So, that is my report.

D. Noble thanked A. Hengst for his comment.

Comment from A. Gates, Community Advisor to the RAB: Dan, I just want to follow up on the housekeeping issue at the Tenley Library and the repository. I think that the master binder with the disks in it is probably the most important piece up there, and before ERT departs it would be really helpful if it could be located or replicated and put in a locked cabinet or something so that it does not walk out the door. This is not the first time the documents have walked out the door. Librarians are being very trusting, probably, but it appears that there is a problem. So, since that is the official sort of document for the public, it would be helpful if it could be completed and left up there in some supervised way, please.

D. Noble explained that USACE will reach out to the library about the repository. He recalled that Parsons provided the binder to USACE and were the ones that put together the CDs and assembled the binder, primarily because most of the documents were Parsons documents. USACE no longer has access to Parsons documents. D. Noble believes Parsons provided USACE with two copies of the binder, one for the USACE office and one for the library. D.

Noble will contact the people at USACE that would know where the USACE copy of the binder is located and ask USACE IT to make a copy to replace the lost copy at the library.

Comment from A. Hengst, Audience Member: The second most important is the index binder, that is the second most important.

D. Noble explained that the Administrative Index binder should be quite easy to replace and placed back in the library.

Comment from A. Hengst, Audience Member: Thank you.

Comment from M. Bresnahan, Community Member: Thank you.

Comment from Paige Ela, Audience Member: I am not sure who is talking but I am a resident of Spring Valley with a property that was partially remediated, and I have a question for the team.

D. Noble asked P. Ela to proceed with her question.

Comment from P. Ela, Audience Member: Okay, great. So, I have a property that is right next to the Algerian Embassy and so our property was done very early on, however there is a portion of the property that is actually on the Algerian Embassy that has not been remediated yet and I have reached out to the team several times indicating an interest in getting that portion remediated and I have not heard back and part of the issue is that there are four dead trees; two are on the Algerian property and two are on my property that we are trying to figure out. I have been reaching out and I have not heard back, and I guess I would just like to understand what is going on.

D. Noble explained that USACE has been waiting on the results of the excavation at the neighboring property before making any decisions about how to proceed with the corner of the property that intersects P. Ela's fence line. Given that no WWI items were found at the rest of the property, USACE decided not to investigate the area on P. Ela's property that is in question.

USACE is still considering the issue with the trees. USACE received the opinion of the arborist that P. Ela provided and internal discussions regarding this issue are ongoing at USACE. USACE has not forgotten about this issue and P. Ela should expect a call from S. Donahue, ERT, in the upcoming days to discuss the issue further. USACE will continue to move forward on this issue until a resolution has been reached.

Comment from P. Ela, Audience Member: Okay, well, I mean we have little kids too, living at our house and that portion of the property, while it might seem small in comparison to the Algerian Embassy, it is a good chunk on the side of our house. I have consistently reiterated that it is our preference to get it done; however, we were concerned with the large trees that have died in the area where all the vegetation was taken out and wanted to really get that resolved as well. It is taking a long time and I guess I am obviously frustrated because originally, when you all came in, you provided assurances that if the trees were to die you would work with us and it just does not seem like anyone is willing to really work with us. We feel like we are getting slow-rolled here and, in the meantime, we have trees, very large poplars that are dead and my home is afraid. I have kids in the house who are very afraid of staying in their bedrooms on the second floor, so we would like a resolution sooner rather than later. We have had three arborists look at it. Everyone says that the disruption created the demise of those trees. And the letter that your arborist wrote only discusses two of the four trees. There are three different species of trees, all that died, all in the same area. So, we would like resolution faster than what we are getting right

now. And it is real time for us because we have trees that are dead that could fall on our house, on a downward slope.

D. Noble reiterated that S. Donahue will be in touch with her in the next day or two.

Comment from P. Ela, Audience Member: Thank you, I appreciate it. And thanks for this call, I mean it is helpful. I saw that this was tonight, and it is helpful to be able to raise these concerns within a community call, so thank you. Okay, appreciate it, thanks so much.

Comment from M. Bresnahan, Community Member: Good night, everyone, and thank you.

VI. Adjourn

The conference call was adjourned at 7:59 PM.