

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

RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT AT THIS MEETING	
Dan Noble	Military Co-Chair/USACE, Spring Valley MMRP Manager
Brian Barone	Agency Representative - Department of Energy & Environment
Paul Bermingham	Community Member
Mary Bresnahan	Community Member
Devamita Chattopadhyay	RAB Technical Assistance for Public Participation (TAPP) Consultant
William Krebs	Community Member
Helen Lyons	Community Member
Lawrence Miller	Community Member
Lee Monsein	Community Member
Joe Vitello	Agency Representative - Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Region III
John Wheeler	Community Member
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEMBERS NOT PRESENT AT THIS MEETING	
Greg Beumel	Community Co-Chair
Marguerite Clarkson	At Large Representative - Horace Mann Elementary School
Alma Gates	Community Advisor to the RAB
Jonathan Harms	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 April 2022 Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) conference call began at 7:04 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

Website Updates

D. Noble reviewed the website updates, which included the January and February Site-Wide Monthly Project Updates. The January RAB meeting minutes and presentation have been posted to the project site. The March Partner meeting was not held, but the project update presentation was posted in lieu of meeting minutes.

B. Task Group Updates

Since the project is beginning to wind down, it is likely that no new RAB members will be recruited for the remainder of the project. The membership focus will shift to retaining the current membership. Therefore, a Membership Committee is no longer necessary. Additionally, there is no longer a need for a Science Task Group. Going forward, Task Group updates will no longer need to be formally presented at the future RAB meetings. Should the need arise, a new Task Group could be created, or an old Task Group revived.

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:** one (1) property approved their Landscape Plan and became available for geophysical surveys. Vegetation removal and blind seeding was completed at this property. Geophysical surveys are underway.
- **One property owner declined participation.** An in-person meeting was held with the property owner. The property owner explained that while they understand the intention of the project, they are adamant about not participating:
 - USACE Baltimore will follow guidance from the USACE Office of Counsel for the non-

participation of this property.

- USACE will send a formal letter to each of the regulatory partners to identify this property owner and provide a summary of unsuccessful attempts to gain the property owner's participation. USACE will consult with the Partners to determine if there is any final effort the Partners wish to employ. The letter will be going out to the Partners soon.

3. Geophysical Surveys

- To date, geophysical surveys have been completed at 13 Fed/city lots and 90 residential properties.
- The property where geophysical surveys are currently being conducted is very large. Completion of survey efforts may take as long as 3 weeks. A substantial amount of acreage is being surveyed as a result of this homeowner's cooperation.

4. Anomaly Excavations

- One (1) property was fully remediated since the January RAB meeting. No munitions and explosives of concern (MEC) or munition debris (MD) items were found.
- The map on slide #10 of the presentation indicates the locations where MEC and MD items have been found so far. The map is updated as properties reach completion. No changes have been made to the map since the last RAB meeting.

Question from Paul Bermingham, Community Member - Dan, may I ask a question about the property owner who declined to participate in the geophysical survey? Did they give a reason, or they are just saying no?

D. Noble explained that survey and anomaly excavation activities were conducted at the property during the Remedial Investigation (RI) ~6 years ago. The property owners were satisfied with the work that was previously completed and do not see the need for USACE to come back and, in their mind, complete the same activities again. The property owners understand from first-hand experience that the work can be intrusive and were not happy with the excavation that was conducted during the RI. The property owners understand that the current proposed plan is to remove vegetation and landscaping from the property to provide as much coverage as possible and are not interested in those removal actions.

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 has been removed (if needed) from 91 private properties and 13 City/Fed lots.
- Geophysical surveys completed at 90 private properties and 13 City/Fed lots off Dalecarlia Parkway.
- Anomaly removal completed at 90 private properties and 13 City/Fed lots off Dalecarlia Parkway.
- Issued 89 Assurance Letters.

The map on Slide #11 of the presentation shows the 92 residential properties and 13 Federal/City lots:

- Properties with no color and are highlighted with blue borders indicate residential properties

and city lots that have been completed.

- Properties shown in blue indicate properties that require future remedial action. The small property shown in blue is the property that is not likely to be remediated. The larger property shown in blue is the property where geophysical surveys are currently underway.

6. Tentative Schedule

Spring 2022

- Complete intrusive investigation at last remaining property.
- Begin subsequent Final Restoration Site walks with latest group of homeowners.
- Remediation activities are still expected to be completed by early summer.

B. Former Public Safety Building (PSB)

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

- Demobilized from the PSB site on 16 April 2021. All work from the previous scope of work was completed. An additional area of debris was discovered extending into the hillside; the team is awaiting contract modification approval to perform the additional work. The team expects to resume work in spring/summer 2022.
- The dashed red lines on the map on Slide #14 of the presentation indicate the areas where additional investigation and excavation need to be conducted. The area is a steep hillside and will require a temporary retaining wall for safety during investigation activities. The proposed retaining wall is shown by the solid gold line on the map on Slide #14.

C. Site Wide Remedial Action Closure Report

D. Noble provided a brief update on the Site Wide Remedial Action Closure Report.

- Similar to the Final Report for 4825 Glenbrook Road, the contractor has begun preparing the Closure Report for the Site-Wide Remedial Action.
- Slides #15 and #16 of the presentation show the proposed Table of Contents and Appendices for the Closure Report. USACE Baltimore approved the proposed format and sent the document to the regulators for review and comments.
- The RAB is welcome to review the document and submit comments to USACE Baltimore.

D. Glenbrook Road

D. Noble provided a brief update on 4825 Glenbrook Road and 4835 Glenbrook Road.

The Site-Specific Final Report (SSFR) has been finalized and posted to the website: https://www.nab.usace.army.mil/Portals/63/docs/SpringValley/SSFR/SV_4825%20Glenbrook%20Road_SSFR_OCT2021.pdf?ver=w2kz4NjzjndgDtYHJPI2w%3d%3d

Question from Allen Hengst, Audience Member: Dan, I have a question and a comment about the landfill that was dumped at Fort Totten from Glenbrook Road back in 1992. Should I wait until the end or bring it up now?

D. Noble explained there were only a few slides of the presentation left and the agenda would transition to a question-and-answer period for A. Hengst to ask his question.

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

D. 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 Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) documentation, including the Groundwater Addendum to the Remedial Investigation (RI) Report, a No Further Action Proposed Plan (PP), and a No Further Action Decision Document (DD).
- Some additional data was collected since the remedial investigation was finalized. This data needs to be added into the Remedial Investigation Report because it is investigation data. AECOM made the amendments to the Report and sent the Preliminary Draft of the addendum to USACE.
- The Preliminary Draft RI Addendum is currently being reviewed by the USACE project team. The document will be sent to the Partners in the next few days for review. Once approved, AECOM will produce the No Further Action PP and the No Further Action DD.
- Now that the first of the three documents has been submitted, the process should go faster moving forward. The No Further Action PP may be available to the RAB in July. At that time, discussions may begin about scheduling public participation meetings that must accompany proposed plans.
- All groundwater documents to date will be made available during the public comment period to be examined, and answer/add any questions or comments.

III. Community Items

A. RAB Scheduling for 2022

As long as Baltimore and Washington DC remain high COVID transmission areas, the RAB meetings will continue to be held virtually.

- With the completion of the Glenbrook Road project, the RAB meeting schedule in 2022 has changed to 4 quarterly meetings per year (January, April, July, October,) instead of 6 meetings per year.
- The main projects left for RAB updates are the Site -Wide Remediation (PSB and the 92 residential properties and 13 Federal/City lots) and Groundwater.

B. Future RAB Meetings

ERT, Inc. will continue to provide USACE with outreach support until the end of the fiscal year, (September 30). Once the ERT, Inc. contract ends, USACE will no longer have a community outreach team on the Spring Valley project and will no longer have support for the RAB meetings.

- The proposed suggestion is to have two meetings for the 2023 calendar year, in April and October. After 2024, it is likely that scheduled RAB meetings will be discontinued.
- This is all subject to change as excavation efforts have not reached completion. However, USACE does not expect that any of the current or remaining excavation will have a serious impact on the schedule or budget at this point.

IV. Open Discussion and Future RAB Agenda Development

The next RAB meeting will tentatively be held in person on Tuesday, July 12th , 2022 at St. David's Church in the Undercroft.

Comment from John Wheeler, Community Member: I am not surprised by your suggestion to go

to two meetings a year and I think that makes a lot of sense. I have been kind of surprised that the end of the RAB...when I joined the RAB, I did not expect it to last so long. I now understand why but it did not seem like it then.

D. Noble confirmed this and thanked J. Wheeler for his comments.

A. Upcoming Meeting Topics

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

B. Next RAB Meeting:

Tuesday, April 12, 2022

C. Open Discussion

V. Public Comments

D. Noble noted that A. Hengst posted comments in the conference call chat box.

Conference Call Chatbox Comments from A. Hengst:

7:28 PM

Thanks to your interventions, I received a complete answer to my September 2021 FOIA request within days of our January RAB meeting. The Park Service did provide voluminous reports on two separate investigations they conducted focused on the 1992 dumping of soil contaminated with munitions debris and lab waste from the construction sites at 4825 & 4835 Glenbrook Road. Their 2019 report documented precisely where the sixty yards of landfill material was spread out over a northwest-facing slope at Ft. Totten National Park thirty years ago. They corroborated USACE records explaining how fumes sickened the bulldozer operator and NPS officials ordered the soil to be removed. The second 2021 report described the discovery of a 75mm AUES artillery shell (adapted with a hexagonal plug to accommodate poison gas) in July 2020 about 2100 feet to the east in a narrow wooded strip of Ft. Totten between Galloway and Gallatin streets NE, as well as their subsequent intrusive of a quarter-acre area where a foot trail was being constructed.

7:29 PM

[CORRECTION]: investigation of a quarter-acre area where a foot trail was being constructed.

Comment from A. Hengst, Audience Member: I wanted to say something as well.

D. Noble confirmed this.

Question from A. Hengst, Audience Member: First of all, I wanted to thank you, Dan and Brian Barone, for reaching out to the Park Service after our last meeting to the Resource Chief Bartolomeo. He responded to my FOIA request within days, and I put in the chat box what he provided but let me just go over it and then I will ask my question. The Park Service did provide voluminous reports on two separate investigations that they conducted on the 1992 dumping of soil contaminated with munition debris and lab waste from the construction sites at 4825 and 4835 Glenbrook Road. The 2019 report documented precisely where the 60 yards of landfill material was spread out over a northwest facing slope at Fort Totten National Park 30 years ago. They corroborated Army Corps records explaining how fumes sickened the bulldozer operator and Park

Service officials ordered the soil to be removed. The second 2021 report describes the discovery of a 75mm AUES artillery shell that was adapted with a hexagonal plug to accommodate poison gas in July 2020 about 2100 feet to the east in a narrow-wooded strip of Fort Totten between Galloway and Gallatin Streets Northeast, as well as their subsequent intrusive investigation of a quarter-acre area where a foot trail was being constructed. This is exactly what I predicted would happen when the Park Service was left to investigate this discovery. They only looked at the narrow footpath, which is about 40 foot wide, about 200 feet long. They did not look to the east or the west of that footpath, and they concluded that the area was clear. Now, what has happened since then is that Eleanor Holmes Norton, the delegate from D.C. called for a meeting with the metro officials, with the Park Service, and with the Army Corps; and Dan, I understand from communication with you, there were individuals from the Spring Valley team or at least from Baltimore Army Corps that attended that meeting. What is amazing is, it was a closed-door meeting, it was a secret meeting. There is no record of what was discussed but after the meeting Eleanor Holmes Norton announced via a press release, I am going to read her quote. She said, this is her quote, 'we had a very in-depth meeting with Park Service and Army Corps officials. There has been a thorough search of the entire area and no additional ordnance or issues have been turned up. I hope we can rely on that this time. They have assured me that they have done a very thorough search of the entire area, when they say the entire area, that is what I am going to hold them to.' So, Dan, here is my question to you. Is there anybody at this meeting tonight who was at that meeting with Eleanor Holmes Norton?

D. Noble confirmed that he was present at the meeting via phone.

Question from A. Hengst, Audience Member: Okay, how in the world were they able to convince her that they searched the entire area? Is she just talking about the foot trail or the entire wooded strip of land which goes from the metro station out to South Dakota Avenue? What is the entire area? What is she talking about, the entire area? Did they fool her into thinking they searched the entire area by just searching the footpath?

D. Noble explained that Congresswoman Eleanor Holmes Norton called and led the meeting. Prior to the meeting, E. Holmes Norton sent letters to the heads of the agencies. This issue held high visibility at USACE and at the National Park Service (NPS) and many people were on the call.

Question from A. Hengst, Audience Member: But what is the entire area? Is she talking about the footpath or the wooded strip of land which is, like, a quarter mile long?

D. Noble explained that he was not sure what E. Holmes Norton meant by that term, but that she received reports, and that it was obvious she and her staff had reviewed the reports. E. Holmes Norton asked NPS if they felt what was needed to be done had been done and if there was anything further at this point left to do. NPS explained to E. Holmes Norton that NPS investigated the areas that needed to be investigated and searched both areas in a manner that would reveal if there was an issue.

Comment from A. Hengst, Audience Member: I just want to ask one more question and then I will make a comment.

Question from A. Hengst, Audience Member: Do you have a record of what was said at that meeting? Do you have minutes or a recording of what was said at that meeting?

D. Noble explained that USACE did not make a recording or take minutes of the meeting because the meeting was hosted by the office of E. Holmes Norton.

Comment from A. Hengst, Audience Member: Okay. I am going to try to get a record of the minutes or at least a recording or whatever, but they did not search the entire area. I have read the report, I do not know if you have but they did not search the entire area. They searched a narrow footpath, and they did not find anything. So, somebody misunderstood, there was a miscommunication. I think we need to have a public meeting. I think we need to have people testifying under oath as to precisely what area was investigated. From my understanding of reading that report, they only searched the area of the footpath. They did not go to the east or the west and there is no way that the soil that was originally dumped on the western slope could be contained within that footpath, that does not even make any sense. Why, thirty years ago, would they have spread out 60 yards of landfill in a narrow strip of land like that? That is silly. That is it, that is all I have to say.

D. Noble thanked A. Hengst for his comments.

Comment from A. Hengst, Audience Member: I also wanted to apologize to Lee for the last meeting. I think he is still there. He did attend the November meeting. The problem, Lee, was that you did not come to the other meetings last year. You came to the November meeting and the January meeting, so I think that is what I was trying to say. I am sorry that I said that it was your first meeting in a year. It was your second meeting in a year.

D. Noble explained Lee Monsein had dropped off the conference call, but A. Hengst's comments would be noted in the minutes.

Comment from A. Hengst, Audience Member: Good, thank you.

VI. Adjourn

The conference call was adjourned at 7:41 PM.