

**U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Spring Valley Restoration Advisory Board
Conference Call
Minutes of the January 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
Greg Beumel	Community Co-Chair
Paul Bermingham	Community Member
Mary Bresnahan	Community Member
Devamita Chattopadhyay	RAB Technical Assistance for Public Participation (TAPP) Consultant
Marguerite Clarkson	At Large Representative - Horace Mann Elementary School
Alma Gates	Community Advisor to the RAB
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	
Jonathan Harms	Community Member
Dan Nichols	At Large Representative - American University
ATTENDING PROJECT PERSONNEL	
Kim Berg	USACE Baltimore
Julie Kaiser	USACE Baltimore
Carlos Lazo	USACE, Government Affairs Liaison
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 January 2021 Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) conference call began at 7:03 PM.

I. Administrative Items

Greg Beumel, Community Co-Chair, welcomed everyone and opened the meeting.

Dan Noble, U. S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) Spring Valley Project Manager, noted that January 2022 marks the 29th anniversary since the start of the project in January 1993.

A. Co-Chair Updates

Helen Lyons was added as a new RAB member at the November RAB meeting. Community Member Jennifer Baine resigned from the RAB because she is leaving the neighborhood. With J. Baine's departure, there is an open position on the RAB.

D. Noble asked if the RAB wanted to fill the open position or leave the membership at the current number in the last year of the project.

Comment from John Wheeler, Community Member - I just wanted to say, I think it would be very unfair to bring anybody on now when we are wrapping up. I felt the same way five years ago, but I definitely feel that way now. That just does not make any sense. I know that Whitney did that memo saying that we could exist forever, but surely no one is interested in that.

Comment from Marguerite Clarkson, At Large Representative - Horace Mann Elementary School - I second John's opinion on that.

Comment from Mary Bresnahan, Community Member - And probably because there will not be that many meetings if it is only going to be one more year and so I would go along with that also.

G. Beumel proposed circling back to this topic at the end of the presentation after the other agenda items were addressed.

1. Introductions

2. General Announcements

Website Updates

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

Since we last met 1 property owner (actually today) began vegetation removal at their property. By the end of the week geophysical survey should be underway.

2. Recent Activities

- Property Availability: one (1) property approved their Landscape Plan and became available for geophysical surveys. Vegetation removal began today at the one property that approved their landscape plan.
- Geophysical surveys are expected to begin at this property by the end of the week.

3. Geophysical Surveys

- Dynamic and cued surveys completed at 4 properties and 2 Dalecarlia Woods Grid Addendum areas.
- To date, geophysical surveys have been completed at 13 Fed/city lots and 89 residential properties.
- Geophysical surveys remaining to be conducted include 3 residential properties (including the property that recently became available for geophysical surveys.) Coordination with the property owners is ongoing.

4. Anomaly Excavations

- Four properties and two partial city lots were remediated in November/December
- 2 munitions debris (MD) items were recovered and are pending headspace analysis
 - 75mm Projectile Fragmentation (shown in the photo on slide #9 of the presentation)
 - Unidentifiable Fragmentation
- The map on slide #10 of the presentation indicates the locations where munitions and explosives of concern (MEC) and MD items were found. The map has been updated as more properties reach completion. The two munition debris items that were recently found are now indicated on this map.

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

- Currently working on 6 residential properties at different stages of the remedial action process.
- 90 civil surveys and 90 arborist surveys have been completed.
- 90 properties have been visited by the geophysicist team, who provide technical recommendations on plant removal.
- Vegetation has been removed (if needed) from 89 private properties and 13 City/Fed lots.
- Geophysical surveys completed at 89 private properties and 13 City/Fed lots off Dalecarlia Parkway.
- Anomaly removal completed at 89 private properties and 13 City/Fed lots off Dalecarlia Parkway.
- Issued 85 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.

6. Tentative Schedule

- Winter 2021-2022
 - Complete round of anomaly removal efforts.
 - Geophysical surveys at 3 remaining properties pending completion of site preparation activities and/or property owner approvals of Landscape Plans.
 - Begin subsequent Final Restoration Site walks with latest group of homeowners.
 - There is a possibility that the last few properties will be completed by the end of June. If not, the contractor's period of performance will need to be extended to ensure all the work will be completed.

B. Former Public Safety Building (PSB)

Kim Berg, USACE Baltimore provided a brief update on the former Public Safety Building (PSB).

1. Public Safety Building Status

- 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 new contract approval to perform the additional work. The team expects to complete the work in spring/summer 2022.
- Completed Erosion and Sediment (E&S) Controls.
- Inspections every other week in October through December and after storms.
- Final non-hazardous Investigation Derived Waste (IDW) from PSB investigation were transported for disposal on 7 October 2021.
- PSB slope and soil benches are vegetated and stable.

2. PSB Slope Excavation Planning

- The additional work at the PSB site requires installing a retaining wall (indicated by the yellow line in the figure on slide #16 of the presentation.)
- The proposed soil and American University Experiment Station (AUES) debris area to be excavated is indicated by the red outline in the figure on slide #16 of the presentation – the area is based on the test pit and Rotosonic soil borings completed at the PSB site in April 2021.
- To safely conduct the soil slope excavation north of the former PSB foundation, a soil retaining wall is recommended. See proposed wall location on next slide. The planned upslope excavation at RS-04 would be conducted using a slide rail modular shoring system.
- Jack Child Hall (west of PSB) is set up for temporary water service with a heat trace for winter service from Hamilton Hall, which is outside the proposed excavation area. The original water line was cut, capped and removed near the PSB. However, the sanitary sewer line from Jack Child Hall is still operational and crosses the proposed slope excavation area. This sewer line will be bypassed around the proposed excavation area.

3. PSB Schedule

- Based on the investigation results, USACE determined the scope of work to excavate the extent

of AUES debris identified.

- Once funding has been obtained and the work awarded, additional plans will be required before re-starting the soil remediation work – this will entail a delay of many months before the work is awarded and the required planning documents are prepared and approved.
- Removal of soil on the slope is not expected to begin until spring/summer 2022.
- Restoration work would start after completing the north/east slope investigation and slope soil excavation and backfilling and include rebuilding the PSB slope and removing the access road.
- Landscape restoration work will be coordinated with American University – based on the approved landscape restoration plan.

C. Glenbrook Road

Julie Kaiser, USACE Baltimore, provided a brief update on 4825 Glenbrook Road and 4835 Glenbrook Road.

- USACE held a closure ceremony event for the project on November 23, with coverage by ~4-5 local media outlets, including radio and tv.
- D. Noble, Brenda Barber, USACE Baltimore, and Colonel Estee S. Pinchasin, District Commander, USACE Baltimore each spoke at the event.
- USACE is working to establish an online link to the 4825 Glenbrook Road closure report and will share when the link has been created.
- The 4835 Glenbrook Road Status Letter has been finalized and issued.

Question from Allen Hengst, Audience Member - Julie, I have a question for Dan, but do you want to do the next slide first?

J. Kaiser confirmed this.

Attendees at the November 23 event included former Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Region III Representative Steve Hirsh, members of the USACE Baltimore media staff Joyce Conant and Andrea Takash, and Officer McElwee.

Question from J. Wheeler, Community Member - Dan, how is Steve Hirsh enjoying retirement?

D. Noble explained that S. Hirsh is enjoying retirement. He and his wife are running an Airbnb on a farm in Pennsylvania.

J. Kaiser asked A. Hengst if he wrote his question in the chatbox or would prefer to speak his question.

Comment from A. Hengst, Audience Member - I put my comment in the chat and I am going to give my comment and then I will put my three questions in the chat. Sorry for the suspense.

I have two or three simple questions for Dan but would like to briefly review the undisputed facts for the benefit of those who are unfamiliar with this issue. Seventeen months ago, in August 2020, following a heavy rain, a WW1-era artillery shell was exposed at Fort Totten metro station along the foot trail that was being excavated to connect Gallatin and Galloway Streets in northeast DC. This so-called ‘smoking’ 75mm had a hexagonal plug to accommodate poison gas, the tell-tale signature of chemical weapons manufactured at the American University Experiment Station. How this munition debris from Glenbrook Road ended up on the other side of Rock Creek Park is well known to this RAB and the Army Corps of Engineers. It is in the March 10th, 2020 RAB meeting minutes. Dan, tell us the story once again. Anyway, at the January 12th, 2021 RAB meeting, Dan acknowledged consulting with the National Park Service about this artillery shell.

Although, the Army Corps decided, despite their documented expertise, to let the National Park Service function as the lead agency for the subsequent investigation that was eventually undertaken months later. When I asked Dan about this investigation at the March 2020 RAB meeting, he invited me to contact the National Park Service directly. That was Nick.

Question from Lee Monsein, Community Member - What does this have to do with anything we are talking about right now?

Comment from A. Hengst, Audience Member - It comes from Glenbrook Road, Dr. Monsein, it comes from Glenbrook Road! I am sorry you do not know about it. They tried to dump it at Lorton, and it smelled so bad that the Army Corps...

Comment from L. Monsein, Comment Member - We are finished with...

Comment from A. Hengst, Audience Member - Let me finish! The Army Corps made an arrangement with the National Park Service to dump the soil from Glenbrook Road at Fort Totten. They were constructing a metro station...

Comment from L. Monsein, Community Member - Dan, I do not like this.

Comment from A. Hengst, Audience Member - Do not interrupt me! Do not interrupt me!

Comment from L. Monsein, Community Member - I do not like Allen going on about this.

Comment from A. Hengst, Audience Member - Dan, I ask you to tell Lee to stop interrupting. This has to do with 4825 Glenbrook Road. I am going to finish my comments and then I am going to ask the question. You invited me, Dan, to contact Nick Bartolomeo of the Chief of Resource Management of the National Park Service. At Delegate Norton's quarterly meeting with the National Park Service later in March 2021, I asked them a simple question about their investigation. Their four-sentence non-responsive answer arrived in writing 4 months later in July 2021. As the Army Corps and the RAB is well aware, I sent the National Park Service contact a two-page FOIA request on September 13th, 2021. Lee, I think you got a copy of that letter. So did Dan, so did the rest of the RAB members. As of today, I still have not received a response. Now I am ready to ask my questions. Question number 1: to your knowledge, Dan, is the National Park Service exempt from FOIA?

D. Noble explained that no government agency is exempt from FOIA but that there are exceptions that allow agencies to be non-responsive.

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

D. Nobles explained that agencies would have to disclose that an exception exists.

Question from A. Hengst, Audience Member - Thank you. Will the Army Corps please confirm with the National Park Service that they are at least working on a response to my September 13th, 2021 certified letter?

D. Noble confirmed that he would contact N. Bartolomeo.

Question from A. Hengst, Audience Member - Thank you. Then I do not have a third question. But will you let me know what he says, please?

D. Noble confirmed this.

Comment from A. Hengst, Audience Member - Thank you. And Lee, I am sorry you have missed the last couple meetings. As I understand it, you miss two meetings in a row you are not supposed

to be on the RAB! So, you should be leaving!

D. Noble explained that L. Monsein dropped off the meeting.

Comment from J. Wheeler, Community Member - Lee was at the last meeting.

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).

The Partners and USACE agreed in principle to a No Further Action Decision Document (DD). The Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) administrative steps for the DD include a public meeting and a public comment period.

- Awarded contract to AECOM for completing the Groundwater Addendum to Remedial Investigation (RI) Report, No Action Proposed Plan (PP), and No Action Decision Document (DD).
- A draft of the Remedial Investigation Report has been submitted to USACE with the additional perchlorate and arsenic data collected in recent years.
- Anticipate scheduling a meeting with the Partners in January to discuss specific details to be included in the RI addendum and a schedule for the path forward in 2022.
- 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

IV. Open Discussion and Future RAB Agenda Development

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

- An email was sent to all RAB members with USACE Baltimore's proposal to change the RAB meeting schedule in 2022 to 4 quarterly meetings per calendar 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.
- The remaining fieldwork will be conducted at the Public Safety Building and the last 3 properties for the Site-Wide remedial effort. The remaining Groundwater effort is a paperwork administrative exercise; there is no additional field work to be completed.

D. Noble noted a message in the chatbox from A. Hengst and asked if the message was a question for D. Noble or G. Beumel.

Comment from A. Hengst, Audience Member - It is a comment for the end of the meeting, a public comment.

Question from G. Beumel, Community Co-Chair - Okay, I want to get everyone's input. I know that tonight's meeting, the actual content of the meeting took less than 30 minutes. So, do we have enough information or anticipate enough information that we need to have more than quarterly meetings?

Comment from A. Hengst, Audience Member - Sorry, the meeting is not over yet. The meeting is not over yet.

Comment from G. Beumel, Community Co-Chair - Allen, I understand that the meeting is not over, but we are no longer hearing anything new from the Corps and that was my point. They are done saying their update of what happened.

Question from A. Hengst, Audience Member - Are you saying that the only purpose of the RAB meeting is to hear from the Corps? They are not supposed to hear from the public at the RAB meeting? Is that your idea of a RAB meeting?

Comment from G. Beumel, Community Co-Chair - Allen, you can discuss it when we get to the point of me asking people what they think. And I know your opinion as you just expressed it; I am asking everyone else's opinion, and just stating what has happened at this meeting.

Comment from A. Hengst, Audience Member - Excuse me, but I have not begun to express my opinion, I have only recited the facts. I am going to recite my opinion during the public comment period.

Question from G. Beumel, Community Co-Chair - Does anyone else have anything else to say?

Comment from M. Clarkson, At Large Representative - Horace Mann Elementary School - I agree with the move to quarterly meetings.

Comment from J. Wheeler, Community Member - I absolutely agree.

Comment from Paul Bermingham, Community Member - I agree.

Comment from M. Bresnahan, Community Member - I agree also.

Comment from Lawrence Miller, Community Member - There we go, first time on this new platform. I agree with the analysis and with what people have said. One caveat; I think we obviously have a diminishing number of topics to discuss, the caveat is that if we go this way and we are meeting quarterly, but something unexpectedly comes up, I would expect that the Corps would notify us and convene a special meeting or a briefing or whatever is needed to make sure that we do not go too long without an opportunity for RAB and public participation.

Comment from G. Beumel, Community Co-Chair - Okay. Allen, you can go ahead and give us your comments now.

Comment from A. Hengst, Audience Member - I am going to just start by putting something in the chat box, but we will see where we go from there.

Question from G. Beumel, Community Co-Chair - While Allen is doing that is there anyone else who has anything they want to say?

Comment from William Krebs, Community Member - I agree with Larry's qualifications. The only other thing I was going to say was that as these reports are being drafted as you reach natural distribution points, if you make sure you distribute them to us and do not save them for a meeting.

Question from G. Beumel, Community Co-Chair - Okay. Has everyone had a chance to read Allen's message? Then he can go ahead and continue.

Comment from A. Hengst, Audience Member - I am going to speak it out loud in case people do not have access to the chat box. Several Restoration Advisory Board members have already contacted me, they are unknown to you, but they have contacted me about their concerns over the 'smoking gun' artillery shell discovered at Fort Totten in Northeast Washington. In my humble opinion, it is a national disgrace that the Army Corps Spring Valley clean up team has essentially

washed their hands of responsibility for the full and transparent investigation that the residents of the Fort Totten neighborhood are entitled to. The National Park Service has no expertise when it comes to investigating buried munitions. Why is the Spring Valley, why are you conceding, why are you letting them cover this up? You know they are going to cover it up. You know they are going to do a half-ass job, excuse my language, and that is apparently what they have done. Why do you not go over there and investigate it the proper way? Why are they only investigating the footpath, which is a quarter acre? The soil from Glenbrook Road amounted to many, many truckloads. It was not just confined to a quarter acre. The official story is that the National Park Service ordered it moved after their bulldozer operator passed out! He fainted from the fumes. So, now that we know it was not moved or all of it was not moved, why are we not doing a thorough investigation? Why is the National Park Service covering it up and why is the Army Corps letting them? Those questions are for Dan.

D. Noble explained that the National Park Service (NPS) runs some of the largest unexploded ordnance clean-ups in the United States, such as Vieques and Culebra in Puerto Rico. Vieques and Culebra are massive former Naval bombardment ranges that were turned over to the NPS to be used as wildlife refuges. The NPS is taking lead agency authority for the clean-up on those projects and hires the necessary expertise. There is a lot of expertise in the private contractor arena. Private contractors with experience in ordnance are working with the NPS at Fort Totten. USACE Baltimore offered any technical assistance that may be needed by the NPS. The NPS understands they can hire USACE Baltimore to perform the work. There are sites where USACE has been hired by the NPS to perform the work on NPS land. The Fort Totten site is NPS property and the NPS is the lead federal agency for Fort Totten, so the decision is up to the NPS. As of right now, the NPS has not asked the USACE to perform the work.

Comment from J. Kaiser, USACE - Dan, I could add that we do not have any authority on other federal land. This can be very sticky, and we run into problems sometimes with the NPS and other Department of Interior agencies that do not even want to let us on their land, but this is not that. It is just that we simply do not have the authority to go in and work on another federal agency's land. We would not even be able to get funding for it, so it is really not from a legal and policy perspective, it is not even a choice for us. So, for what that is worth, Allen, and I hear your frustration, it is terribly frustrating. And when you do not see progress being made...

Comment from A. Hengst, Audience Member – It is the Army's way, they will not even investigate munitions that we know were buried outside the FUDS boundary at Westmoreland Circle. And near the reservoir, north of the reservoir. You are not going to do it because you are a bureaucracy, and it is not within the boundary. The fact is, the Park Service is covering this up. It took them four months to answer a simple question I asked in March of 2021. At that rate, I will finally get an answer from them, I may not even be alive when their answer comes, at the rate they are going. I did not ask that many questions. I wanted to see the documentation of how far the munitions were originally spread out when they dumped it there back in the 90s. How far did it spread out? Was it just that narrow quarter-acre footpath? Of course not! But that is all they investigated. They are covering it up.

Comment from J. Kaiser, USACE - John Wheeler has raised his hand I see.

Comment from J. Wheeler, Community Member - Yes, the one agency that would have authority over the Park Service would be the DC government, so that is who I recommend Allen talk to. The Corps of Engineers does not have authority over them, the EPA does not have authority over

them, but the DC government does. There is this well-established law about how regulatory agencies within the federal government do not have authority over other federal agencies. If you really want to pursue this, you are not pursuing it at the right place. You are making a lot of noise, but it is not doing much good.

Comment from A. Hengst, Audience Member - Thank you, John. I really want to pursue this.

Comment from J. Wheeler, Community Member - Talk to the DC...

Question from A. Hengst, Audience Member - Is Brian Barone who represents the DC Department of Energy and Environment at this meeting?

B. Barone, Agency Representative, Department of Energy and Environment (DOEE) confirmed this.

Question from A. Hengst, Audience Member - Are you going to follow through on this?

Comment from B. Barone, Agency Representative, DOEE - Absolutely.

Question from A. Hengst, Audience Member - You got a copy of the letter in September! Why have they not responded? Are they going to respond within my lifetime?

Comment from B. Barone, Agency Representative, DOEE - Send me an email and I will be sure to follow up on any of the access issues you have got.

Comment from A. Hengst, Audience Member - I will do it. Thank you.

Comment from B. Barone, Agency Representative, DOEE - Not a problem.

Comment from A. Hengst, Audience Member - Where is Dr. Albright now that we need him? A rhetorical question, I am sorry.

D. Noble asked if the RAB reached a decision point regarding holding quarterly RAB meetings and suggested holding a vote on the proposal after any additional comments.

Question from G. Beumel, Community Co-Chair - Are there any other comments on the number of RAB meetings we should have this month, with, I think, Larry's caveat that if something comes up, we should call a special meeting to address a big issue, not necessarily that you have a closing ceremony for the site like 4825, but if there was something big enough, a discovery, whatever the case may be. Does somebody want to move on that?

John Wheeler moved to accept the proposal to change the RAB meeting schedule to 4 meetings per calendar year (January, April, July, October), with the caveat that special meetings would be called if necessary.

M. Bresnahan seconded the motion.

G. Beumel called for any objections; none were raised.

Comment from G. Beumel, Community Co-Chair - All in favor say 'Aye.'

Several RAB members said 'Aye.'

Comment from G. Beumel, Community Co-Chair - Okay, then I guess that passes. I am sorry, somebody said something, I did not hear it.

Question from Holly Hostetler, Spring Valley Community Outreach Lead - I am sorry to interrupt, who seconded the motion, please?

M. Bresnahan confirmed she seconded the motion.

Comment from H. Hostetler, SV Community Outreach Lead - Ok, thank you.

Comment from M. Bresnahan, Community Member - You are welcome.

Question from G. Beumel, Community Co-Chair - So, we will have our next meeting in three months and the Corps will send out a new schedule for that as we go along. Is there any other new business that we want to discuss?

Question from L. Miller, Community Member - So, when will that date will be, the one in three months?

Comment from J. Wheeler, Community Member - They have actually already sent the schedule out.

Comment from L. Miller, Community Member - Ok.

Comment from J. Wheeler, Community Member - I accepted the new schedule and it automatically populated my calendar with the dates. That was really cool.

Comment from G. Beumel, Community Co-Chair - Okay, and then, Brian, if you could just let us know what the Department of Interior says to you and/or someone else in DC government, whoever is going to officially request, their response.

Comment from B. Barone, Agency Representative, DOEE - I can do it two ways: I can report back to everyone at the next meeting, or I can send you all a quick summary in an email. Either way is fine by me, so whatever everyone's preference is. It might just be easier to do it in the next meeting, though.

Comment from G. Beumel, Community Co-Chair - Okay. Well, that works, I guess, unless you hear them tell you to stuff it, in which case you can let us know that earlier, but if you get a lot of rejections from the Department of Interior, we would like to hear about it. But if it is sort of a standard and they start doing things, then you can report later. Thank you, Brian.

Comment from B. Barone, Agency Representative, DOEE - No problem, you are welcome.

Comment from J. Wheeler, Community Member - I would just like to make a comment here. I think that what is going on in Fort Totten is beyond the scope of our RAB, and that is really why I suggested DC. DC is in the position to do something about this if something needs to be done and the Park Service is not doing it. I do not know; I have no opinion on that side of things at all; but it certainly should be looked into. It is just not our job to look into it.

Question from G. Beumel, Community Co-Chair - Okay, is there any other new business from anyone? Okay, Dan, do you have anything else?

D. Noble confirmed that he will meet with B. Barone and share information about Fort Totten.

A. Upcoming Meeting Topics

- RAB Membership
- 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

VI. Adjourn

The conference call was adjourned at 7:48 PM.