

**U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Spring Valley Restoration Advisory Board
Conference Call
Minutes of the November 2021 Meeting**

RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT AT THIS MEETING	
Dan Noble	Military Co-Chair/USACE, Spring Valley MMRP Manager
Greg Beumel	Community Co-Chair
Jennifer Baine	Community Member
Paul Bermingham	Community Member
Devamita Chattopadhyay	RAB Technical Assistance for Public Participation (TAPP) Consultant
Alma Gates	Community Advisor to the RAB
William Krebs	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	
Brian Barone	Agency Representative - Department of Energy & Environment
Mary Bresnahan	Community Member
Marguerite Clarkson	At Large Representative - Horace Mann Elementary School
Paul Dueffert	Community Member
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 November 2021 Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) conference call began at 7:05 PM.

I. Administrative Items

A. Co-Chair Updates

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

1. Introductions

Comment from Holly Hostetler, Spring Valley Community Outreach Team Lead - I want to point out that Helen Lyons is with us tonight, she is the candidate that Bill and Mary have been having conversations with; so, I want to welcome Helen. Thank you for joining us.

Dan Noble, U. S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), Spring Valley Project Manager welcomed H. Lyons and thanked her for joining the call.

Comment from H. Lyons, Community Member Candidate - Thank you, it is nice to be here.

2. General Announcements

Website Updates

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

B. Task Group Updates

RAB Membership

1. RAB Membership Search Committee Update

RAB Membership Search Committee members Mary Bresnahan and William Krebs selected Helen Lyons as a potential candidate for the RAB.

Question from G. Beumel, Community Co-Chair - Do we have enough people onboard to vote tonight?

D. Noble confirmed there were enough RAB members on the call to form a quorum.

G. Beumel invited W. Krebs to introduce H. Lyons to the RAB.

Comment from W. Krebs, Community Member - Both Mary and I met with Helen Lyons a few days ago. She has been a long-time real estate agent in this area. She is a resident of Spring Valley, and she is knowledgeable of the issues presented by selling real estate in the FUDS and Spring Valley and has had to deal with the issues and transactions in which she has been an agent. I think she would be very qualified and good. Mary apologizes she had to take a

mandatory real estate education course tonight and she could not get out of it, but she also recommends we admit Helen to the RAB.

Question from G. Beumel, Community Co-Chair - Is there anyone who wants to discuss or comment on the issue? I will take the silence as no. So, why do we not vote on admitting Helen as a full member of the RAB? I am not sure how are going to count this, but speak up, all in favor say "Aye."

Comment from W. Krebs, Community Member - Aye.

Comment from Jennifer Baine, Community Member - Aye.

Comment from Paul Bermingham, Community Member - Aye as well.

Comment from H. Lyons, Community Member Candidate - Hi, Paul. Paul is my neighbor.

Comment from G. Beumel, Community Co-Chair - That is a good sign that he did not say no!

Comment from H. Lyons, Community Member Candidate - I would say it is ok, I take rejection well!

Question from G. Beumel, Community Co-Chair - Does anyone oppose?

[Ed. there were none opposed.]

Comment from G. Beumel, Community Co-Chair - Then I think it passes, and Helen, welcome to the RAB.

Comment from H. Lyons, Community Member - Thank you very much, it is a pleasure to be here.

Comment from W. Krebs, Community Member - Hey, Greg, I think we should say that it was approved by affirmation.

Comment from G. Beumel, Community Co-Chair - Ok, yes.

Comment from D. Noble, Spring Valley Project Manager - Alright, well, great. Helen, so you know, we do offer a briefing to new RAB members. So, either Holly or Sarah will get in touch with you, figure out your schedule, and we can certainly offer that briefing to you. We can do it online or we can do it in person, whichever you are more comfortable with. And we will get you set up with that, hopefully before the next meeting; but with the holidays coming up if it has to wait until January, no problem.

Comment from H. Lyons, Community Member - Well, thank you very much, that would be wonderful. As a new member, I definitely will feel much better off going forward if I am properly briefed, so I appreciate that.

D. Noble confirmed this.

II. USACE Program Updates

A. Annual Project Funding

1. FY21, Actual Funding (\$3.566 M)

- Military Munitions Response Program (\$3.308 M):
 - Site-Wide Remedial Action (RA) (\$2.842 M)
 - Conduct RA at 4825 Glenbrook Road (\$0.459 M)

- Stakeholder Outreach
- Site Security
- Potentially Responsible Party (PRP) Effort
- Hazardous Toxic Waste (HTW) (\$0.228 M):
 - Site-Wide RA (\$0.000 M)
 - Groundwater Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study/Proposed Plan/Decision Document (RI/FS/PP/DD) (\$0.228 M)
- TAPP Consultant (\$0.030 M):
 - RAB Technical Consultant (\$0.023 M)
 - RAB Cost (\$0.007 M)

2. FY22, Projected Funding (\$5.483 M)

- Military Munitions Response Program (\$5.355 M):
 - Site-Wide RA (\$5.266 M)
 - RA at 4825 Glenbrook Road (\$0.043 M)
 - Stakeholder Outreach
 - Site Security
 - PRP Effort
- HTW (\$0.078 M):
 - Site-Wide Remedial Action (\$0.000 M)
 - Groundwater RI/FS/PP/DD (\$0.078 M)
- TAPP Consultant (\$0.050 M):
 - RAB Technical Consultant (\$0.030 M)
 - RAB Cost (\$0.020 M)

3. Funding Summary Chart

- The 2021 fiscal year ended on September 30th.
- The actual \$3.566 M funding spent is under budget from the \$4.934 M amount that was expected for FY21. The bulk of the funding was spent on the military munitions response program.
- All the funding numbers through 2021 are actual numbers for spending. The \$5.483 M for FY22 is the planned funding estimate.
- To date, \$338.256 M has been spent on the Spring Valley Project.
- For groundwater, the \$0.228 M was spent primarily to bring the new contractor on board.
- One of the reasons the project was under budget in FY21 and why some of the funds have shifted into FY22 is because of the further work at the Public Safety Building (PSB). Last year, the project was unable to modify the contractor's task order to complete the additional work needed at the PSB. Projections estimate more funds will be spent this year than last year to fund the PSB work.

Question from Alma Gates, Community Advisor to the RAB - Can you separate out for us, please, the total cost, if it is in yet, for Glenbrook Road?

D. Noble estimated that between \$60-\$80 M was spent at 4825 Glenbrook Road but confirmed he would provide the accurate figure for the next RAB meeting.

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

Question from W. Krebs, Community Member - It seemed to me, was not there something that

was budgeted last year that was carried over into this year's work on Glenbrook Road? Did it ever include last year's money or is that the bulk funding dedicated to 2021?

D. Noble explained that the numbers reported on the funding summary are reported in the year they were "spent." Large contracts may indicate that a certain amount of money was spent in a particular year, but many times a portion of money is placed on a contract and some of the money is not dispersed. The remediation project carries over a healthy balance from year to year, but the undispersed funding is referred to as "unliquidated obligation." The unliquidated obligation is not reported because it seems to over-complicate things. Each year, several million dollars carry over because the funding is dedicated to contracts and the contractor is still working. Contractors are not paid for work until they have achieved the work.

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

B. 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: two (2) properties approved their Landscape Plans and became available for geophysical surveys.
- Vegetation Removal/Blind Seeding: vegetation removal completed at 3 properties and blind seeding completed at 4 properties.
- Advanced Geophysical Classification (AGC) survey efforts are completed with the last group of homeowners. The data will be analyzed, and the dig team will begin excavation activities at the 4 properties next week.

3. Geophysical Surveys

- Dynamic and cued surveys completed at 4 properties and 2 Dalecarlia Woods Grid Addendum areas. The 2 additional addendum areas that need to be investigated are located on the neighbor side of Dalecarlia Parkway. The areas have been surveyed and an excavation crew is scheduled to remove any anomalies detected.
- 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. Coordination with the property owners is ongoing.

4. RA Found Items

The map on Slide #15 of the presentation indicates the locations where hazardous objects have been found. The map has not changed since the September RAB meeting because there have not been any excavation teams in the neighborhood. The map will be updated for the January RAB meeting.

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 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 85 private properties and 13 City/Fed lots off Dalecarlia Parkway.
- Issued 85 Assurance Letters.

The map on Slide #16 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. Advanced Geophysical Classification (AGC) Prove-Out Grid

The purple highlighted area indicated on the map on Slide #17 of the presentation is the area at the Federal Property where the geophysical survey team conducts daily quality control checks on their instruments:

- Throughout the project there have been several geophysical survey contractors. The area highlighted in purple shows where different prove-out grids have been established. The prove-out grid for the current contractor is in the middle of that area (FED4 and FED5).
- The whole prove-out grid area will be surveyed to ensure that no objects placed in the ground for the purpose of the project are left behind.
- Site preparation: soil pile moved outside of the prove-out grid survey area and tall grasses mowed.
- Dynamic surveys completed with the man-portable vector (MPV) and G-858. Cued surveys scheduled to be completed during the November 2021 mobilization.
- Excavation of any remaining objects at the Federal Property will be completed in the next calendar year.

7. Tentative Schedule

- Fall 2021
 - Begin round of anomaly removal efforts.
- 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.

Question from A. Gates, Community Advisor to the RAB - On slide 16, there was one house that is outstanding in the circle. Is there a problem with that?

D. Noble explained that the property highlighted in blue in the circle on Slide #16 of the presentation is one of the four properties that the team will be finishing up at the end of the

month. The team is actively working with that property owner and the property is expected to be completed soon.

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

C. Former Public Safety Building (PSB)

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

The PSB slides in the November RAB presentation are drawn directly from the Partner Update:

- 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, so a new workplan is being developed.
- Completed Erosion & Sediment Control Inspections September 1st, 15th, and 21st and October 1st and 7th.
- Non-hazardous investigation-derived waste (IDW) from PSB investigation were transported for disposal on 7 October 2021.
- Mowed PSB site the week of September 21st.
- The site is visited on a weekly/monthly basis.

1. PSB Slope Excavation Planning

- USACE sent out a Request for Proposal dated 21 July 2021 to complete excavation of American University Experiment Station (AUES) debris east, north, and west of the former PSB foundation. Proposal was submitted on 8 September 2021. USACE is analyzing the proposal and is in discussions with the contractor.
- The proposed soil and AUES debris area to be excavated 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. 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.
- The rectangular area shown on Slide #22 of the presentation indicates the original PSB slab excavation area. The area in the dashed red line that encompasses the rectangular area is where additional debris is believed to exist. Just north of the retaining wall, there is a small additional area of debris that was discovered during the investigation that was conducted in April. No retaining wall is required for that area because the area is much smaller.
- Construction work in the last few months has become quite expensive. There are supply chain problems, issues getting materials and supplies, and a construction labor shortage. The retaining wall is a large factor in driving up the cost for the additional work. Field work is going to take longer than anticipated because time must be allotted for the construction of the retaining wall.
- Slope Soil Removal not expected to begin until winter/spring 2022.
- When the work at PSB is completed, the retaining wall will be removed, the site will be restored, and all utilities will be re-established in their original locations

- 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 AU, based on the approved landscape restoration plan.

Question from John Wheeler, Community Member - So, why do you think the area of contamination around the Public Safety Building is so much larger than you anticipated?

D. Noble explained that the team created the initial PSB workplan based on information acquired from an extensive investigation performed in the area during 2009 - 2011. Most of the excavations were focused on the areas surrounding the former PSB, which was still in place at the time. At that time, the team believed all the debris surrounding the building had been removed. Now the team understands there were two layers of debris in the immediate vicinity of the former PSB building. The first debris layer, ~4 feet deep, was removed during the first investigation outside the footprint of the PSB. The team later discovered a second layer of debris, ~9 feet deep, that runs on a horizontal plane into the hillside. The second layer of debris was under the first debris layer, which is why the second layer of debris was missed during the first investigation.

Question from Allen Hengst, Audience Member - Dan, I have a quick question about the slide that is up there now. That little red square that is separate from the main area that you are going to excavate, the one that is next to the drill pad; first of all, how did you discover that and how is it possible that there would be debris just in that little square and not elsewhere at that altitude? I assume that is halfway up the hill.

D. Noble explained that the main objective of the remedial activities at the PSB is to completely remove the large landfill debris layer associated with Lot 18. Lot 18 was located to the southwest of the backside of the PSB and was a very large debris field addressed during the debris removal effort during 2004-2007. The area around the PSB is an extension of Lot 18, as the area was all one debris field during WWI.

Smaller areas of debris deposits may exist in other areas of the AU property, but there is no practical way to locate all the smaller areas of debris deposits. If smaller debris deposits are discovered while investigating larger debris deposits, the smaller areas will be removed as well. The current small depositional area was discovered by chance when the team was on the drill pad conducting horizontal drilling into the hillside. The borings above and below the small depositional area showed clean soil. Since the team found this small depositional area during the drilling process, the area will be included the removal effort. While there may be other small depositional areas, the current focus and goal of the removal effort is to remove the larger debris field surrounding the former PSB.

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

Question from W. Krebs, Community Member - Is this hillside naturally existing as of when the Public Safety Building was built or is this debris or...when did this hillside exist, vis a vis when they would have dumped the munitions?

D. Noble confirmed there was a hillside and slope during WWI. The expectation is that as the large debris field approaches the historic hillside area, the debris will end. There has been some fill installed in the development of the AU campus over the years and the area has been built up. One of the reasons the hillside has been built up was to accommodate the parking lot. There was

quite a bit of fill that was placed at the top of the already sloped area, creating an even more steeply sloped area to form a flat area for the parking lot. When the PSB was built in the 1950s or 1960s, the slope was there, so the building was built in such a way to accommodate the slope. An elevated walkway was installed that was level with the parking lot. The sloped area has always been there, but since WWI the area is likely more steeply sloped than it was back in WWI.

Question from A. Hengst, Audience Member - Is it true that the Public Safety Building was originally a fraternity?

D. Noble confirmed this.

Question from A. Hengst, Audience Member - And are they part of the PRP? I know you probably cannot say that, but they are part of the PRP, they are trying to collect from the alumni association with the extra expense.

D. Noble explained that he could not discuss the Potentially Responsible Party (PRP) issues, the PRP is in the hands of the USACE Legal Counsel and the Department of Justice.

Comment from A. Hengst, Audience Member - Thanks, I have got another question on the next slide, it is in the chat box.

D. Noble asked if A. Hengst was referring to Slide #23 of the presentation.

Question from A. Hengst, Audience Member - Yes. In the 6/23/21 'PSB Slope Investigation Report' on page 10 the authors estimate that '720 cubic yards of soil and AUES debris' will need to be removed from the hillside. Based on 20 cubic yards per dump truck, it sounds like 36 truckloads will be excavated and removed. How does that compare to the amount of soil and AUES debris already removed from underneath the PSB foundation?

D. Noble explained that he does not exactly know how the soil removal estimate compares to the amount of soil that has already been removed from underneath the building. The footprint of the former PSB was 30x60ft and the team excavated to ~8 feet deep. The figure in cubic feet can be compared to the ~720 cubic yards of soil described in the slope investigation report released in June.

Comment from A. Hengst, Audience Member - Thanks. I do not know if it is lesser or more or about the same. I do not know.

D. Noble explained that the team has removed ~530 cubic yards so far. The additional ~720 cubic yards is a little more, but the magnitude of effort is about the same. The removal effort is going to be a longer and slower process because the work will be conducted on a hillside rather than a flat area such as under the former PSB.

2. Next Steps

- Continue to maintain erosion control of the site.
- Continue to maintain communication with American University about this site on a weekly basis.

D. Glenbrook Road

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

1. Recent Activities

- Parsons spent September and October turning in all the equipment that was used at Glenbrook Road (20 years' worth of equipment, 3-4 truckloads, including the tent used for high-probability activities.)
- Two (2) Interim Holding Facility (IHF) containers have been removed from the Federal Property. A single IHF will be used for the remainder of the Spring Valley project.

2. Site-Specific Final Report

- The Site-Specific Final Report (SSFR) summarizes all the remedial action work that was conducted at Glenbrook Road.
- The SSFR is complete and has been reviewed and approved by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and Department of Energy & Environment (DOEE).
- Parsons added a chapter that details the work done on 4835 Glenbrook Road as part of the removal action along with conclusions relative to previous Remedial Investigation (RI) for 4835 Glenbrook Road.
- The SSFR document with the new chapter was reviewed and approved by regulators and the Huntsville Corps of Engineers Environmental and Munitions Center of Expertise.
- Parsons submitted a final copy of the SSFR to USACE and all outside stakeholders.
- The Site-Specific Final Report has been distributed to USACE and the Partners. The report will be available within a week or two on the website.
- Parsons reissued the Final Report with an October date to make the SSFR more current, but the information within the SSFR has not changed.

2. Near-Term Schedule

- Project complete.
- Parsons period of performance ended October 27th.
- A small invite-only ceremony to mark the completion of the Glenbrook Road project will be held at the site and the Federal Property. Because of COVID restrictions, invitees will be limited to the District Commander, government representatives, and members of the media. The ceremony will be recorded and uploaded to the website.

Question from A. Hengst, Audience Member - Do you know who the media will be? Or who they represent? Is it TV, newspaper, the Post?

Question from J. Kaiser, USACE Baltimore - I do not know. Dan, do you know?

D. Noble explained that he spoke to Cynthia Mitchell, USACE Corporate Communications Officer about the event. The plan is to reach out to ~6 media outlets that in the last 4-5 years have written in-depth reports on the Glenbrook Road site. An invite will be extended to the media outlets to attend the closing ceremony if they wish. The invitee list has not been finalized yet.

Question from A. Hengst, Audience Member - Can I make a recommendation?

D. Noble confirmed this.

Question from A. Hengst, Audience Member - You may have noticed that you had a reporter as part of this meeting earlier, who has now left. But will you invite him?

D. Noble believed the reporter was Neal Augenstein.

Comment from A. Hengst, Audience Member - Right.

D. Noble confirmed that N. Augenstein will be invited because he has visited the Glenbrook Road site multiple times over the years.

C. Mitchell is in discussions with the Washington Aqueduct to host the Glenbrook Road ceremony in a large indoor space at the Washington Aqueduct property. Electronic invitations will be extended to the invitees. D. Noble discussed the invitee list with G. Beumel, and they decided to extend an invite to the RAB members. The ceremony will also be recorded, so those who are not on the invite list will be able to view the ceremony video. The ceremony is solely to commemorate the end of the Glenbrook Road project; no decision-making will occur. The ceremony will take place November 23rd at 11:00 AM, and all invitees interested in attending must RSVP. The date and time of the ceremony was the only time the District Engineer was available, but the District Engineer did not want the end of the project to pass unobserved.

Question from A. Hengst, Audience Member - Dan, can I make another suggestion for a guest, a media guest?

D. Noble confirmed this.

Question from A. Hengst, Audience Member - How about the AU Eagle, the newspaper that has been covering this for longer than the RAB?

D. Noble explained that he did not know the details of how C. Mitchell was developing the media list but would pass along A. Hengst's suggestion to her.

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

Comment from J. Kaiser, USACE Baltimore - Thanks, Dan, I am glad about the venue change. The Aqueduct is a much nicer space than the Federal Property; I assume we are going to be in the big lobby area where the fountains are and stuff. That is the only space I have really seen there that can accommodate a lot of people.

D. Noble confirmed that as C. Mitchell described the space to him, it is a large indoor space that is right next to the visitors center.

Comment from J. Kaiser, USACE Baltimore - Yeah, it is in the historic building if that is the area, if I am correct; but it is much, much nicer, so that will be good, and it will be indoors in case the weather is bad.

The finalized document summarizing the remedial efforts completed at Glenbrook Road is complete and will be available to the public both on the USACE website and at the Tenley-Friendship Neighborhood Library.

3. Tentative Schedule

Fall 2021

- Finalize the written Site-Specific Final Report.
- Virtual Project Completion Event November 23

E. 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).
- All the groundwater documents to date will be made available during the public common period to be examined, and answer/add any questions or comments
- The goal for 2022 is to work on a No-Action Decision Document (DD) for the site.
- Todd Beckwith will schedule a meeting with the Partners to discuss in more specific detail what might be added into the already existing RI report.

III. Community Items

IV. Open Discussion and Future RAB Agenda Development

The January RAB meeting will tentatively be held virtually on Tuesday, January 10th, 2021, through WebEx video conferencing services. As long as Baltimore and Washington DC remain high COVID transmission areas, the RAB meetings will be held virtually.

- With the completion of the Glenbrook Road project, proposal to change the RAB meeting schedule in 2022 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.
- 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 asked the RAB to think about the potential schedule change by the January RAB meeting. He asked G. Beumel if the RAB would like to discuss the schedule change now or during the January meeting.

Comment from G. Beumel, Community Co-Chair - Yeah, I think we would like to circulate it among the greater RAB, for the people that did not show up as well, and then we can discuss it at the January meeting formally, since we are going to be there in January.

D. Noble confirmed that the discussion will be included in the next RAB meeting agenda.

Comment from J. Wheeler, Community Member - I think that we need to be thinking about the future of the RAB. This is part of it, but I think that is something that the RAB members need to discuss as well.

D. Noble suggested that the RAB continue to meet through the Final DD. Because the Final DD is a No Action DD, there is no requirement, but as long as the community and USACE determine that the RAB meetings are helpful and help the progress of the project then it is worth continuing the RAB meetings. D. Noble believes it is worth continuing the meetings through the next calendar year, so USACE is certainly willing to make a commitment to continue to host the RAB meetings and continue the meetings through 2022. The community has a voice in the decision to continue meeting as well; if the RAB believes the meetings no longer need to continue, the RAB may notify USACE of that decision.

D. Noble plans to send an email to the RAB announcing the more in-depth formal discussion

about the potential schedule change during the January RAB meeting.

The January meeting will likely be virtual, depending on how things go with COVID in the DC area. There is a possibility to consider having an in-person meeting for the next RAB meeting after January.

Question from G. Beumel, Community Co-Chair - Are you guys working from the office or still working from home?

D. Noble confirmed that most USACE employees still work from home. The USACE Baltimore office is open, and employees are welcome to enter as long as they follow CDC guidelines. This week, employees were instructed to send in scans of their vaccine cards. As a Federal Agency, USACE is in the process of entering all employees' individual vaccination records into the record keeping system.

Question from A. Hengst, Audience Member - Would you consider having the meeting at the Tenley library?

D. Noble explained that holding the meeting at the Tenley-Friendship Library is a possibility, however, parking has been a challenge in the past. There may be parking across the street at the grocery store.

Comment from A. Hengst, Audience Member - There is plenty of parking there if you buy something at Wholefoods.

D. Noble confirmed this.

Comment from J. Wheeler, Community Member - The library is not allowing meetings at the moment, so, that would not work now.

D. Noble confirmed this.

Question from A. Hengst, Audience Member - They are open until 8:00 on Thursdays and another day and if they were open until 8:00 on Tuesday maybe we could have a meeting there until 8:00 and stay late?

Comment from J. Wheeler, Community Member - But they are not allowing meetings, Allen.

Comment from A. Hengst, Audience Member - That is not what I was told.

D. Noble explained that the team could check with the library. The team reached out to St. David's for the September RAB meeting, and the church was still not ready to host outside groups yet. D. Noble was not sure whether AU would open their community meeting space but would check with Dan Nichols.

Comment from A. Hengst, Audience Member - There is also the Metropolitan Memorial Church at Nebraska and New Mexico.

D. Noble confirmed that USACE has conducted meetings at that venue in the past when a large meeting space was needed. The team will check into various options but for right now the January RAB meeting will remain virtual.

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, January 11, 2022

C. Open Discussion

V. Public Comments

Comment from J. Baine, Community Member - Hi, we are selling our Spring Valley house this Friday and have moved to Chevy Chase Village, so I need to relinquish my spot on the RAB. It has been a really wonderful experience to meet a lot of neighbors I would not have met otherwise, but I just want to say thank you guys for all the hard work and including me.

Comment from G. Beumel, Community Co-Chair - Thank you very much for being a member of the RAB during this time and I am sorry to see you go. But I would move to Chevy Chase Village if I had a chance too.

Comment from J. Baine, Community Member - I love Spring Valley too; we sold the house to my brother-in-law, so maybe he will join the RAB. Thank you, guys. I will send an email to follow up officially.

D. Noble suggested sending the official email to Holly.

Comment from J. Baine, Community Member - Okay, thank you. Bye.

VI. Adjourn

The conference call was adjourned at 8:05 PM.