

**U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Spring Valley Restoration Advisory Board
Conference Call
Minutes of the March 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
Brian Barone	Agency Representative - Department of Energy & Environment
Mary Bresnahan	Community Member
Devamita Chattopadhyay	RAB Technical Assistance for Public Participation (TAPP) Consultant
Marguerite Clarkson	At Large Representative - Horace Mann Elementary School
William Krebs	Community Member
Joe Vitello	Agency Representative - Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Region III
Lawrence Miller	Community Member
John Wheeler	Community Member
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEMBERS NOT PRESENT AT THIS MEETING	
Jennifer Baine	Community Member
Paul Bermingham	Community Member
Mary Kathryn Covert Steel	Community Member
Paul Dueffert	Community Member
Jonathan Harms	Community Member
Lee Monsein	Community Member
Dan Nichols	At Large Representative - American University
Tom Smith	Community Member
ATTENDING PROJECT PERSONNEL	
Kim Berg	USACE Baltimore
Whitney Gross	Spring Valley Community Outreach Team

Holly Hostetler	ERT, Inc.
Carrie Johnston	ERT - Community Outreach Team
Julie Kaiser	USACE Baltimore
ZaKerra Lance	ERT - Community Outreach Team
Carlos Lazo	USACE, Government Affairs Liaison
HANDOUTS FROM THE MEETING	
I. Army Corps of Engineers Presentation (emailed PDF)	
II. Excerpt from the Code of Federal Regulations - CFR-2011-title32-vol2-sec202-10	

AGENDA

Starting Time: The March 2021 Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) conference call began at 7:03 PM.

I. Administrative Items

A. Co-Chair Updates

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

1. Introductions

None

2. General Announcements

D. Noble reviewed the website updates, which included the January and February Site-Wide Monthly Project Updates and the weekly 4825 Glenbrook Road updates and photos. The January RAB meeting minutes have been posted to the project site. The December and February Partner meetings were not held, but project update presentations were posted in lieu of meeting minutes.

Comment from Allen Hengst, Audience Member - As of 15 minutes ago, the February Partner meeting presentation had not been posted on the website.

D. Noble thanked A. Hengst and explained that USACE Baltimore would look into the postings and ensure that the February Partner meeting presentation is posted online.

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

B. Task Group Updates

RAB Membership

- Malcom Pritzker recently stepped down from the RAB, leaving the position of Membership Chair open on the RAB.
- With open seats on the RAB, it was suggested to take a vote to fill the positions or leave them open for now.

Question from Greg Beumel, Community Co-Chair – How many voting members of the RAB do we have right now? Does somebody know for me? Because I think we are going to need to know what minimum we are required to have and then, do we have enough extra to make sure we will have a quorum when we have meetings. I am hoping someone like Whitney is counting real fast right now or whoever else is counting.

Comment from Holly Hostetler, ERT, Inc. - I think we have 6, counting Greg.

Comment from G. Beumel, Community Co-Chair - Well, that might be at the meeting, but I mean total. Because there are people like Lee who are not here.

Comment from Carrie Johnston, ERT - Community Outreach Team - Just to clarify, Greg, you mean how many are attending right now or how many have not resigned and are left.

Comment from G. Beumel, Community Co-Chair - How many who have not resigned and are left.

Comment from H. Hostetler, ERT, Inc. - I think we have 14.

D. Noble explained that 14 is the full complement of the RAB. There are 12 left right now.

Question from G. Beumel, Community Co-Chair - And 6 are attending. That is just a piece of information. What do people on the RAB think? Do we need to get back up to 14? What do we need to do? Because for tonight's meeting we have 6 out of 12 members attending. I understand times are, you know, a little goofy now but I do not want to get us too few people so that we cannot officially have a meeting; we can have a meeting, but we cannot vote on anything.

Question from Lawrence Miller, Community Member - What is the likely end date for the RAB?

D. Noble explained that he was going to ask for discussion about the end of the RAB near the end of the presentation. The end of the RAB is difficult to predict because a project such as the Public Safety Building might experience delays and take longer than expected to complete. The RAB may choose to continue to meet through the finalization of all the decision documents, or until the last proposed plan is finalized. The RAB may also choose to continue to meet until all the closure reports are in and final. There are going to be a several closure reports that will be finalized with agreement and concurrence with the Department of Energy & Environment (DOEE) and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). USACE is willing to continue the RAB as long as the community feels the RAB is worthwhile and is supported by sufficient participation, and as long as the RAB wants to continue to meet and hear updates.

Comment from L. Miller, Community Member - It is, Dan, that is an answer from the point of view of whether or not there is any end-date in mind that would relate to how many people. Your answer is a good one, which is the RAB is open indefinitely right now, no matter what might happen. So, I think we are now back to Greg's question, 'do we have enough people to make sure that we hit a quorum most of the time?'

Comment from John Wheeler, Community Member - I have had a concern for a long time when we have been bringing new people on the RAB, that it is really not fair to them, because we are wrapping things up. It is a slow wrap up but wrapping things up. It is a big learning curve for them to come in and to even understand what the RAB is, because the RAB is not a decision-making body, it is an advisory body. It has been kind of amusing to me to see people come on that have been used to being on boards that are making decisions and try and direct what the Army does. That is not the function of the RAB. So, my view is very strongly that it is not fair to the rest of the RAB, and it is not fair to the people who have been invited to be a member of the RAB

to come on now. Because we are wrapping up. It is going to be a long time before things are wrapped up, but it is happening. The big thing now is the RA that is taking place and most of the things have happened.

Comment from L. Miller, Community Member - John, I tend to agree with you unless there was someone who really was already up on the project by happenstance who wanted to join. I think going out to recruit a new member who does not have any background, like you say, would be unfair to them and may be unfair to the RAB.

Comment from J. Wheeler, Community Member - It has nothing to do with that, but Larry and I both became members of the RAB the same night. I almost was ready to quit, it was such an awful meeting. They did not get around until like 10:00 at night to say, 'oh, we have got these people sitting here, can we vote on them before people walk out.' But one of the great things is getting to know Larry who is actually a close-by neighbor of me.

Comment from L. Miller, Community Member - Well, likewise, we will be vaccinated and get together, but bringing new people on, I think you are correct. Unless they are already steeped in what has been happening it is problematic.

Question from G. Beumel, Community Co-Chair - Ok, do others agree that at least at this time we do not need to add any new members? If we find we have problems later getting quorums or doing things we can readdress it but otherwise the 12 of us are probably fine?

Comment from C. Johnston, ERT - Community Outreach Team - Hey Greg, I would just add to people's thinking about this, that if we were to solicit a particular industry to come in at this time it might be helpful, although we have Mary, to have another realtor, because the paperwork that we are going to be looking at over the next year, year and a half is mostly impacting real estate perceptions and so it might be helpful, if only for the purpose of educating another person in that industry to have someone in that local concern on the RAB. We can also do it through outreach and all that, which we have been doing for years, but that would be another consideration.

Question from G. Beumel, Community Co-Chair - Mary, do you want us to recruit another realtor?

Comment from Mary Bresnahan, Community Member - I think that having another realtor is a good idea, I really do, because I do agree with what you said, and it does answer a lot of questions and makes a big deal because all the realtors when you do business in Spring Valley, as you know, we have to sign that addendum, and so does the seller and the buyer have to sign that in-particular addendum about what is going on. I think more than one realtor would be good because probably we may each have a different opinion but basically the same thought.

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

Comment from M. Bresnahan, Community Member - So, I would recommend that, and I think it would make the RAB look good, I do.

Comment from J. Wheeler, Community Member - I just have one comment on that, and that is every time we add a person, that increases the number of people we need for a quorum. So, if we do add someone, we need to make sure that they serious enough to attend meetings.

Comment from M. Bresnahan, Community Member - I definitely agree with you on that also and that is something that has to be said when you interview someone to be on the RAB.

ZaKerra Lance, ERT - Community Outreach Team noted that she received an email from Tom

Smith explaining that he will be moving to Florida and will be resigning from the RAB after the May meeting.

Question from G. Beumel, Community Co-Chair - Ok, well then maybe with both of those pieces of information we could use one more person to get us up to 12. Because at 11 or 12 we will need at least 6 people to have a quorum, and so that would not change that. And with the focus on getting another realtor as the new person. Now the problem is we do not specifically have anyone to do recruiting for it. So, is USACE going to be able to try to find us a realtor?

Comment from M. Bresnahan, Community Member - If I may add something, I would be willing to work with someone else on the RAB in getting a realtor, if you so desire, but I do not want to do it alone. I think someone else needs to be involved with it also.

Question from G. Beumel, Community Co-Chair - Ok, would anyone like to work and be part of this 2-member committee?

Comment from William Krebs, Community Member - I would be willing to do so.

Question from G. Beumel, Community Co-Chair - Ok, and so we will have a 2-member committee who will begin trying to recruit a member from the real estate community to join our RAB as a 12th. There is unanimous consent. Ok, Dan, if you could reach out and help the two of them with some things they might need, ok? You have got their contact info, that would be great.

D. Noble confirmed that USACE Baltimore would work with M. Bresnahan and W. Krebs on recruiting the new member. He agreed with the idea of recruiting additional real estate representation because members of the real estate community often reach out to USACE Baltimore for documentation. At some point in the future there will no longer be a Spring Valley Community Outreach Team and only a few USACE personnel assigned to the project. Access to self-serve resources, such as a website, will be developed over the next year so real estate agents may find the information if needed.

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. Planned Remedial Action Area Map

The map on slide #8 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.

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

- Currently working on 89 residential properties at different stages of the remedial action process.

- 89 civil surveys and 89 arborist surveys have been completed.
- 89 properties have been visited by the geophysicist team, who provide technical recommendations on plant removal.
- Vegetation has been removed from 85 private properties and 13 City/Fed lots.
- Geophysical surveys completed at 85 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 55 Assurance Letters.

As the Remedial Action efforts conclude, a Final Report will be written to include all the clean-up efforts that were completed during the Remedial Action. The report will include several maps, which visually reflect the achieved survey geophysical coverage in the Area of Focus of the 92 private properties and 13 city/federal lots.

4. Maps for the Site-Wide RA Final Report

The maps in the Final Report will look slightly different than the maps in the RAB presentations. The 92 properties make up 4 different Areas of Use in WWI for different purposes. The map on Slide #8 of the presentation shows the outlines of the 4 areas. In the Final Report, the focus will be less on the 92 properties and more on the 4 areas used by the U.S. Army in WWI. The Final Report will discuss how the Spring Valley Project Team met the requirements of the Site-Wide Decision Document (DD) in each of the 4 areas. The maps in the Final Report will be focused on the 4 areas and less focused on the 92 properties. However, the 92 properties will be depicted in the maps.

The map on Slide #10 of the presentation shows Area of Interest (AOI) 13, a potential munitions storage and operations area, located between Quebec Street and Woodway Lane:

- The red dashed outline indicates the Area of Focus Boundary, one of the 4 areas of use.
- Areas in grey indicate developed areas, defined as inaccessible by the Site-Wide DD.
- Areas in tan indicate shown the coverage that the team was able to achieve.
- Areas in bright green represent areas that were technically accessible but permission to investigate those areas could not be obtained from the homeowner.

The box in the bottom left of Slide #10 of the presentation gives the calculations for AOI 13:

- The first line shows the Total square footage of the area: 143,581.78 square feet (sq ft).
- The second line shows the amount of area defined by the Site-Wide DD as Inaccessible, including trees, buildings, saturation buffer, and streets (grey): 30,590.92 sq ft.
- The third line shows the Total square footage of the area minus the Inaccessible areas: 112,990.86 sq ft.
- The fourth line shows technically accessible area where permission to investigate could not be obtained (green): 9,073.62 sq ft.
- The fifth line shows the remaining area after the Inaccessible area and Accessible/No Coverage area are subtracted from the Total area: 103,917.24 sq ft.
- The sixth line shows the percentage of coverage achieved: 91.9%.

Investigation and remediation in AOI 13 is complete. The team investigated all 13 properties in the area and worked with each of the homeowners to achieve 91.9% coverage of the area available for remediation. The 91.9% coverage represents the best percentage achievable. Maps similar to

the map shown on Slide #10 of the presentation will be included in the Final Report for each of the parcels of land to illustrate the coverage the team was able to achieve based on what the Site-Wide DD defined as accessible.

In WWI, the entire Spring Valley area was 100% accessible to the soldiers in the area. The soldiers could have moved around anywhere in the area and could have left something behind. For open disclosure, a map similar to the map on Slide #11 of the presentation will be included in the Final Report to show the total AOI 13 area and the total coverage achieved in the area. The box in the left corner shows the calculations without taking Inaccessible areas into account. This changes the total coverage percentage to 72% due to the development of the properties that has occurred since WWI, such as the addition of homes and swimming pools. The 72% coverage is an example of the best total percentage the team will be able to achieve in any of the 4 areas, given the 100 years of development since WWI.

Question from W. Krebs, Community Member - Dan, as I understand it then, does this include the property that we did not get permission to examine and the footprint of the buildings that are existing on top?

D. Noble confirmed that the map on Slide #11 of the presentation shows areas that coverage would not be possible because there is a building in the way. Other inaccessible areas were at the homeowner's discretion. The homeowners asked the team to avoid coverage in some areas because something would have to be destroyed or removed. The homeowners had their own specific reasons why they wanted areas left intact.

Question from W. Krebs, Community Member - That would be the areas shown in green on the previous slide, right?

D. Noble confirmed this.

The map on Slide #12 of the presentation shows the Area of Use on the west side of the project area and on both sides of the Dalecarlia Parkway. This area was a Static Test Fire Area in WWI and is the largest area for remediation. This area also has most of the properties where the team does not have access yet. There are 6 properties clustered in this area where the team hopes they will eventually be able to work with the homeowners. The broad stripe of green on the left side of the map represents an area behind a federal fence on the west side of Dalecarlia Parkway. The Area of Use in WWI extended behind the current federal fence. The owner of that land, the Washington Aqueduct, based on the considerations that the fence is in place, there are 'No Trespassing' signs, no one is admitted in the area, and the fence will not move, made the decision that the remediation team will not be allowed access.

The 2 boxes in the bottom left of Slide #12 of the presentation give the calculations for the Dalecarlia West of Fence area:

- The calculation with the green area (behind the federal fence) removed: 71% percent coverage.
- The calculation with the green area (behind the federal fence) added: 63.5 % percent coverage.

These calculations are for the current progress, the team aims to achieve over 90% in the area, if possible, at the remaining 6 properties to be investigated.

The map on Slide #13 of the presentation shows 52nd Street, Upton Street, and Dalecarlia Parkway as Inaccessible Areas. Dalecarlia Parkway is not labeled on the map. There were no city streets inside the boundaries AOI 13, but the other Areas of Use include city streets. The overall coverage

is currently at 49% but the percentage is expected to approach 70% by the end of the effort.

Question from J. Wheeler, Community Member - I have a question about the green area that you showed before, the area behind the fence. So, who is the federal owner?

D. Noble explained that the federal owner is the Washington Aqueduct, USACE.

Comment from J. Wheeler, Community Member - I have no idea whether that is important to get access to it, but I would assume that because it is part of USACE, that if it was important to get access to it, you could push and get access to it. So, I am not suggesting that is important other than to take some area off the map. I work for the government also, so I know even though that is USACE, which is a huge organization, it is not like talking to the guy in the office next to you.

D. Noble confirmed that if USACE Baltimore determined that the federal fence area needed to be included, USACE Baltimore and the Washington Aqueduct would have worked together to include the area. However, the Site-Wide DD determined that an area behind a permanent federal fence and not open to the public is not an area that needs to be addressed. The federal fence area was not included in the Site-Wide Proposed Plan (PP), which became the accepted Site-Wide DD.

The maps on Slides #14 and #15 of the presentation show the other Static Test Fire Area, centered around the old Sedgwick Trenches. Sedgwick Street, shown in grey, runs through the area. One property remains to be remediated, and the team is working with the homeowner to include the property in the next group:

- The current coverage for this area is 91.4% of accessible area, and when the last property is completed the coverage is expected to be closer to 95% coverage for the area.
- The overall current coverage is 66.7%.

The maps on Slide #16 and Slide #17 of the presentation show the Functional Test Range Area Impact Area of the range fan. Remediation in this area is complete:

- This area contains more roadway than the other areas, impacting the overall calculation: 66.7%
- When the accessible area is considered, the team achieved 94.3% coverage.

The new maps are a graphical representation of what the project team was able to accomplish and will be included in the Final Report. The team intends to show the maps at future meetings and will update the maps as more remedial work is completed.

Question from Rita McWilliams, Audience Member - I am on the HOA Board for Spring Valley West. The Board was wondering if there is going to be any more excavation work or any kind of work at all coming up those 52nd Street houses and up into the street?

D. Noble explained that the areas shown in blue in Figures 3, 4, and 5 are the only areas where excavation work will be conducted. All of the areas are to the west of 52nd Street.

Question from R. McWilliams, Audience Member - Yes, but nothing further north, right? I am not sure if it is north or east or west, but nothing coming more into the newer part of the neighborhood, right? On Figure 7 you can see that there were still some areas in green, but those are just areas that you are not going to go into?

D. Noble confirmed that if an area is shown in green it means that access was not obtained for that area. The team believes access will not be granted for those areas, but enough coverage was achieved in the surrounding areas that access will not be needed. No properties outside the boundary lines on the maps will be investigated.

Comment from R. McWilliams, Audience Member - Thank you so much.

5. Site-Wide RA Munitions Debris (MD) and Munitions and Explosives of Concern (MEC) Finds

The map on Slide #18 of the presentation shows the locations where munitions debris (MD) and munitions and explosives of concern (MEC) items were found during the Remedial Action.

- The blue shaded areas indicate the four Areas of Concern.
- The orange circles indicate locations where MD items were found.
- The three pink circles indicate locations where MEC items were found.

Only those items found during the current Remedial Action effort are shown on the map. Other MD and MEC items were found during the Remedial Investigation. All items found during the Remedial Investigation and the Remedial Action will be included in the final Closure Report.

6. Anomaly Excavation Finds

In February, the team completed the latest round of clearance and investigation at an additional 7 properties and the final city lot. The photos on Slide #19 show items found in the last round of investigation. No hazardous items were found. The photo on the left shows cultural debris found and the photos on the right show MD items that were found. MD items are immediately bagged in plastic and cultural debris is photographed but not bagged.

7. Munition Debris Items Disposal

The cutting operation for the small amount of munitions debris in storage at the Federal Property took place on January 26 in a filtered Engineering Control Structure (ECS) with the near real-time air monitoring miniature chemical agent monitoring system (MiniCAMS):

- The team used a remotely operated saw to cut ~12 intact but empty items in half. The items were then soaked in a bleach solution, rinsed, and allowed to dry. The items then underwent a headspace analysis and sent for recycling. No agent or agent breakdown products (ABPs) were detected during the cutting process.
- When the cutting process was complete, the bleach-water and rinse-water were combined. A sample of the combined water was collected and sent to a laboratory for disposal characterization. Low levels of the compound 1,4 Dithiane, a mustard (HD) breakdown product, were detected in the combined water when the process was complete. The combined water was properly disposed after analysis.
- The low-level detection of 1,4 Dithiane means that at least one of the MD items was contaminated with either HD or 1,4 Dithiane. It is unclear if the contamination was HD or 1,4 Dithiane because the bleach-water and rinse-water would have broken HD down to 1,4 Dithiane.

The photos on Slide #21 of the presentation were taken from a monitor inside the ECS. The cutting operation was conducted with a remote-operated band saw. A video camera was set up to monitor the operation. Technicians placed the MD item in the saw, left the building and closed the door, and then the saw was started. The heavy radial arm of the saw cut the MD items in half by force of gravity.

8. Munition Debris Items Inventory

In February, a series of ice storms moved through the DC area. During an inspection of the Federal

Property fence line after one heavy icing event, the USACE onsite explosive safety specialist discovered a padlocked day box (explosive storage bunker) containing two 75mm munitions from WWI.

The Federal Property has 2 day boxes onsite. The day boxes have not stored anything in many years because USACE has not had the need to store explosives at the site. The day boxes would be used to safely store modern explosives temporarily during operations, not typically WWI items. The day boxes were supposed to be empty.

- The explosive safety specialist found the key to the padlock and opened the day box. Inside were 2 closed cavity recovered 75mm munitions from WWI. The munitions each had duct tape handles. Recovered munitions in Spring Valley are not duct-taped.
- USACE Baltimore does not store recovered munitions in the day boxes. There are other designated areas at the Federal Property for recovered munitions, located next to the day boxes.
- All intact recovered munitions in Spring Valley are given identification numbers on the day the munitions are recovered. The 2 munitions found in the day box did not have identification numbers or markings.
- The agencies, contractors, and personnel on site in recent years were unable provide any information; it is speculated that these items may have been used as demonstration items or training aids.
- Since the munitions did not have identification numbers and could not be traced, the onsite personnel had to follow protocol as if the items were just discovered during excavation. The U.S. Army Explosive Ordnance Disposal (EOD) Team was called, and a formal assessment process of the items began on February 16.

9. Munition Debris Items Found

- While one of the recovered items was empty, the other item contained 10 to 20% liquid fill, shown in the x-ray on Slide #23 of the presentation. A portable isotopic neutron spectroscopy system (PINS) instrument was used to analyze the liquid inside the munition.
- The Army's Material Assessment Review Board (MARB) determined with high confidence that the liquid was water. It is likely groundwater made its way into the munition over time, which is usually the case with 20% or less liquid fill present.
- The items were assigned identification numbers and are currently stored in the MARB Holding Facility under negative pressure carbon filtration.
- The items will be cut open and disposed in the same way the intact munitions were cut open during the cutting operation in January.

A complete search of the entire Spring Valley Project Area was made, including all storage spaces, office spaces, and workspaces; in all project areas including the Federal Property, American University (AU), and the Public Safety Building (PSB). No other munitions items were found other than those pictured on Slide #24 of the presentation and 2 items buried in the Geophysical Prove Out grid. These items are known to be inert and were used as seed items in the Geophysical Prove Out grid at the Federal Property. The items will be properly disposed at a later date.

Question from W. Krebs, Community Member - Where did you find the key to the locks?

D. Noble explained that the key to the lock was found in a common lock box, used by more than one agency at the site. At one point in time someone had proper possession of the items but let the chain of custody to slip. The lock box where the key was stored did not have a check-out/check-in system.

10. Tentative Schedule

- Winter 2021
 - Continue geophysical surveys.
 - Continue anomaly removal efforts.
 - Continue obtaining Rights-of-Entry from the next group of homeowners.
- Spring 2021
 - Finalize plant removal plans with the last groups of homeowners and conduct plant removal at private properties in preparation for geophysical surveys.
 - Begin subsequent round of geophysical surveys.
 - Complete subsequent round of anomaly removal efforts.

B. Former Public Safety Building (PSB)

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

In preparation for the investigation of debris going into the northern hillside, a drilling pad and access ramp was constructed at the top of the slope of the PSB excavation area:

- The pad will stage the drill to be used for soil coring activities as a part of the investigation.
- After placing geotextile and stone, the drilling pad and access ramp for the drill were compacted in place using a vibratory drum compactor.

All soil removal and backfilling efforts below the water table were completed at the PSB footprint area at the end of January.

The additional section of terra cotta drainage pipe was replaced with High-Density Polyethylene (HDPE) pipe in Grid Cell E3.

In February, the team began excavating test pits to the east of the PSB excavation area to determine the extent of debris, excavating soil at 1-foot intervals at a time. Laboratory glassware was encountered down to 7 to 8 feet below ground surface.

Backfilling and compaction efforts continued in the remaining grid cells within the PSB excavation area, including over the HDPE pipe that replaced the terra cotta pipe in Grid Cell E3.

The photos on Slide #29 of the presentation show the recovered debris material and laboratory glassware debris excavated in the additional test pit excavations outside of the former PSB footprint.

The map on Slide #30 of the presentation shows an overall view of the site excavation and grid cells:

- All grid cells have reached final excavation depth and the depths are noted in the figure.
- The green box indicates the area that has been backfilled up to 3 feet below the former PSB slab elevation.
- The blue line on the western side of the former PSB footprint indicates the section of terra cotta pipe that was replaced with HDPE pipe.

The map on Slide #31 of the presentation shows the overall layout of PSB site. The drilling pad and access ramp are located along the eastern edge of the former PSB foundation excavation area. The drilling pad and access ramp will be used to investigate the American University Experiment

Station (AUES) debris, indicated in yellow on the map, that extends into the slope of the PSB area.

Question from J. Wheeler, Community Member - Dan mentioned some time ago on this meeting it will be a while before the PSB issues are resolved. How long is long?

K. Berg explained that the additional boring work is expected to be conducted in the spring/summer timeframe. Once the additional investigation is complete, the team will have a better understanding of how much debris extends into hillside beyond the PSB footprint. That information will help determine the effort required to remove the additional debris.

Question from J. Wheeler, Community Member - I have another question, it concerns the debris. I think you refer to it as WWI debris. That is not what you said, but whatever it is, AUES debris. Do you think that it is that type of debris or could it be from the use of this building later as a chemistry building?

K. Berg explained that the debris initially observed is laboratory glassware and metal, a type of AUES debris is similar to what was shown on Slide #29 of the presentation.

Comment from J. Wheeler, Community Member - Great, that is very helpful.

C. Glenbrook Road

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

1. Recent Activities

In mid-January, the crew excavated the area around the soldier pile in need of removal near the southern boundary of 4825 Glenbrook Road. As a safety measure, a shoring box was placed around the soldier pile during excavation. Upon completion, the shoring box was removed and the trench where the soldier pile existed was backfilled.

Over the past 2 months, in response to the heavy winter storms and seasonal wet weather, the crew installed and maintained additional soil and erosion controls. The wet weather prevented progress with backfilling and soil compaction.

As of this week, the backfill and soil compaction operations are 57.5% complete.

The site team discussed sloping for the property. Parsons researched and did not find permitting requirements in the DC area for erosion controls. The current slope of the property and erosion controls were determined to be sufficient.

Question from A. Hengst, Audience Member - I have a brief comment and 2 questions, but I think they are better for Dan. I put them in the chat box, but I am going to read them out loud for the people that don't have their computers. I spent an hour inspecting and photographing the closed Ft. Totten foot trail last Saturday where that World War I 75mm artillery shell was discovered last summer. This fenced-in area, including a 150-foot trail with 10-yard borders on either side, is approximately 12,000 square feet or about one quarter of an acre. I noticed that the ground was super-saturated with standing water. Has the Park Service conducted the geophysical survey and soil testing that Dan reported on at the January RAB meeting?

D. Noble explained that the Park Service collected soil samples in that area and were conducting the same sampling process that USACE Baltimore utilizes. The soil samples are cleared for chemical agent first, and then sent to a laboratory to be analyzed for a list of other chemicals. The

chemical agent clearing process is complete, and the Park Service is now awaiting the results of the further chemical testing. Once the results are received, the Park Service will likely schedule the geophysical survey this summer. The work is still underway. The Park Service occasionally checks in with USACE Baltimore, but USACE Baltimore is not completely up to date with the progress of the Park Service.

Question from A. Hengst, Audience Member - If the contaminated soil from 4825 Glenbrook Road construction site was moved from the Ft. Totten equipment yard (where it was originally spread out) to this new location on the far eastern boundary of the park, will the survey and soil testing include the property beyond the fenced-in area, which surely holds additional Glenbrook Road soil contaminated with munition debris and laboratory waste?

D. Noble explained that the Park Service has the best idea of the areas the Park Service is actively investigating. D. Noble did not know the full inventory of focus areas for the Park Service but was aware of the old equipment yard and the area along the trail. D. Noble did not know if the Park Service is concerned about other areas but understood the Park Service believes those 2 areas were the most likely areas for soil that came from Glenbrook Road.

Question from A. Hengst, Audience Member - Do you think it is likely that all the soil that was moved to Ft. Totten was contained in this one quarter acre area where the foot trail is? Is it not more likely that it is a larger area and if they only survey the foot trail, they are going to miss soil to the east and west of the trail?

D. Noble explained that he would have to defer those questions to the Park Service.

Question from A. Hengst, Audience Member - Can you tell me who I should contact? A name, a phone number, to find out.

D. Noble explained USACE Baltimore could give A. Hengst the name and phone number of someone in the Capitol Region office.

Comment from A. Hengst, Audience Member - Alright, I will write to them if you give me an email or a snail mail address or if all I have is a phone number, I will call them. That is my least favorite choice, I would rather document it in writing.

D. Noble confirmed USACE Baltimore would supply contact information to A. Hengst.

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

2. Upcoming Efforts

- Complete effort to re-install AU water line and the AU sanitary sewer line.
- Restore the fences along the 4801 and 4835 Glenbrook Road properties.
- Restore site to final grade in 6-inch lifts with compaction in accordance with the Work Plan.
- Submit Draft Final Site-Specific Final Report.

3. Tentative schedule

- Winter/Spring 2021
 - Continue the planned final site restoration tasks for the Glenbrook Road project area. This includes restoring utilities along the shared property lines and restoring landscaping in the easement areas.
 - Complete the planned elevation levels of soil backfill and compaction at the site.
- Summer 2021 - Anticipated project completion.

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).

In agreement with EPA Region III and DOEE, a final groundwater sampling event for perchlorate at wells PZ-4D and MW-44 was conducted by USACE Baltimore on March 1. The event was pushed from February due to icy conditions.

The results of this sampling event should be available within the next month. USACE Baltimore will share these results with the RAB once the results become available.

The June 2020 sampling results were very similar to the results from September 2019. USACE Baltimore and Partners are awaiting these results to confirm if perchlorate concentrations are consistent with the September results.

E. Future of the RAB

D. Noble suggested the RAB begin thinking about what tasks or close-out documentation the RAB would like in regard to closing out the RAB meetings. Z. Lance sent a copy of the excerpt from the Code of Federal Regulations that discusses how to close a RAB down officially to the RAB members. This will be an agenda item for the May meeting.

There are 2 processes for closing down a RAB, adjournment and dissolution. The Spring Valley RAB close-out would be an adjournment, when USACE Baltimore and the community agree to adjourn the RAB.

G. Beumel specifically asked for examples of how other RABs closed out in the past. USACE Baltimore requested that information from USACE leadership and has not received any information from USACE HQ or the USACE Division, likely because there have not been many RABs that have closed-out. Once RABs begin, they tend to continue for a long time. The Spring Valley Project is closer to completion than many other sites. The RAB may request whatever document the RAB would prefer, and the RAB's wishes will be included in the record, maintained permanently in the Administrative Record for the site, as a Lessons Learned document, Final Report from the RAB, a list of suggestions, or an After-Action Report with suggestions on how to address similar projects in the future.

Comment from G. Beumel, Community Co-Chair - Ok, well, that sounds good. We should begin to talk about it, even though we are talking about adding a member. So, I do not think we are planning on solving it at the May meeting.

D. Noble confirmed that the RAB will not likely adjourn after the May meeting.

Question from G. Beumel, Community Co-Chair - Let me ask a question to people. In your far out thinking, when are you thinking we can get back together in person? If we assume that people are potentially vaccinated by the end of June, are we talking September in the fall? Obviously, it all changes when we discover that we have some new strain of coronavirus and none of our vaccines work. But I know for myself, I will be fully vaccinated and have waited 2 weeks afterwards at the end of the first week in April. I know most people are behind me, okay, but it is beginning to happen to members of the RAB. So, it is something to think about, we will talk about it at the next meeting. I know a lot will change in 2 months, in both the coronavirus and our immune status for people. So, put it in the back of your head.

D. Noble confirmed that September might be the earliest that the RAB might meet in person.

Comment from G. Beumel, Community Co-Chair - It is myself; I do not know what other people think. I am not sure if everyone would show up if we tried to do it earlier. But we will know as we get to September what is happening to us.

Comment from J. Wheeler, Community Member - Dan or Greg, I just have one comment. I really appreciate your openness about the day box. I think that this is a sign of a true partnership when you tell us that detail. Most of you do not know, but I came into this process pretty skeptical of the process and my mind has changed a lot, and it is in particular because of Dan.

Comment from Marguerite Clarkson, At Large Representative - Horace Mann Elementary School - John, I appreciate your words for Dan.

Comment from J. Wheeler, Community Member - I will just say I think this was a very good meeting.

III. Community Items

IV. Open Discussion and Future RAB Agenda Development

The next RAB meeting will be May 11 and will likely be conducted using the same virtual format.

A. Upcoming Meeting Topics

- RAB Membership
- Groundwater FS Study/Policy Issues between USACE, EPA, and DOEE
- Groundwater Sampling Results
- Site-Wide RD/RA
- 4825 Glenbrook Road/4835 Glenbrook Road
- Future RAB Planning Discussion

B. Next RAB Meeting:

Tuesday, May 11, 2021

C. Open Discussion

V. Public Comments

VI. Adjourn

The conference call was adjourned at 8:32 PM.