U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Spring Valley Restoration Advisory Board
Conference Call
Minutes of the May 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
Brian Barone	Agency Representative - Department of Energy & Environment
Paul Bermingham	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
Lawrence Miller	Community Member
Dan Nichols	At Large Representative - American University
Tom Smith	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	
Mary Bresnahan	Community Member
Mary Kathryn Covert Steel	Community Member
Paul Dueffert	Community Member
Jonathan Harms	Community Member
Lee Monsein	Community Member
ATTENDING PROJECT PERSONNEL	
Todd Beckwith	USACE Baltimore

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)	

AGENDA

Starting Time: The May 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, February, and March Site-Wide Monthly Project Updates and the weekly 4825 Glenbrook Road updates and photos. The January and March RAB meeting minutes have been posted to the project site. The February and April Partner meetings were not held, but project update presentations were posted in lieu of meeting minutes.

B. Task Group Updates

RAB Membership

During the March RAB, a Membership search committee was formed. The committee is working to fill the open RAB position with a local Realtor.

As USACE transitions to project shutdown in the next 12-18 months, USACE will not be as active in the neighborhood. After project completion, USACE may not be as available for property specific information as in the past, so adding another Realtor to the RAB in the last year of the project would likely help the transition. D. Noble asked if the RAB wanted to discuss the addition of another Realtor to the RAB or if there was any progress since the last meeting.

Comment from William Krebs, Community Member - I can help you on that. Mary and I have talked about this a number of times, she has been speaking with potential candidates and has tentatively identified a Realtor who lives in Spring Valley West. We are going to try to meet with her sometime within the next week or so, and then we are going to try to arrange a meeting or call with Dan and Greg. Then hopefully we will be able to present her as a candidate at the July meeting.

Comment from D. Noble, USACE Spring Valley Project Manager - Alright, well, that sounds good, that sounds like good progress. Is there was any desire on RAB for addition discussion or wait to see if there is a candidate to present in July?

Question from Marguerite Clarkson, At Large Representative - Horace Mann Elementary School - Are there any backup people in case this person is not interested?

Comment from W. Krebs, Community Member - Yeah, we are still trying to find somebody, we are still looking at people and trying to identify somebody. Mary identified somebody else, but it was not suitable. We are not solely focused on her, but this woman has already indicated some interest.

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 61 Assurance Letters.

There are seven properties remaining to be remediated, highlighted in blue on the map on Slide #8 of the presentation. One property is located in the Sedgwick Trench area and the other six properties are located in the Static Test Fire Area, shown as a triangle standing on its side. The team is actively working with five of the seven property owners now and making progress. The cold winter weather prevented work until the arrival of spring to start work again. The arborists needed the vegetation on the properties to begin to grow leaves and flowers for identification. The identification process is being conducted now. The team is actively moving forward on properties where the property owners have allowed the work and is in communication with all seven property owners. The next step will be the geophysical surveys on the remaining properties for data collection and potential anomaly removal.

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

The map on Slide #9 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.
- There are no new updates to the map.

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.

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.

5. Site Preparation for Landscape Removal and Geophysical Surveys

- With the warmer spring weather at the end of April, the excavation team was able to complete the remaining hardscape anomaly removal from the previous group of properties. The warmer weather was necessary to complete damage repair with concrete and mortar after anomaly removal.
- The hardscape anomalies included two anomalies located under sidewalks and one anomaly that was located under a patio in a back yard.
- Each hardscape excavation site was promptly restored the next day after completing anomaly removal.

All of the anomalies were cultural debris; no American University Experiment Station (AUES) debris was found. In two of the three hardscape cases, the anomalies were found to be long sections of 3- or 4-inch metal pipe used as drainage pipe. The uniform, symmetrical pipe sections resembled munitions to the investigation instruments, causing the instruments to recommend excavation of the items.

- This spring, the field team began the Remedial Action effort process for the final group of properties with site preparation.
- Site preparation includes landscape appraisals, HD videos of properties, and planimetric surveys to map property boundaries.

6. Tentative Schedule

- Spring 2021
  - Obtain remaining Rights-of-Entry from current group of homeowners.
  - 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.
- Summer 2021
  - Complete round of anomaly removal efforts.
  - Begin subsequent Final Restoration Site walks with final group of homeowners.

B. Former Public Safety Building (PSB)

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

1. Recent Activities

- On March 23, all backfilling, compaction, and test-pitting activities were completed below the foundation at the PSB excavation site. The slab has been graded to final grade, as shown in the top photo on Slide #14 of the presentation.
- The team demobilized from the PSB excavation site on April 16, after completion of the additional investigation outside the PSB slab into the hillside and test-pitting operations to the west of the slab. A truck entrance as well as the security and work fencing were left in place.
- In April, the team completed the Roto-Sonic drilling into the northern hillside to investigate the trail of debris. The investigation included six soil boring points (RS01-6).
- Each soil core was processed for AUES debris. Any potential debris encountered was logged and collected for headspace analysis.
- In addition to laboratory grade glassware, some burnt material was also encountered at Soil Boring RS03. Soil Boring RS03 is located in the middle of the line of soil borings as shown on Slide #16 of the presentation.

Slide #16 of the presentation identifies the six soil borings that were drilled into the hillside. The team did not observe a continuous layer of soil, so the debris layer appears to end. Most of the debris encountered was concentrated in Soil Boring RS04 and not much debris was observed in Soil Boring RS06, the soil boring furthest away from the PSB slab and closest to the parking lot area on the western line of soil borings.

The photos on Slide #17 of the presentation show the recovered glassware excavated from the slope investigation. Most of the glassware was concentrated in Soil Boring RS04.

The map on Slide #18 of the presentation shows the overall site at the PSB, including the additional test pits completed in February to investigate for glassware outside the PSB foundation. Most of the glassware was concentrated in test pits D-7 and E-7, as well as debris in E-7 and F-7.

USACE and the Partners are reviewing the investigation report following the completion of all the backfilling operations and investigation of the debris trail into the slope. The team will discuss the results to determine the path forward and develop work plans for the final soil remediation approach at the former PSB.

2. Next Steps

- Develop and finalize work plans.
- Award work contract for remaining work.

- Fall 2021 - tentative start to complete any remaining work.

Question from Tom Smith, Community Member - What are the issues to decide about the work going forward? I mean, you have got things that you have to clean up, correct? So, I guess I am asking, why is the delay? What is complex about this that needs to have a long delay to the fall?

D. Noble explained that the site itself is complex with the hillside. As the investigation moves further away from the slab and towards the parking lot and the top of the hill, the excavation would intersect with utility corridors that run alongside the road and infrastructure such as the road and parking lot. The investigation should not undermine those important features of American University's (AU's) infrastructure. The data is open to interpretation, but the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and Department of Energy & Environment (DOEE) will have an independent review of the investigation report. USACE will discuss a strategy with the Partners as to how far into the hillside the investigation may realistically reach, where the debris appears to be, and how much clean soil must be moved out of the way to access the debris. There will be a point at which the investigation will become technically infeasible to remove the debris. The boring results may indicate that the debris dissipates. As K. Berg mentioned, not much debris was observed in the first borings immediately next to the slab. There was a large amount of glass found in RS04; but RS06, the very next boring approximately12 to 15 feet away, was almost completely clean. This may mean that the debris stops by the time the debris reaches RS04. If that is the case, the team may be able to develop a strategy to remove the debris from the hillside and yet keep the hillside propped up to prevent collapse. If additional debris is observed, the team may have to back out at that point because the disruption to infrastructure would be too extreme.

Question from T. Smith, Community Member - Thank you, that was very helpful, but as a follow up, as part of this report, are you also looking then at the possible future uses of that site and laying out some guidelines about what would be appropriate there or what would not be appropriate there? Is that going to be part of the assessment here?

D. Noble explained that the report will only be an assessment of what USACE believes is the extent of the remaining debris and different engineering strategies for removing the debris, while also setting a limit on each strategy for how far excavation may reach. There will likely be a trade-off between the strategies and what each may achieve. The goal is to remove all the debris so the site would be unrestricted. USACE and the Partners might have to accept that some debris must be left behind. If there is the possibility of some debris that is left behind, perhaps USACE can note the location of the debris as accurately as possible and allow the landowner, AU, to manage the debris in the future.

Comment from Allen Hengst, Audience Member - I put two questions in the chat box. I do not know if you can see them. How deep below ground surface did the angled Roto-Sonic drilling go down? Were all the borings done at the same depth below ground surface?

K. Berg explained that the Roto-Sonic drilling was an angled boring that reached the desired depth on the angle at about 22 feet below ground surface.

D. Noble explained that the boring was designed to intercept the elevation where the team believed the debris field was located. The debris was observed at a consistent elevation under the former PSB and extending into the hillside. The team believed that the debris elevation would remain consistent or become more shallow as the debris extended into the hillside, and if the boring were

conducted to those depths, the boring should intercept the elevation where the debris was observed.

K. Berg confirmed this.

Question from A. Hengst, Audience Member - Kim, when you say 22 feet below ground surface, you mean from the parking lot up above it is 22 feet down, but from the actual surface of the slope, how deep was that horizontal layer that you were exploring?

K. Berg asked A. Hengst to clarify if he meant from the foundation slab to the furthest boring to the parking lot.

Question from A. Hengst, Audience Member - I am just asking how far below the surface of the slope are you finding this debris? Is it 1 foot down, 2 feet down, or 3 feet down?

K. Berg explained that the concentrated glassware layer was observed in the boring at RSO4 at approximately 17 to 18 feet down along the boring core.

Question from A. Hengst, Audience Member - Ok, I am not getting my question answered, so let me go to the second question. Were all the borings done at the same depth below ground surface? All 6 of the borings, were they all the same depth?

D. Noble explained that the drill rig stayed in the same location for each boring and swiveled around to send out each boring at a different angle to reach down to different areas. The borings were designed to intercept the elevation level where the debris was expected to be located. The debris elevation at the borings closest to the building was under the least amount of over-burden, or soil over the top of the debris layer. The hillside rises up quickly, so there is more soil over the top of the borings reaching into the hillside and down to the same elevation. As the borings moved away from the PSB, the borings extended deeper into the ground because of the slope of the hillside.

Comment from A. Hengst, Audience Member - It makes sense to me, but I still do not know the depth of the horizontal layer of debris that you are finding the AUES stuff.

D. Noble reiterated that at boring location RS04, the debris layer was encountered at approximately 17 to 18 feet down. At RS06, the drilling went deeper to ensure the boring reached the same contour elevation. The other borings closer to the building were drilled at a shallower angle but still intercepted the depth where the debris was observed underneath the building. The elevation varied boring by boring.

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

C. Glenbrook Road

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

1. Recent Activities

- The photos on Slide #21 of the presentation show the team reinstalling 3 manholes, sewer lines, and water lines. This includes excavation to prepare the area, installation of pipes and manholes underground, and modifying the manholes onsite. The sewer lines are complete, and the water lines are still in progress.
- The team is prepared with all needed equipment and materials to complete the utility restoration effort over the next few weeks. A continuous effort has been underway with both

the site crew and the utility contractor working to expedite the effort. The photo on the left of Slide #22 of the presentation shows the delivered water pipe, and the photo on the right of Slide #22 shows the trench where the sewer line was installed and the temporary sewer lines above. The sewer lines were installed below first, and the water lines are being installed on top. The temporary sewer lines are now disconnected.

- The crew focused much of the soil compaction efforts around the utility installation areas, on the east and north sides of the property, over the past 2 months. The backfill effort at the site is currently at 75% complete. The photos on Slide #23 of the presentation show the backfill and compaction efforts that have happened since the sewer lines and part of the water line were installed. The photo on the right of Slide #23 is more recent. The photo on the left shows the elevation against the soldier pile wall on the left side. The team started the effort at the top of the wood of the soldier pile wall.
- The soil must be dried before compaction to meet moisture content requirements. Efforts to dry the soil include spreading the soil around to dry, and the team continues to place plastic sheeting over the soil when wet weather is anticipated to keep the soil as dry as possible.
- All of the remaining solid waste stored at the Federal Property, including the soil transferred from drums into roll-offs and the empty drums, has been transported offsite to a Subtitle D landfill. The last effort included non-hazardous waste and material from the PSB.

2. Upcoming Efforts

- Complete effort to re-install AU water line. The AU sanitary sewer line has been completed.
- Repair or replace 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.
- Seed the site.
- The Draft Final Site-Specific Final Report has been submitted for review.

3. Tentative Schedule

- Spring/Summer 2021
  - Crew completes the planned site restoration tasks for the Glenbrook project area, including completing restoration of the water lines, soil compaction at the site to reach the planned elevation levels of soil backfill, and restoration of fence lines.
  - Complete topsoil layers at the site before applying grass seed.
- Summer 2021
  - Install and maintain grass and soil erosion controls.
  - Anticipated project completion

Question from Lawrence Miller, Community Member - What is the 6-inch lift?

J. Kaiser explained that a 6-inch lift is the amount of soil material that is laid down each time during backfilling.

Question from L. Miller, Community Member - And that ties into what happens with the compaction when it rains?

J. Kaiser explained that the 6-inch lift is the amount of material that is being laid down at any one time, but the soil must meet a certain dryness requirement and cannot be too wet. That is why the contractor has made extra effort to dry the soil. Once the soil has been spread out and dried it is soil is compacted.

Comment from L. Miller, Community Member - Thank you.

Question from T. Smith, Community Member - When you say that the project will be completed the summer of 2021, does that mean that after that USACE is not paying AU any more rent for the site? It means it is done; it is over with?

D. Noble confirmed that as soon as the project is completed and the team is demobilized from the site, USACE will no longer lease the 4825 Glenbrook Road property and will return the property to AU. Currently, the lease is set to expire on July 31. The team expects to be de-mobilized and off of Glenbrook Road to meet the July 31 deadline.

4. Significant Milestones Achieved at Glenbrook Road

- All the remedial action waste has been removed from federal property and shipped to waste disposal facilities for permanent long-term disposal. The contractor worked to set up appointments at the waste facilities to send the shipments and there is now no Glenbrook Road waste on hand.
- Completion of the sewer line: the temporary sewer line, installed in 2012, was only expected to be in service for one to two years. The temporary sewer line serviced the AU campus for almost 10 years and has now been replaced with the permanent sewer line.
- The team is very close to achieving the same milestone with the water line as well. The temporary water line was also installed in 2012 and is expected to be replaced with a permanent water main next week.
- Backfill efforts past the 75% completion mark.

D. Groundwater

Todd Beckwith, USACE Baltimore provided a review of the Groundwater monitoring results and the path forward for the Groundwater Remedial Investigation (RI.

1. Recent Activities

The map on Slide #28 of the presentation shows the different wells in the Spring Valley area. The wells within the oval area on the map have historically had detections of perchlorate and arsenic (As) above drinking water standards along Glenbrook Road and at Kreeger Hall at AU. In the previous 2 sampling events, all detections of As were below the drinking water standard, but there were still detections of perchlorate above the EPA drinking water advisory level of 15 parts per billion (ppb) at PZ-4D and MW-44, which are wells in front of Kreeger Hall.

The groundwater sampling event for perchlorate at wells PZ-4D and MW-44 was conducted by USACE and the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) on March 1:

- The purpose of this sampling was to confirm that perchlorate concentrations are steady or decreasing at PZ-4D and MW-44.
- The preliminary data for this sampling event has been received and USGS is currently validating the data. No data quality issues are expected. Preliminary perchlorate results:
  - PZ-4D - 27.5 ug/L (micrograms per liter)
  - MW-44 - 16.2 ug/L

2. Historic Kreeger Hall Data for Perchlorate, July 2006 Through March 2021

The comparison table on Slide #30 of the presentation shows the historic perchlorate data for the wells in front of Kreeger Hall. Sampling began at that location in July 2006, and the last sampling from March 2021 is shown in the far-right column of the table.

There are 5 different wells close to each other at the Kreeger Hall location but drilled to different depths. The first column in the table on Slide #30 shows the different depths that each well was drilled to provide data on concentrations at different depths within the aquifer.

The cells shaded in yellow in the table on Slide #30 show when perchlorate results were above the 15 parts per billion (ppb) drinking water advisory level. The highest perchlorate concentration of 146 ppb was detected at PZ-4S in June 2007. Perchlorate concentrations have decreased since 2007. All the results in recent years for wells PZ-4S, MW-45S, and MW-45D have been below the 15 ppb standard, so those wells are no longer a concern. There have been consistent perchlorate detections above 15 ppb at PZ-4D and MW-44.

Prior to the sampling conducted in September 2019, the wells had not been sampled for 4 years. The results from the most recent sampling from September 2019 through March 2021 have been consistent; ranging from 26.2 ppb to 32.5 ppb at PZ-4D and approximately 16 ppb at MW-44, just above the drinking water advisory level. These levels show a decrease from levels over 40 ppb in December 2013 and March of 2014.

3. Next Steps

USACE discussed the sample results with EPA and DOEE. Since perchlorate concentrations at PZ-4D and MW-44 are consistent with past results, no further action is expected to be required for perchlorate:

- Perchlorate concentrations above 15 ppb are limited to one isolated location (Kreeger Hall), and one point does not constitute a plume.
- Overall perchlorate concentration trends have been decreasing.

Since previous As results were below the 10 ppb maximum contaminant level (MCL) for two consecutive sampling events, no further action is expected to be required for As.

Complete Addendum to Remedial Investigation Report summarizing the most recent sampling results, followed by Groundwater No Action Proposed Plan (PP) and Groundwater No-Action Decision Document (DD).

Question from A. Hengst, Audience Member - So, your dispute with the Partners, is that now resolved?

T. Beckwith confirmed this.

Question from A. Hengst, Audience Member - They will accept the no action plan? They are?

T. Beckwith confirmed that the No-Action plan was discussed with EPA and DOEE. There was a dispute regarding the Groundwater RI report. USACE and the Partners agreed to stop the dispute and conduct another round of sampling to assess current concentrations, since the wells had not been sampled in four years. The sampling was completed, and the results showed that As was no longer an issue, since all the arsenic concentrations were below the drinking water standard. The results for perchlorate, while still slightly above the drinking water standard at 2 wells, showed that the groundwater issue in general had dwindled down to 1 location, and that is not a significant enough issue to warrant further action. EPA and DOEE agree with that conclusion now.

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

Question from D. Noble, Military Co-Chair/USACE, Spring Valley MMRP Manager - In order to move forward with the documentation, you are anticipating, basically, you are going to go out and

hire a contractor to write this documentation for us, is that correct?

T. Beckwith confirmed this.

Question from D. Noble, Military Co-Chair/USACE, Spring Valley MMRP Manager - Right, and so that is a little bit of a delay as Todd is first going to do the contract action, get the contractor lined up, and then the contractor will go ahead and produce the additional documents. They will modify the RI report for us as well as they will write the PP and they will draft the DD as well.

T. Beckwith explained that two years may seem long, but each one of the reports goes through review by the USACE Baltimore District, the USACE Center of Expertise, and the Partners.

Comment from D. Noble, Military Co-Chair/USACE, Spring Valley MMRP Manager - Right, and we will be passing them through the Technical Assistance for Public Participation (TAPP) contractor as well, so Devamita will be getting all these documents.

T. Beckwith confirmed this.

E. Future of the RAB

Ideas on how the RAB would like to close out their work in conjunction with the conclusion of Army Corps' Remedial Action efforts in Spring Valley:

- Close out document
- Record in the meeting minutes

Most of the Spring Valley remedial actions are wrapping up, the project teams know what is required to complete the projects. There are still decisions to be made for the remedial action at the PSB; there is still a significant final remedial action effort to excavate into the hillside to remove as much of the debris as possible. The PSB project may take more time to complete. At the last RAB meeting, the RAB began to discuss the idea of how the RAB may wish to close out their work on the site. The RAB may choose to create a document of some kind or simply conduct a final meeting. If there is a desire to write a final report from the RAB, USACE can assist with drafting the documents. If the RAB would like to draft documents but keep the effort authorship by the RAB, USACE will understand. This will be the RAB's decision on what to do at the end.

Question from W. Krebs, Community Member - Did you not indicate that you might be willing to show us a draft of a close-out from another RAB, so we can see kind of what they did?

D. Noble explained that he looked into examples of other RAB close-out documents but did not get much feedback from USACE. Not very many RABs have actually shut down, but the RABs that have shut down fell apart due to disinterest or an issue that could not be solved. D. Noble has never seen a close-out from a RAB, but he can keep looking. The RAB could come up with whatever end product the RAB chooses.

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

Comment from Greg Beumel, Community Co-Chair - It sounds like Bill was asking to be the lead author on this one!

Comment from W. Krebs, Community Member - We will talk about that!

Question from G. Beumel, Community Co-Chair - Yeah, ok, we will do that. You have got enough talking to do, right? I guess that becomes a question for people to think about. We can start a discussion right now. What would you like to do? Do we want to write some sort of report? I do

not think we necessarily want to give a detailed report on what has happened at the site but on, sort of how the RAB feels it is leaving the site. I am willing to hear whatever anyone else thinks.

Comment from T. Smith, Community Member - This is easy for me to say, because this is my last RAB meeting. It seems to me that having been in the community since Day one of this project, it seems to me that it would be very good to have a close-out document that identifies just the history of the RAB and maybe some assessment of how it has worked within the context of the community. Just something on the record. What happened in Spring Valley is important historically with implications far beyond the residents of Spring Valley. I think, to validate all the effort that has been made in the community, including by people on the RAB itself over the years and others in the community who were not involved in the RAB. I think it would be a shame to just kind of disappear without some kind of historic document. But, again, that is easy for me to say because I am gone, I am not going to be involved in this, but I hope it is something that folks will give some serious thought to.

Comment from Whitney Gross, Spring Valley Community Outreach Team - If the RAB needs any help writing the history of the RAB or some kind documentation on how we started, we have our outreach plans and how we worked with the RAB. So, that might be helpful if you guys decide to write a report.

Question from G. Beumel, Community Co-Chair - Do we have any volunteers who want to help draft such a report?

Question from L. Miller, Community Member - I would suggest that if we are doing it everybody has a little time. One of the things that should be done is to think of what issues have arisen along the way in the governance and membership composition of the RAB to leave something that can help other future RABs, not just our community but perhaps in other communities. But if we are going to do it, it sounds like we some start of it already in what Whitney was talking about. I think we have to divide it out. I am not willing to take on a giant writing assignment, but I would sure take on one part of it if everyone or almost everyone would take on a chapter, a page, we might be able do it that way, unless there is someone who is going to speak up now and say he or she would like to do the whole thing. Also, maybe it would be appropriate if we think about it, to have a fuller discussion at the next meeting. It might make sense, now that we have a couple of proposals, a couple thoughts on the table, to think about it and devote some real time to it at the next meeting, unless you think we are going to close out at the next meeting.

Question from G. Beumel, Community Co-Chair - I think we could put it as an agenda item on the next meeting. When is the next meeting, guys?

D. Noble confirmed that the next RAB meeting will be July 13.

Comment from T. Smith, Community Member - I think that I thought I heard Dan make an offer about USACE also helping to write this and given the nature of what kind of document we are talking about, that would be a great resource to the RAB to get it started.

Question from G. Beumel, Community Co-Chair - Ok, can you guys put on the agenda for the next meeting that we are going to have a full discussion of this report? I will work with some people between now and then and talk to the staff and we can get some idea of how we might want to structure some report so we have something in front of us, not just, 'hey, what should we write, guys,' because I know that is the hardest part.

Question from Alma Gates, Community Advisor to the RAB - Tom, since you have been really

very closely involved in this, even though you were not on the RAB, would you be willing to help out with this report, in terms of the actual RAB itself?

Comment from T. Smith, Community Member - I would be happy to help. I do not know what kind of time commitment we are all talking about here, but if there is something that I can do to help, recognizing that I am not a part of the RAB anymore after the end of this month. If there is some way that I can be helpful, sure, I am happy to be helpful.

Comment from Alma Gates, Community Advisor to the RAB - I feel the same way, Greg, I think that I have sort of had a bird's eye view for a while, and so I would be happy to help out on this.

D. Noble confirmed that RAB Final Document Writing will be added to the agenda for the next RAB meeting. USACE will create a potential draft guide and send it to G. Beumel for review before the July RAB meeting.

Question from W. Krebs, Community Member - Years ago, I raised this issue and I do not remember what the resolution was. But there is this alley that has never been paved that runs between Sedgwick and Tilden Street. I do not know whether it was ever tested. The backyards: my backyard was tested, people on Sedgwick's backyard was tested, but I do not know if this alley had ever been tested. It arose recently in my mind because there is some bamboo on it that has to come out. I found somebody who is going to be willing to take it out and also, I realized he was going to be digging 18 to 24 inches on this alley that I do not know if it has ever been tested. I guess the first question is, did we ever test any of DC's property?

D. Noble explained that the intent of the investigation was to test all available acreage. If an alley is not paved it should have been tested. USACE will review the report to identify ownership and obtain the results for W. Krebs.

Comment from W. Krebs, Community Member - Yeah, I asked Nance that earlier this month or last month; I do not think he understood what I was really looking for. If you could look into that, Dan, I would appreciate it.

D. Noble confirmed this and asked W. Gross to coordinate W. Krebs' data request with Frank Bochnowicz, USACE.

Comment from T. Smith, Community Member - That is a paper alley, so the ownership should be the District government.

Comment from W. Krebs, Community Member - Yeah it is. I have got many writings with the District about who owns that and who is responsible for removing the trees on it. They agree it is theirs. Thanks very much.

Comment from T. Smith, Community Member - I just want to express my appreciation to Dan and all the staff and all the work they do to help make this RAB work so effectively, as well as a shout-out to all the members of the RAB for the hard work that they have done over the years, and also to Alma, who has been invaluable in terms of her contributions over the years. It has been really a pleasure for me to have served on this RAB and I have enjoyed it and I have learned a lot. So, I just wanted to thank everybody.

Comment from G. Beumel, Community Co-Chair - Well, Tom, I want to thank you for all the time you have put into this issue. You have had important input along the way, and I think you have helped us get to this point where we are talking about closing down rather than for years and years always having 1 next thing that has to be done. So, thank you very much.

Comment from D. Noble, Military Co-Chair/USACE, Spring Valley MMRP Manager - Thank you very much, Tom.

Comment from T. Smith, Community Member - Thanks.

III. Community Items

IV. Open Discussion and Future RAB Agenda Development

The next RAB meeting will be July 13 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 and Final Document Writing Discussion

B. Next RAB Meeting:

Tuesday, July 13, 2021

C. Open Discussion

V. Public Comments

VI. Adjourn

The conference call was adjourned at 8:14 PM.