

**U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Spring Valley Restoration Advisory Board
Discussion Summary of the June 15, 2017 Conference Call**

RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT ON THIS CALL	
Dan Noble	Military Co-Chair/USACE, Spring Valley MMRP Manager
Greg Beumel	Community Co-Chair
Linda Argo	At Large Representative - American University
Alma Gates	At Large Representative - Horace Mann Elementary School
Steve Hirsh	Agency Representative - US Environmental Protection Agency, Region III
Lawrence Miller	Community Member
Mary Bresnahan	Community Member
Paul Dueffert	Community Member
Tom Smith	Community Member
Dr. Peter deFur	Environmental Stewardship Concepts/RAB TAPP Consultant
Malcolm Pritzker	Community Member
Kathleen Connell	Community Member
Ralph Cantral	Community Member
William Krebs	Community Member
Mary Douglas	Community Member
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEMBERS NOT PRESENT ON THIS CALL	
Lee Monsein	Community Member
John Wheeler	Community Member
James Sweeney	Agency Representative - Department of Energy & Environment
George Vassiliou	Community Member
ATTENDING PROJECT PERSONNEL	
Brenda Barber	USACE, Spring Valley Project Manager
Alex Zahl	USACE, Spring Valley Technical Manager
Rebecca Yahiel	Spring Valley Community Outreach Program
Carrie Johnston	Spring Valley Community Outreach Program

Holly Hostetler	ERT, Inc.
-----------------	-----------

HANDOUTS FROM THE MEETING
I. Requested Glenbrook Road Sections of May 2017 RAB meeting
II. Formal update on the issues pertaining to the Fry family from West Virginia May 2017

AGENDA

Starting Time: The June 15, 2017 Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) conference call began at 2:04 PM.

I. Administrative Items

A. Co-Chair Updates

Dan Noble, Spring Valley Project Manager and Military Co-Chair, opened the conference call and thanked everyone for attending. He noted that Greg Beumel, Community Co-Chair and D. Noble agreed that a phone call would be appropriate at this time because of events that have occurred since the May Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) meeting. In addition, he noted that he and Steve Hirsh, Agency Representative - US Environmental Protection Agency, Region III will not be available for the July RAB meeting.

II. USACE Program Updates

D. Noble provided a status update of activities in relation to the Fry family, former workers at 4825 Glenbrook Road and 4835 Glenbrook Road.

Prior to the conference call, two handouts were sent to the board members. The handouts concerned the two motions passed by the RAB during the May RAB meeting with respect to the statements made by the Fry family from West Virginia (WV).

D. Noble invited the RAB to discuss developments that have occurred since the May RAB meeting and decide whether or not to modify the two motions passed by the RAB. The Fry family made statements at the May RAB about the Fry’s concerns about 4835 Glenbrook Road and that the Fry family was in possession of a bottle recovered during their employment at the Glenbrook Road site. The Fry family made statements that they were keeping the bottle for some kind of insurance. Brenda Barber, Spring Valley Project Manager spoke to the Fry family after the May RAB meeting. At that time, the Fry family reiterated that they did have the bottle and gave B. Barber additional details about what the bottle looked like and how the bottle was being stored. This information raised concerns, so D. Noble and B. Barber shared the information with U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) Baltimore leadership and USACE senior leadership in Washington D.C. There was grave concern that the Fry family claimed to have an intact liter bottle with liquid inside that could pose a serious public health threat.

The government prepared to mount a hazardous material response to the allegation. After a week went by, the USACE Colonel, District Engineer (DE) personally telephoned both the father and son. When the DE spoke with the father, the father finally said that the allegation was not true; the Fry family did not have a bottle. The father said the Fry family made that claim to get the government’s attention and to be taken seriously.

B. Barber wrote a letter describing the details of the events following the May RAB meeting to James Sweeney, Agency Representative - Department of Energy & Environment (DOEE), Steve Hirsh, Agency Representative - US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Region III, and Dr. Peter deFur, Environmental Stewardship Concepts/RAB TAPP Consultant. D. Noble shared that letter with G. Beumel, Community Co-Chair. In addition, USACE pulled out the section of the May RAB meeting minutes that contained the statements made by the Fry family. B. Barber and Chris Gardner, USACE, Corporate Communications Office prepared affidavits to state what the Fry family said to B. Barber and C. Gardner

after the meeting; those statements and additional detail provided are formally written down as part of the record. The DE prepared an affidavit of the results of his phone conversation with the Fry family.

When the section of meeting minutes and B. Barber's letter were sent to the RAB members, D. Noble made some statements to the RAB concerning the follow-up USACE attempted to perform with the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR) to set up medical appointments for the Fry family. D. Noble had indicated that the Fry family were no-shows at the appointments. That is not what occurred. D. Noble retracted that statement. The incident seemed to be a genuine communication misunderstanding between ATSDR and the Fry family. The RAB should not hold the Fry family at fault for the fact that medical appointments have not yet occurred. USACE is still working on the situation with ATSDR. The medical appointments are ATSDR's area of responsibility, but USACE is assisting ATSDR with maintaining communication with the Fry family. D. Noble apologized for that inaccuracy in the email that was sent to the RAB, and reiterated that the incident was no one's fault and USACE is still working to facilitate the medical appointments.

D. Noble invited B. Barber to provide any pertinent detail of her conversations with the Fry family directly after the May RAB meeting and during the following week.

B. Barber replied that USACE took the allegation very seriously. B. Barber performed an immediate follow-up the morning after the May RAB meeting with the Fry family and all of USACE's senior leadership. USACE was very diligent about quickly following up to respond to the Fry family's concerns about the bottle and the Fry family's medical concerns brought up during the May RAB meeting. Communication with the Fry family was hindered and difficult; contacting the Fry family by phone or email was a challenge. USACE sent letters to follow up and used every method of communication available to USACE, but were unable to make any progress with the Fry family. The Fry family continued to maintain their story. The DE was finally able to get James Fry to admit that the claim of the bottle was an unfounded allegation.

Question from Kathleen Connell, Community Member - How long did they work for the employer that was building in the designated area?

B. Barber explained that her understanding was that James Fry, the father, had performed some initial work to support Mr. Brandt's development opportunities in Virginia, particularly the Greenbrier Estates. In that case, Mr. Brandt utilized the Fry family's building and construction licenses in order to complete that project. The Fry family then traveled to Spring Valley with Mr. Brandt to build the houses on Glenbrook Road. The Fry family was at the Glenbrook Road project for about a year and a half. B. Barber did not know how long the Fry family worked on the prior project in Virginia.

Question from K. Connell, Community Member - Do you have any awareness of other people beyond these two who were employees at the time?

B. Barber explained that USACE was hoping to continue conversations with the Fry family to gain some additional knowledge or information on the identities of the other former workers. USACE has partial names and limited information, but found it challenging to find individuals without a full name. USACE has also been in contact with other individuals who may have that information. Some contacts are not communicating with USACE, such as the Brandt foremen and supervisors.

Question from K. Connell, Community Member - Is there a way of requiring those to communicate?

B. Barber explained that EPA has the authority to issue a Section 104E, a request letter asking for information and to provide assistance in this process. USACE has done that in the past with Mr. Brandt and other people involved, but the people do not necessarily have to comply or respond. USACE has talked to S. Hirsh about issuing a Section 104E in this case.

Comment from K. Connell, Community Member - I think that may be an instructive process, because I think that until we can get them on the record. If they deny wanting to do that, that is fine, but then we have

extended USACE's and RAB's interest in learning more directly to them. If they refuse to participate, then fine, they cannot say that USACE has not been responsive. I would like to be able to shut down that argument; that USACE has not been responsive to their health concerns. I would like to know that they want to participate, get their health check-up, and get some help if they have a medical issue. I think to the extent that we can, be assertive in getting other former workers aware that we are interested in their narrative, and we would like to give them an opportunity to access the same medical care that we have given these first two gentlemen. If they do not want to make themselves available, they do not feel that they have been exposed to any risk, then fine. But at least the additional support has extended to them. Then I think we have fulfilled our responsibility.

B. Barber explained that USACE sent a follow-up letter to the Fry family the day after the May RAB meeting which included hard copies of the ATSDR Health Consultation Report. In the body of the letter, USACE described exactly who to coordinate with to get the Fry family's medical concerns addressed. She reiterated that even though the medical consultation was not USACE's responsibility, USACE was trying to facilitate communication with ATSDR. USACE could send a follow-on letter, and reiterate that USACE would like to know who else USACE could communicate with, and once again offer for the Fry family to come and participate; but that would be the extent of what USACE could do. USACE cannot make the Fry family communicate with ATSDR or USACE.

Comment from K. Connell, Community Member - I respect that but I think if we have gone the extra mile then they cannot come back to a future RAB meeting or subsequently speak to the press and say they have been dismissed. They have not been dismissed; they have chosen not to be involved.

B. Barber explained that USACE can send another letter.

Comment from K. Connell, Community Member - But you might want to get feedback from the other board members, I do not know if they agree with me.

Question from Tom Smith, Community Member - I just want to be sure I understand. Has anything happened since the last RAB meeting that the Frys have indicated that they are not willing to engage with us on sharing information about what they may or may not know about 4835 Glenbrook Road? Since the last RAB meeting have they said that they are not interested in cooperating with the RAB at all in terms of sharing information about what they know about that site, putting aside the ATSDR health piece?

B. Barber explained that she had sent the Fry family one letter and several emails. She has had conversations with Bobby Fry, the son, to coordinate that site visit. She requested numerous dates from the Fry family that may be accommodating to their schedule, but the site visit has not been set up yet. The Fry family has not committed to any date or time, but has not said no to B. Barber at this point.

Question from K. Connell, Community Member - When will we have the results from their health tests available?

B. Barber explained that it is unlikely that ATSDR will share health information with USACE due to the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA) requirements. ATSDR has committed to USACE that if ATSDR is successful in conducting a consultation or any type of appointment with the Fry family, ATSDR will give USACE the courtesy of letting USACE know.

Question from T. Smith, Community Member - I am more interested in knowing what information they may or may not have about the site. If you went back to them with a formal invitation from the RAB, expressing our interest in their participation in a site visit and coming to the RAB meeting to share information with us, do you think that they would not do that? Do you think their reluctance to commit to a site visit could be because it is USACE making the invitation?

D. Noble explained that he did not know the reason. His concerns are that he does not know what USACE could do with the information the Fry family might provide, and the veracity of what the Fry family says, based on what has happened since the May RAB meeting.

Comment from T. Smith, Community Member – But I think that is something you judge after you hear it. I hear the concern about the bottle. I also can understand, if you are telling me that I am going to have the FBI down my back, I am going to tell you that I do not have it anymore. I also understand that piece of it as well. I am just trying to say, about the credibility of the workers and all the rest of it, but until we actually hear what they have to say, I do not know that we are really in a position to test their overall credibility.

Question from Mary Bresnahan, Community Member - Do you have any knowledge if they have a military background at all?

D. Noble explained that he did not know.

B. Barber explained that she did not have any knowledge that the Fry family had any military background from her conversations with the Fry family. She has not specifically asked the Fry family about military background.

Question from M. Bresnahan, Community Member - The reason that I am asking that question is since they gave a different story to the Colonel and I just was wondering if they had a military background and would respond differently if the Colonel asked them these questions.

B. Barber explained that she was not part of the Colonel's conversation with Mr. Fry. The Colonel indicated in his affidavit that James Fry said he wanted to see if he could get the attention of someone in the Army and he got the attention of an Army colonel. B. Barber could not speculate and does not know if the Fry family had a military background and if that led the Fry family to see if they could get someone in a senior position to give them some attention and credibility.

Question from William Krebs, Community Member - To follow-up on T. Smith's observation, D. Noble, are you relatively satisfied with his denial that he does not have the bottle as the true story?

D. Noble explained that he does not know what to think because James Fry gave fairly specific details to describe the bottle, but at the same time the details were also a little general. He could not understand why a person would then deny having the bottle if the person indeed had the bottle. At that point the person would be revealing that they are engaged in some falsehood; either engaged in a falsehood previously or engaged in a falsehood now to cover it up.

Comment from W. Krebs, Community Member - One is a falsehood that says, I lied about having something dangerous; the other is a falsehood saying, I told the truth about having something dangerous.

D. Noble explained that the Colonel seems satisfied that he was getting the truth when James Fry acknowledged that he had fabricated the story. The Colonel directly contacted the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) and discussed the call with the FBI. The FBI seemed satisfied with the idea that the bottle does not exist. He noted that EPA is conducting an investigation about the incident, and asked S. Hirsh if he had any detail on the matter.

S. Hirsh explained that the investigation is under the criminal enforcement part of EPA, and he had no information on the investigation. He understood that EPA still plans to go out and talk to the Fry family.

Comment from Linda Argo, At Large Representative - American University - I think that would be a good idea to have EPA go out and talk to them.

D. Noble explained that if USACE obtains any information from EPA, that information will be shared with the RAB.

Question from Alma Gates, At Large Representative - Horace Mann Elementary School - Would it be helpful to have the RAB make a formal request that EPA follow through?

S. Hirsh explained that the RAB may choose to make that request if they wish, but did not think it was necessary. S. Hirsh would supply a contact name if the RAB chooses to make the request.

Question from Malcolm Pritzker, Community Member - Is not all this a prelude for these guys wanting to

file a lawsuit against somebody for something? At what point do we advise them that we require certain confirmation that they lied and also tell them what we expect them to do as far as information or we are just going to cease processing their allegations; which certainly have been false up to this point. These guys are in construction, they might have worked at 100 different places after they worked on this project.

B. Barber explained that the Fry family has not indicated to USACE that they are going to file a lawsuit. The Fry family had attorneys at the prior RAB meeting over a year ago, and has had various representation pertaining to this issue. The Fry family has asked specific questions about their medical issues, so she suspects that the Fry family may be pursuing or may want to consider something along that line. The issue would be very difficult for the Fry family to prove, because the Fry family worked at numerous places before and after Glenbrook Road. None of the Fry family's symptoms could likely be definitively tied to exposure to chemical agent, which was one of the conclusions of the ATSDR Health Consultation Report.

Comment from W. Krebs, Community Member - My feeling is to keep the invitation open to them. If they want to show up at the next meeting, we will hear what they have to say. They may not show up.

Comment from T. Smith, Community Member - As I recall, one of them said that they would not be able to come in July because of some kind of family thing.

Comment from W. Krebs, Community Member - Invite them to the next meeting if they cannot do this meeting. I do not see any reason to foreclose them from saying whatever they want to say, or have it look like we are foreclosing it. Either they will show up or they will not show up and then we can worry about how credible they are afterwards.

Comment from T. Smith, Community Member - I agree.

D. Noble explained that at the last Partner meeting, the Partners discussed whether or not there is still value in attempting to conduct a site visit. DOEE, EPA, and the property owner were very much neutral and were looking to USACE as the responsible agency. If USACE decides at this point that the site visit is not worthwhile, the Partners will not protest. If USACE decides there is some value in conducting the site visit, the Partners will support that decision. EPA and DOEE indicated they would attend a site visit and the property owner indicated they would make the property available. As the leader of the project team, D. Noble was very much on the fence; he could see upsides and downsides to either situation. USACE has not completely taken the site visit off the table. If the Fry family shows up at the RAB and wants to make statements and ask questions, the RAB is public meeting so of course they may do that. If the RAB decides to hear something formally from the Fry family or perhaps have USACE make a formal presentation to the RAB about 4835 Glenbrook Road to remind everyone; perhaps that presentation could be held off for future meetings so S. Hirsh and D. Noble may be at the meeting and participate. D. Noble requested that the RAB consider holding off any formal presentations on the agenda until September.

Comment from W. Krebs, Community Member - If you are not going to be there and S. Hirsh is not going to be there, I do not want to do anything with them without you there.

Comment from K. Connell, Community Member - I am interested in influencing the information flow to the community at large, because I think the credibility of USACE and the role of the RAB should be reaffirmed. There were some very strong accusations made by these two gentlemen at the last meeting. It is to everyone's advantage to reaffirm the actions that have been taken by USACE and ratified by the RAB. I think the community as a whole should be informed that we have addressed this thoroughly, that we do not see any cause for alarm here, and that we will continue to be open to any additional information that is forthcoming from anybody. I think at the September meeting it would be good to have a formal discussion of the actions taken.

D. Noble explained that USACE could put together a presentation for the September meeting about the work that USACE has done and the information that USACE has about 4835 Glenbrook Road. USACE can extend an invitation to the Fry family to be present so they may listen and fully understand what USACE

understands about the property. USACE can offer the chance at that time for the Fry family to either address the RAB after the USACE presentation; or if the Fry family would like to wait, think about what USACE said and then address the RAB at the subsequent meeting, USACE is open to that as well. USACE cannot commit that the Fry family will continue to cooperate and show up.

Comment from T. Smith, Community Member - I like your idea. I think that it would be valuable to ensure that they are also formally on the agenda and that they understand that they have been invited by the RAB to talk to the RAB. There has been so much talk over the years about what the workers knew or did not know. What we are hearing, from talking to a couple real estate agents over the weekend, is that housing prices in the neighborhood are being depressed. When I ask 'why,' I am told it is because of the munitions issue. When I say 'why now, given that this has been an issue for many, many years and has not really had the impact,' what I am being told is the perception out there is that it is starting back up again. I think that we do need to demonstrate to the community that what is being done is thorough. That is why I would also encourage USACE to move forward with the site visit. If it means setting the date yourself and saying to them 'this is the date that we are going to do it.' I think we need to show that we are doing everything in our power to give them the opportunity to share information with us. Then if they do not do that, then it is on them, not on us.

Comment from K. Connell, Community Member - I agree. I did not know that it was having a negative impact on property values, I am distressed that is happening. I think that we can be helpful and instructive, because whatever we do we can then make a similar report; that we have looked at this issue, that there is nothing if that indeed proves to be true that is outstanding. I think it would be good for the RAB chair and USACE to do an interview with the press. I think they should do a full update about what is going on in this community to help stem the negative perception out there, and hopefully stabilize the property values. M. Bresnahan, what do you think?

Comment from M. Bresnahan, Community Member - I would not want to do a sit down with the press, because historically, the press gets more coverage when they report a negative issue. You can be sure that they will find some negatives in it because they will talk to some additional people besides us.

Comment from M. Pritzker, Community Member - I thoroughly agree with Mary; that has been our experience for these many years.

Question from K. Connell, Community Member - Then how do you suggest we get information out there?

Comment from M. Pritzker, Community Member - If we document what we have done, including the fact that these guys have lied, and they have been invited to do all these things, including asking them to supply information. At some point we have to bring it to a conclusion. At that point if we have a position paper that is brief then I think we have something. As far as the real estate being depressed, I guess it is like a group of people touching different points of a horse and just trying to describe what the horse is. The house right next door to me sold within one day. I do not know if every real estate agent handling houses in this area would agree that the prices are depressed.

Comment from Mary Douglas, Community Member - A neighbor, who seems pretty knowledgeable and is starting a magazine about this area, said that prices are depressed about 10% below what they would be. I think the one reason that they may be somewhat depressed in some areas is because of the 100 house examination for munitions.

Question from M. Bresnahan, Community Member - What you are saying is very interesting, but there are a lot of people that think this increased knowledge and technology is great. I have heard a lot of positive stuff. But some real estate agents will not show properties in Spring Valley.

Comment from M. Douglas, Community Member - It is absolutely rational to say that we will have a cleaner bill of health on our properties than other neighborhoods. But I do not think that the public perception is entirely like that. I went on this website called D.C. Urban Moms where there was a lot of hysterical talk

by these young mothers about how they would never buy in Spring Valley.

Comment from M. Bresnahan, Community Member - We had a presentation done by USACE maybe two years ago at Georgetown Long and Foster.

D. Noble confirmed this.

Question from M. Bresnahan, Community Member - When USACE goes in and actually cleans up areas; that tells me that it gets cleaner than a lot of other neighborhoods. I think the house prices in Spring Valley are pretty good.

D. Noble noted that there seemed to be encouragement from the RAB for USACE to continue to offer the invitation to the Fry family for the site visit. If that is something the Fry family is willing to do, USACE is willing to show up and listen. USACE will take that under consideration. In addition, USACE is certainly open to the idea that USACE will have a discussion about 4835 Glenbrook Road at a future RAB meeting. USACE offered to give a full briefing about the property; what USACE has done and what USACE knows. D. Noble does not object if the Fry family would like to hear that presentation and then say something themselves. The Fry family presentation may be formally put on the agenda so there is no misunderstanding that USACE does not want to hear what the Fry family has to say.

Comment from M. Bresnahan, Community Member - I think that is a good idea.

Comment from Paul Dueffert, Community Member - It sounds like we do need some kind of agenda item for the July meeting about this. It strikes me that you cannot speak entirely until September.

D. Noble explained that USACE can provide an update on whether or not USACE was successful in arranging a medical consultation for the Fry family, or if USACE has an indication that the consultation is going to happen. USACE can let the RAB know where USACE stands with respect to a site visit. USACE can also commit between now and then to make an effort to reach out to the Fry family and ask if they would like to make any sort of presentation at the September meeting. USACE will let the RAB know if USACE has received a response from the Fry family.

Comment from T. Smith, Community Member - I really do think, given what has transpired since the last meeting, that it would be helpful if you indicated to them that the RAB wanted to hear from them. Is USACE required to arrange a medical exam for them?

D. Noble explained that USACE is not required to arrange a medical exam. At certain sites, USACE is required to formally consult with ATSDR and to ask ATSDR to examine the health of the community around the site. That must be done at National Priorities List (NPL) sites.

S. Hirsh explained that an ATSDR examination was conducted at the site years ago. Recently, ATSDR conducted an assessment of just 4825 Glenbrook Road.

Question from T. Smith, Community Member - So there is no requirement that a medical appointment be set up for them, is that right?

S. Hirsh explained that he thinks it is the right thing to do. There are people in government that are responsible to look at the effects of Superfund-like sites on communities, and that is who have been asked to meet with the workers to assess their health.

Question from T. Smith, Community Member - So these appointments that are set up for them with ATSDR doctors, how far away are they from where they live?

B. Barber explained that ATSDR identified an occupational health clinic in WV in close proximity to the Fry family's residence and ATSDR arranged for the clinic to provide an occupational health consultation. She did not know the exact location and would have to verify, but believed the clinic was within 45 min of the worker's house.

Question from Lawrence Miller, Community Member - Is it correct that there is no provision in the

remediation program for compensation to anyone for medical harm?

D. Noble confirmed this and explained that Defense Environmental Restoration Account (DERA) funds have no legal provision in the account to allow those funds to be used for medical compensation. There is a way for the government to compensate people, but it does not involve the program that USACE uses to pay for the project.

Question from Lawrence Miller, Community Member - Is outside of the RAB's purview as to whether or not somebody might potentially be harmed in way that would entitle them to payment?

D. Noble confirmed this and explained that someone seeking medical compensation would have to make a claim, and that claim may or may not go to court.

Comment from Lawrence Miller, Community Member - It would be a tort claim that is not related to the board or this remediation effort.

D. Noble agreed with S. Hirsh's answer to T. Smith's question of whether or not USACE has to set up a medical appointment; that it seemed to be the right thing to do. USACE and the project team asked ATSDR to look at the situation at 4825 Glenbrook Road because it seemed clear that the items found and the levels of contaminant at the property seemed to present a potential significant risk. It seemed logical to USACE that the workers building the houses at the site and excavating into the ground may have come into contact with these materials. It seemed to be a case of a documented exposure to some potentially dangerous chemicals, so USACE asked ATSDR to investigate and see if there was a way for ATSDR to comment on what the health risk may have been to the workers or to the residents of the house.

Question from Paul Dueffert, Community Member - Focusing back on the July RAB meeting, if there is something unexpected that comes up, will G. Beumel be available to take point in terms of dealing with whatever that is?

G. Beumel, Community Co-Chair, explained that he will be at the July RAB meeting and USACE will have someone to replace D. Noble as Military Co-Chair at that meeting.

D. Noble confirmed this. He contacts G. Beumel between meetings when D. Noble believes there is something G. Beumel should know.

Comment from Paul Dueffert, Community Member - That sounds good.

D. Noble thanked everyone for getting on the call. He made notes of what USACE should do between now and July and between now and September. USACE will keep the RAB up to date on what occurs with the Fry family, any other workers USACE might contact, and any new information that USACE learns about the issue.

Question from A. Gates, At Large Representative - Horace Mann Elementary School - Can you give us a very brief update on the Public Safety Building (PSB)?

D. Noble explained that American University (AU) has made progress, including transferring the occupants out of the building, rerouting some utilities, and engaging a firm to do the demolition of the building to ground level. USACE plans to acquire a contractor by the end of June who will conduct the follow-on work on the PSB by taking up the slab, removing the foundation, and assessing the potential debris and any contamination that might be underneath the building from the debris fields that were known to be in the area. USACE expects to begin that work by late fall late or early winter.

Question from A. Gates, At Large Representative - Horace Mann Elementary School - Will this action prolong any other actions in the community. Will anything be put on hold while this is done, which might otherwise move forward?

D. Noble explained that the Site-Wide Decision Document (DD) outlines a three-prong effort. There are the ~95 houses in the neighborhood to include an area along Dalecarlia Parkway, the PSB, and the areas of

soil contamination on the AU campus and the adjoining property, the Spaulding/Captain Rankin Area. Those three efforts will launch at the same time and will have different rates of progress, but will all be underway concurrently once the contract is awarded and the contractor is instructed to begin their efforts.

Question from A. Gates, At Large Representative - Horace Mann Elementary School – Is this all within the FY18 budget?

D. Noble explained that USACE has funds this year to make the initial award, and then expects additional funds in FY18 and FY19 to fully fund the effort.

III. Community Items

No community items were presented.

IV. Open Discussion and Future RAB Agenda Development

A. Upcoming Meeting Topics

- Groundwater Feasibility Study
- Site-Wide Decision Document
- 4825 Glenbrook Road
- 4835 Glenbrook Road

B. Next RAB Meeting:

Tuesday, July 11, 2017

C. Open Discussion

V. Public Comments

No public comments were presented.

VI. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 3:09 PM.