

**U.S. Army Corps of Engineers  
Spring Valley Restoration Advisory Board  
Conference Call  
Minutes of the November 2020 Meeting**

<b>RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT AT THIS MEETING</b>	
Dan Noble	Military Co-Chair/USACE, Spring Valley MMRP Manager
Jennifer Baine	Community Member
Paul Bermingham	Community Member
Greg Beumel	Community Co-Chair
Brian Barone	Agency Representative - Department of Energy & Environment
Mary Bresnahan	Community Member
Marguerite Clarkson	At Large Representative - Horace Mann Elementary School
Mary Kathryn Covert Steel	Community Member
Mary Douglas	Community Member
Jonathan Harms	Community Member
Joe Vitello	Agency Representative - Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Region III
Lawrence Miller	Community Member
Tom Smith	Community Member
John Wheeler	Community Member
<b>RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEMBERS NOT PRESENT AT THIS MEETING</b>	
Paul Dueffert	Community Member
William Krebs	Community Member
Lee Monsein	Community Member
Dan Nichols	At Large Representative - American University
Malcolm Pritzker	Community Member
<b>ATTENDING PROJECT PERSONNEL</b>	
Todd Beckwith	USACE - Baltimore

Kim Berg	USACE Baltimore
Whitney Gross	Spring Valley Community Outreach Program
Holly Hostetler	ERT, Inc.
Carrie Johnston	ERT - Community Outreach Team
Julie Kaiser	USACE Baltimore
ZaKerra Lance	ERT - Community Outreach Team
<b>HANDOUTS FROM THE MEETING</b>	
I. Army Corps of Engineers Presentation (emailed PDF)	

**AGENDA**

**Starting Time:** The September 2020 Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) conference call began at 7:02 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.

Comment from Greg Beumel, Community Co-Chair - All, I want to say is thanks for getting online, everybody. I know for some people this is a new event, certainly on Webex. For other people, this is a daily experience. Regardless of your experience in doing this, thanks for being here. I think it will be good to get caught up, especially if we have something about the email that was sent around today. Thank you.

**1. Introductions**

None

**2. General Announcements**

Malcolm Pritzker, Community Member, has announced that he will be withdrawing from the RAB. M. Pritzker has been a long-time member of the RAB and USACE appreciates all M. Pritzker’s efforts over the years. M. Pritzker was the membership co-chair, so a new membership co-chair will need to be appointed. This position is important in the recruitment and selection of new members.

D. Noble reviewed the website updates which included the August and September Site-Wide Monthly Project Updates and the weekly 4825 Glenbrook Road updates and photos. The August and October Partner meetings were not held, but project update presentations were posted in lieu of meeting minutes.

**B. Task Group Updates**

**RAB Technical Assistance for Public Participation (TAPP) Consultant**

- The 2-year contract for the TAPP advisor Devamita Chattopadhyay, Ph.D., a local Environmental/Chemical Engineer, was awarded in September through Dayton Group, Inc. (DGI).
- USACE and ERT held a brief orientation with Dr. Chattopadhyay ahead of this meeting. A site tour for Dr. Chattopadhyay is expected before the end of the year.

Comment from Dr. Chattopadhyay - Hello, everybody. I am really honored to be acting as the TAPP advisor. I am a chemical engineer by training, by degree, but I have worked a fairly long time in environmental consulting. I have over 20 years of experience, so I have been in this area for quite some time. I started my career in Ohio, and recently I moved to Maryland, and I am liking it here.

D. Noble welcomed Dr. Chattopadhyay to the project.

**II. USACE Program Updates****A. Annual Project Funding****1. FY20, Actual Funding (\$10.168 M)**

- Military Munitions Response Program (\$10.046 M):
  - Site-Wide Remedial Action (RA) (\$6.198 M)
  - Conduct RA at 4825 Glenbrook Road (\$3.613 M)
  - Stakeholder Outreach
  - Site Security
  - Potentially Responsible Party (PRP) Effort
- Hazardous Toxic Waste (HTW) (\$0.090 M):
  - Site-Wide RA (\$0.000 M)
  - Groundwater Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study/Proposed Plan/Decision Document (RI/FS/PP/DD) (\$0.090 M)
- TAPP Consultant (\$0.032 M):
  - RAB Technical Consultant (\$0.023 M)
  - RAB Cost (\$0.009 M)

**2. FY21, Projected Funding (\$4.934 M)**

- Military Munitions Response Program (\$4.628 M):
  - Site-Wide RA (\$4.251 M)
  - RA at 4825 Glenbrook Road (\$0.340 M)
  - Stakeholder Outreach
  - Site Security
  - PRP Effort
- HTW (\$0.256 M):
  - Site-Wide Remedial Action (\$0.000 M)
  - Groundwater RI/FS/PP/DD (\$0.256 M)
- TAPP Consultant (\$0.050 M):
  - RAB Technical Consultant (\$0.025 M) This is the statutory spending limit allowed.
  - RAB Cost (\$0.025 M)

### 3. Funding Summary Chart

- All the funding numbers through 2020 are actual numbers for spending. The \$4.934 M for FY21 is the planned funding estimate.
- To date, \$334.69M has been spent on the Spring Valley Project.

### B. Site-Wide Remedial Action (RA)

D. Noble briefly reviewed the Site-Wide Remedial Design (RD)/Remedial Action (RA).

#### 1. COVID-19 Response:

The project team continues to implement safety measures in response to COVID-19 including: daily health monitoring of all workers, wearing masks, decontaminating tools, frequent hand washing, and social distancing.

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

- Currently working on Eighty-nine (89) residential properties at different stages of the remedial action process.
- Eighty-nine (89) civil surveys and eighty-nine (89) arborist surveys have been completed.
- Eighty-nine (89) properties have been visited by the geophysical team to provide technical recommendations on plant removal and landscape adjustments.
- Vegetation has been removed from seventy-eight (78) private properties and all thirteen (13) Federal/City lots.
- Geophysical surveys completed at seventy-eight (78) private properties and 11 Federal/City lots along Dalecarlia Parkway.
- Anomaly removal completed at seventy (70) private properties and 7 Federal/City lots along Dalecarlia Parkway.
- Issued forty-three (43) Assurance Letters.
- The teams expect to have approximately eighty (80) properties completed by the end of the year.
- Restoration activities will be conducted through the winter and into spring 2021.

#### 3. Planned Remedial Action Area Map

The Remedial Action Progress map for the 92 residential properties and 13 Federal/City lots on slide #12 of the presentation shows:

- Properties with no color and highlighted with blue borders indicate residential properties and city lots that have been completed.
- Properties shown in green indicate properties that have active contact and are undergoing the RA clean-up process.
- Properties shown in blue indicate properties where efforts are being made to engage the properties but have not yet reached a firm commitment. To date, 4 properties remain unclear whether access will be given.

Question from Mary Bresnahan, Community Member - I have listened to every word you said, and I have heard this before, but if these property owners refuse to let anything be done, can that be sustained?

D. Noble explained that since the properties are private properties, the only option that USACE

has is to explain to the homeowners that the remedial effort is worthwhile. From USACE's perspective, the goal is to remediate the four areas associated with the former American University Experiment Station (AUES) testing activities. Good coverage of the properties has been achieved at three out of the four areas, but there are three of the remaining properties in the last area. USACE will need to calculate the percent of coverage in the 4th area and discuss the results with the Partners. The team continues to reach out to the remaining property owners.

Question from M. Bresnahan, Community Member - I am taking it they need remediation, is that correct?

D. Noble confirmed.

Question from M. Bresnahan, Community Member - Now, when you talk to them, do they understand that there are disclosures that go out should they wish to sell their property? And they could cause their property to lose quite a bit of value? By the way, I am a real estate agent, and I am very familiar with all the disclosures and also the [Ed. garbled] that goes out for Spring Valley regarding this issue. I am just wondering, is that ever brought up in the discussions? Because that is a pretty serious thing.

D. Noble explained that in any one of the remaining areas where a property owner has declined, the coverage might still be sufficient for the Partners to determine that the issues in those areas have been addressed. If there is only one property that has declined and good coverage was achieved on the surrounding properties, the Partners might conclude that the remediation is complete in that area.

Question from Dr. Chattopadhyay, RAB TAPP Advisor - Will they still be getting the assurance letters from USACE or not really?

D. Noble explained that if a property owner declines remediation activities on their property, that property owner will not receive a property-specific assurance letter. At the completion of the Spring Valley project, a Remedial Action Report will be issued that states that sufficient coverage was achieved in that area. The homeowner would have to rely on the Remedial Action Report from USACE and the Partners, since there would be no assurance letter.

Comment from M. Bresnahan, Community Member - I think that is really serious, when it comes to real estate. I have been on some of these (real estate) committees and actually even had a say in how to write some of these addendums [Ed. garbled] some issues they had way back when.

D. Noble explained that the Remedial Action Report will cover all the items found, including munitions debris (MD) and items with an associated hazard. To date, only three items with an associated hazard have been found.

Question from M. Bresnahan, Community Member - That is that 3-inch target of interest?

D. Noble confirmed this and explained that the find will be covered in a slide later in the presentation.

#### **4. Site Restoration Conducted at Completed Properties**

After the final Restoration Walk-through with homeowners, the team will begin the reimbursement process or scheduling property restoration.

#### **5. Anomaly Excavation Finds**

During intrusive investigations on September 16, the team encountered an intact 3-inch Stokes mortar round on Quebec Street within Area of Interest (AOI) 13.

- The Army Corps' Ordnance and Explosives Safety Specialist and an Explosive Ordnance Disposal (EOD) unit from Joint Base Andrews responded to the site.
- The item was x-rayed in place, examined, and safely transported offsite by the EOD unit for disposal. The item was destroyed on the range the same day. Based on observations of the explosion during disposal, the EOD unit reported that the 3" Stokes mortar contained 2.5 pounds of high explosive (HE) filler. Due to the HE filler, the item was determined to be a munitions and explosives of concern (MEC) item.

Question from Tom Smith, Community Member - How deep was this item? How far down?

D. Noble explained that the item was located 1 foot down. The Man-Portable Vector (MPV), an advanced geophysical instrument, identified the item as a 3-inch Stokes mortar before excavation of the item. This property was part of the previous remedial investigation in 2006. At that time, approximately 20 to 25 anomalies were investigated on the property. During the previous remedial investigation, the teams were not removing vegetation for anomaly investigation, only investigating open areas. The Stokes mortar was located in the footprint of a large mature rhododendron. During the current remedial action, the homeowner allowed the removal of the rhododendron to scan the ground underneath that had not been previously investigated.

Question from T. Smith, Community Member - So, does it mean, when it says 3-inch, does that mean that it was 3 inches down in the ground below the surface?

D. Noble explained that '3-inch' indicates the type of Stokes mortar.

Question from T. Smith, Community Member - So, my question was, how far below the surface was this item on Quebec Street?

D. Noble explained that the item was found 1 foot down.

Comment from T. Smith, Community Member - Thank you.

Comment from Allen Hengst, Audience Member - I posted questions in the chat box; I think you answered them all except for the last one: Please provide more details on the excavation and removal of the intact 3-inch Stokes mortar round from AOI 13 on September 16. How deep below ground surface was it found? Where precisely offsite was it transported for disposal? Since the munition was intact and AOI 13 is labeled as a "possible disposal area," can you guess where the other shells might have been dumped?

Comment from A. Hengst, Audience Member - It is just the last one, you answered the others already.

D. Noble explained that AOI 13 is an area of interest because in the RI report the area was labeled as a potential disposal area based on the activities performed by the military in the days of the AUES. The Stokes mortar was a single item identified by the MPV. The teams also use another instrument at every property that searches for large amounts of metal clustered together at a deeper level that may indicate a disposal area. This property received that type of survey and there was no indication of a disposal area. Coincidentally, AOI 13 is also a group of 13 properties. This property was #12, and there is only one remaining property in the group. This area will receive 100% property participation for remedial action.

Question from A. Hengst, Audience Member - Can you explain why it was still intact? Why do you have intact munitions ready to blow up a foot below ground surface [Ed. garbled]?

D. Noble explained that in areas where the military has operated nation-wide, there are items that are left behind, including intact munitions that are either discarded or dropped on the ground. There is a difference between discarded military munitions and munitions that are intended to explode but never exploded. Munitions that are intended to explode but did not explode are called unexploded ordnance (UXO) items. There is no way to know if a Stokes mortar is a discarded munition or a UXO item. In this case, the Stokes mortar contained a high explosive fill, so there was detonation potential associated with the item, but it would take a lot to make the item explode. There is no way to determine if an excavated Stokes mortar has been fired. Based on where the item was found, in AOI 13 bordering the AU campus and the former experiment station, it is likely that the Stokes mortar was not fired. The item was not found in an impact area. The item may have been a munition brought in to be worked on and discarded in the area for some reason. The item was most likely a discarded military munition, rather than UXO.

## 6. RA MEC/MD Finds

The summation of finds map in the presentation shows where the items have been recovered.

Items highlighted in red indicate MEC items. The area in the bottom right of the map is AOI 13. The location of the recent Stokes mortar find is highlighted, along with several MD items found in AOI 13. The Stokes mortar was found outside the range fan and not close to the impact area. The item is believed to be a discarded munition rather than a UXO that never exploded.

- The circle in the middle bottom of the map indicates the Sedgewick Trench area. A civil war-era black powder cannonball was found in this area in April 2019. Several MD items were found in this area.
- The Impact Area is located in the center of the map and indicated by the rectangular shape. A Livens projectile was found in this area in April 2020; described in slides sent to the RAB over the summer. Several MD items were found in this area.
- The Static Test Fire Area is indicated by the triangle shape on the left side of the map. To date, no hazardous items have been found in this area, only a few MD items. More work remains on some of the larger properties and city lots in this area.
- The data on the map only relates to the remedial action; munitions found during the remedial investigation are not shown.

## 7. Tentative Schedule

- Fall 2020
  - Continue geophysical surveys.
  - Continue anomaly removal efforts.
  - Continue obtaining Rights-of-Entry from the next group of homeowners.
- Winter 2020/2021
  - 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.

### C. Former Public Safety Building (PSB)

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

#### 1. Recent Activities

- The team completed digging test pits at the site which helped determine the final excavation boundaries for the PSB, as well as to conduct confirmation soil sampling.
- Excavation to these final boundaries were initiated in October to depths up to 8 feet below slab grade.
- All excavated material is transferred to the sorting table, processed, and transferred offsite for analysis and disposal. The team continues to encounter lab-grade glassware. The glassware is separated from the soil material and transferred offsite for analysis.
- Once excavation is completed within a grid cell, the team reviews the data to confirm the excavation floor and soil meets the cleanup criteria.
- After this is confirmed, backfilling activities are conducted in the grid cell. This includes non-woven geotextile, No. 2 stone, and imported granular fill.
- Large, concrete bin blocks are installed around the borders of the grid cell to contain the layers of fill. Once the backfill is in place and compacted using a remote-controlled vibratory drum compactor, the blocks are removed.

The team reached final excavation depth in six of the ten grid cells and is working in the four grid cells that have not yet reached final excavation depths.

#### 2. Excavation Depths

Based on the test pit excavations, the team determined final excavation depths for each of the grid cells, as represented on grid map (slide #21) in the presentation:

- Green indicates grid soil to be excavated to 4 feet below ground surface.
- Purple indicates grid soil to be excavated to 5 feet below ground surface.
- Yellow/Orange indicates grid soil to be excavated to 6 feet below ground surface.
- Red indicates grid soil to be excavated to 7 feet below ground surface.
- Gray indicates grid soil to be excavated to 8 feet below ground surface.

Additionally, as an overview of the PSB site showing the sloped hillside, excavation area, a highlighted area where AUES debris was previously observed extending into the hillside as presented at the September RAB meeting, and identified areas of the previously removed sump and clean backfill area from trenching completed in 2008.

Question from A. Hengst, Audience Member - I posted questions in the chat box: Do you know "when" to expect that report on how to safely chase the contamination north INTO the hillside? Will USACE make the report public?

K. Berg explained that the team is currently working to form a contract to perform a preliminary investigation to determine how far the debris extends into the hillside. Once the preliminary investigation is performed, an approach for the removal of that debris will be developed. The approach is still in the planning stages.

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

#### 3. American University Hazardous and Toxic Waste (HTW) Soil Removal



The Site-Wide DD included areas around the AU south campus that contained elevated levels of metals in the soil. The remaining efforts for these areas are two locations behind the Hamilton Building. SAU-RA1 contained elevated Cobalt and Vanadium, and SAU-RA2 contained elevated Cobalt.

- RA1 (AU-03) and RA2 (AU-02): the excavation work behind the Hamilton Building on AU campus was completed in September.
- The team removed the soil and completed backfill efforts with clean approved fill, topsoil, a grass mix, and an erosion control blanket for the two excavation areas.
- USACE considers all contaminated soil removal for the Spring Valley Formerly Used Defense Site complete.

These two areas were the last areas to be officially addressed for contaminated soil. For bookkeeping and organizational reasons, the work conducted in the footprint of the former PSB and continuing into the hillside is officially happening, not because of contaminated soil, but for potential munitions from a disposal area in WWI. The remaining soil at the PSB is being addressed for the possibility of munitions being present.

Question from A. Hengst, Audience Member - Will you make the report public?

D. Noble explained that there will not likely be a report on how far the debris extends into the hillside. The team will gather the information, continue with the PSB effort, and expand the scope of the clean-up workplan to include these areas. USACE will keep the public informed through RAB meetings and other means, such as the website, on the status of the investigation.

Question from T. Smith, Community Member - I have a question, and it is about the AU campus but not necessarily specific about the PSB. I know AU has already identified a number of sites that they plan to build on as part of their new campus plan. Have they been in touch with you all about these potential sites and had any discussion with you about them?

D. Noble explained that AU has not contacted USACE about every building plan AU is considering. AU does reach out to USACE for information when AU has concrete plans for building, and USACE shares the data with AU.

Question from T. Smith, Community Member - I think what they are looking at is around the fields on the back of the campus, and also at the area of Gray and Roper Halls, just on the other side of the PSB. Did they talk to you at all about it?

D. Noble explained that AU recently asked about an area, but D. Noble could not recall the specific area. D. Noble suggested that T. Smith send his questions on specific areas and D. Noble would look into any discussions with AU.

Comment from T. Smith, Community Member - I will do that. Thanks, Dan.

## **D. Glenbrook Road**

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

### **1. 4835 Glenbrook Road**

- The results of the third round of non-quantitative passive soil gas monitoring at borehole

locations in the basement showed no chemical agent or chemical agent breakdown products (ABPs). No source for chemical agent or ABPs was detected under the house.

- Crews completed the trenching for utilities along the shared property line and installed the replacement utilities for the water and sewer lines.
- USACE and Partners are working with American University (AU) to determine the final path forward to complete this aspect of Glenbrook project area.

## **2. 4825 Glenbrook Road**

- At the end of September, the site team continued with backfilling the site and completed installing sewer and water lines along the 4835 shared property line, which included backfilling and compacting the two utility trenches.
- While completing the installation of the utilities the crew recovered one piece of broken lab glassware. No odors or soil stain was observed, and all testing of the nearby soil and the broken glass determined there was no chemical contamination present.
- The team has completed approximately 30% of the planned backfill and compaction effort to fully restore the site.
- In October, the crew located and tested additional sources in the nearby surrounding area for the large volume of quality clean backfill needed. The clean backfill is almost depleted at the current source, and each source must be tested for all the contaminants analyzed at the site over the years. Test kits for the sampling were prepared, and the crew collected and shipped the samples to a commercial lab for analysis. Samples from any potential backfill sources are tested prior to being selected to ensure material is clean and suitable for site restoration activities.

## **3. Tentative Schedule**

- Fall/Winter 2020:
  - Continue the planned final site restoration tasks for the Glenbrook 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.
- Winter 2021 - anticipated project completion.

## **E. Groundwater Feasibility Study / Dispute Resolution**

Todd Beckwith, USACE Baltimore provided a review of the Groundwater Remedial Investigation (RI) and a brief update on the Groundwater Feasibility Study (FS).

The map on slide #34 of the presentation shows the area of original concern for groundwater. The circled area represents Exposure Unit 2 (EU2), where exceedances continued to be observed in the groundwater above drinking water levels. Monitoring wells PZ-4D and MW-44 had elevated levels of perchlorate and multi-port well MP-2 had elevated arsenic (As) in the past.

The Partners agreed to collect another round of groundwater samples to confirm the results of the groundwater sampling conducted in September 2019. The groundwater sampling event took place on June 23 through 26 and was conducted by the Army Corps and the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS).

The sampling results in June, presented at the last RAB meeting, were similar to the September

2019 results:

- All the results for As at MP-2, a multi-port well with eight different sampling ports at eight different depths, were below the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Maximum Contaminant Level (MCL) level of 10 parts per billion (ppb) for drinking water. This confirmed the September 2019 results of As below 10 ppb.
- For perchlorate, the results at PZ-4D and MW-44, in front of AU's Kreeger Hall, were still above EPA's drinking water advisory level of 15 ppb.

As there was not a new Maximum Contaminant Level (MCL) for perchlorate established by the EPA, USACE and the Partners are now discussing an appropriate comparison criterion for perchlorate. EPA has recommended that the team continue to use the 15 ppb drinking water advisory level as the comparison criteria for perchlorate.

The slides sent out to the RAB yesterday have since been updated. The updated slides will be sent out after the RAB meeting today.

USACE and the Partners discussed the path forward for the final groundwater approach based on the September 2019 and June 2020 sampling results. The conclusions of the discussion include:

- The team will conduct one more round of groundwater sampling for perchlorate at PZ-4D and MW-44, in front of Kreeger Hall. The purpose of the sampling is to confirm that the perchlorate levels are steady or decreasing at that location.
- If the perchlorate levels are consistent with past results, USACE and the Partners agree that no further action will be required for perchlorate.
- For As, there have been two consecutive sampling events with As results below the MCL of 10 ppb. USACE and the Partners agree that no further action is required.

Question from A. Hengst, Audience Member - I have a question, Todd. I put it in the chat box. There is one for Brian, too: Can you comment on the likelihood that the new EPA director will overrule the decision not to establish an MCL for perchlorate? Maybe Brian could weigh in?

T. Beckwith explained that he could not comment on the likelihood that the new EPA director will overrule the decision not to establish an MCL for perchlorate.

Brian Barone, Agency Representative - Department of Energy & Environment (DOEE) explained that he could not comment on the likelihood that the new EPA director will overrule the decision not to establish an MCL for perchlorate.

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

Depending on the results of the additional sampling effort, if the results are as expected, USACE will revise the Groundwater Remedial Investigation (RI) Report to include the new data and any conclusions and then USACE will proceed with a No-Action Groundwater Proposed Plan (PP) and No-Action Groundwater Decision Document (DD).

### **III. Community Items**

### **IV. Open Discussion and Future RAB Agenda Development**

The next RAB meeting will be January 12 and will be conducted using the same virtual format.

Comment from G. Beumel, Community Co-Chair - First, I was wondering if anyone on the RAB

wanted to actually introduce a motion thanking M. Pritzker for his work over the years. Even though he is not here, we could send him a notice that there was a motion and publicly passed.

Comment from T. Smith, Community Member - So moved.

Comment from G. Beumel, Community Co-Chair - Thank you. Is there a second?

[Ed. unknown Community Member speaker] - I second.

The motion was passed by unanimous consent.

Comment from Carrie Johnston, ERT - Community Outreach Team - I would just recommend to the RAB members, see if anybody is interested in joining the RAB, we do have a position opening with M. Pritzker's announcement.

Comment from G. Beumel, Community Co-Chair – That was one other item, that between now and the next meeting, should you be interested in being the chair of the membership committee, please send an email to D. Noble and he will pass that on to me; or Dan, who would like to receive it at USACE?

Whitney Gross, Spring Valley Community Outreach Program explained that she is available to receive the emails at Whitney.L.Gross@USACE.Army.mil

Comment from G. Beumel, Community Co-Chair - Ok, thank you, Whitney. So, send an email to W. Gross, and if not, we will try to twist somebody's arm and have them do that. Ok? Alright, Dan, as far as I am concerned, if someone moves to close the meeting we will do so.

Comment from Lawrence Miller, Community Member - So moved.

[Ed. unknown Community Member speaker] - I second.

The motion was passed by unanimous consent.

#### **A. Upcoming Meeting Topics**

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

#### **B. Next RAB Meeting:**

Tuesday, January 12, 2021

#### **C. Open Discussion**

#### **V. Public Comments**

Comment from A. Hengst, Audience Member - Thank you USACE for posting ppt from Partnering meetings! I hope it continues after COVID is over.

#### **VI. Adjourn**

The conference call was adjourned at 8:13 PM.