

**Spring Valley Partnering Meeting
February 4, 2016
Spring Valley Project Federal Property Conference Room**

Name	Organization/Address	
Sherri Anderson-Hudgins	USACE - Huntsville	X
Thomas Bachovchin	ERT	X
Brenda Barber	USACE - Baltimore	X
Todd Beckwith	USACE - Baltimore	
Janelle Boncal	Parsons	
Bethany Bridgham	American University	X
Sean Buckley	Parsons	X
Paul Chrostowski	CPF Associates, American University Consultant	
Tom Colozza	USACE - Baltimore	
Jennifer Conklin	DOEE	
Kathy Davies	EPA – Region III	
Eva Falls	DA Intern - Baltimore District	X
Dr. Peter deFur	Environmental Stewardship Concepts/RAB TAPP Consultant	X
Diane Douglas	DOEE	
Bill Eaton	URS	
Chris Gardner	USACE – Corporate Communications Office	X
Alma Gates	RAB Member – Horace Mann Representative	X
Steven Hirsh	EPA –Region III	X
Holly Hostetler	ERT	X
Dawn Iovan	EPA – Region III	
Carrie Johnston	ERT – Community Outreach Team	
Dan Noble	USACE - Baltimore	X
Cliff Opdyke	USACE - Baltimore	
Randall Patrick	Parsons	X

Amy Rosenstein	ERT – Risk Assessor, Independent Consultant	
Lattie Smart	ERT - Community Outreach Team	
Jim Sweeney	DOEE	X
Tenkasi Viswanathan	USACE – Washington Aqueduct	
Cheryl Webster	USACE - Baltimore	
Ethan Weikel	USACE - Baltimore	
Nan Wells	ANC 3D Commissioner	
Maya Werner	ERT	X
Kellie Williams	USACE - Huntsville	
Bruce Whisenant	USACE - Huntsville	X
Rebecca Yahiel	ERT – Community Outreach Team	X
Alex Zahl	USACE - Baltimore	X

Summary of 4 February 2016 Spring Valley Partnering Meeting

Consensus Decisions

- None

4 February 2016 Action Items

- DOEE and EPA-Region III will review the arsenic removal comfort letter of a 3700 Block of Fordham Road property and return the signed letter to U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE).
- ERT will send EPA-Region III examples of both Fort A.P. Hill, Virginia and Blossom Point Research Facility, Maryland final Institutional Analyses (IAs) using questionnaire tables to develop the IA document.

Thursday 4 February 2016

Check-in

The Partners conducted their normal check-in procedure.

A. 4825 Glenbrook Road Remedial Action

The goal of this segment of the meeting was to review the status of the remedial action at 4825 Glenbrook Road.

Parsons deconstructed the Tent 2 structure in order to move the tent to the 3rd and final location (Tent 3). Deconstruction of Tent 2 started on November 12th and was completed on December 4th. Tent 3 construction was completed on January 11th. All formerly exposed areas have been covered with geotextile fabric, clean fill, and gravel. Parsons installed additional erosion control measures for the holiday break-shutdown.

Parsons completed structure construction of the tent's truck door on December 15th and began installing the following equipment:

- Video Cameras
- Electrical service lines inside the structure
- Ducting
- Air lines
- Personnel Decontamination Station (PDS) Tent
- Redress Tent

Before the large snow storm at the end of January, Parsons was able to dismantle the Redress Tent, but was not able to dismantle the PDS Tent. After the storm, a large amount of snow fell from the Engineering Control Structure (ECS), crushing the PDS Tent. Snow cleanup was completed February 1st. A new PDS tent was procured and set up, and will be connected to the structure by a vestibule when the vestibule is completed. The vestibule is at 90% completion at this time.

On January 20th, testing was performed on the Shelter-in- Place (SIP) system to ensure that it was fully functional. Additional tests will be performed the first week in February. The Community Outreach Team will provide any necessary re-training for the residents within the Shelter-in-Place zone.

Future activities include:

- Complete vestibule set-up
- Perform smoke test to ensure negative pressure within the structure
- Conduct several days of refresher training led by the Office of Emergency Shelter and Services (OESS)

Parsons anticipates resuming high probability operations the week of February 15th. Once high probability operations resume, the work will occur Monday through Friday, from 8 AM to 4 PM. Parsons will notify the neighborhood when they have determined the exact start-up date. High probability operations under Tent 3 are scheduled to be completed by late November of 2016.

Question from Dr. Peter de Fur, Environmental Stewardship Concepts/RAB TAPP Consultant: Is any of the equipment affected by the ice and snow; specifically the electronics, the SIP alarm systems, for example?

Parsons explained that other than the PDS Tent being crushed, all of the systems are weatherized.

American University (AU), Parsons, and USACE-Baltimore District discussed the prospect of outdoor athletic programs starting up again at AU. The new SIP zone for Tent 3 should not affect activities on the AU athletic fields.

USACE noted that the Department of Transportation permit to transport Recovered Chemical Warfare Materiel (RCWM) has expired. USACE is in the process of renewing the permit. In the meantime, any RCWM will be transported as an emergency situation using a Multiple Round Container (MRC). USACE will provide updates to the Partners as they are available.

B. Pilot Project

The goal of this segment of the meeting was to provide an update on Pilot Project planning.

USACE-Baltimore District provided a brief update on the status of the Pilot Project. Through ongoing discussions with the Navy Research Lab (NRL), the Pilot Project will go forward using the Time-domain Electromagnetic Multi-sensor Tower Array Detection System (TEMTADS) and the Man Portable Vector (MPV). These instruments seem well suited to the project, enabling better maneuverability around existing landscaping and residential buildings. The NRL will operate both systems for USACE. The Pilot Project will consist of 5 properties, implementing Advanced Classification (AC) information. The 5 properties will be chosen from a group of properties that have already undergone a geophysical survey, giving a comparison with the new AC technology. Criteria for choosing candidate properties also include diversity of landforms, such as slopes and landscaping. Close to 99% of detected anomalies will be excavated. Homeowners given

the opportunity to participate in the Pilot Project will need to weigh the balance of having their property finished sooner, with the possibility of more holes being excavated on the property in the process. USACE will use the results of the Pilot Project to develop a Remedial Action plan for the remaining 98 properties. The Pilot Project should begin this spring or summer (2016), to receive results by the end of the 2016 calendar year.

In response to a question by Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Region III, USACE confirmed that there will be a Pilot Project work plan finalized in April or May, which will cover USACE's plans. USACE will follow the Pilot Project guidance laid out by the EPA. Environmental Security Technology Certification Program (ESTCP) will produce a separate work plan. A final report will be developed in the fall of 2016.

C. Groundwater Remedial Investigation (RI)

The purpose of this segment of the meeting was to review the status of the Groundwater RI report.

USACE briefly reviewed the status of the Groundwater RI report. All comments for the Draft Groundwater RI report have been received from the Partners. The Response to Comments (RTCs) document is scheduled to be sent out in the next week. Two issues that still remain include, the policy discussion between the Department of Defense (DOD) and the EPA; and the permitting process for homeowners who want to dig a groundwater well. USACE does not have a timeline for when the policy issue will be resolved. Once the RTCs has been finalized, the Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) will be briefed.

USACE noted that Ed Hughes, Hazardous and Toxic Waste (HTW) Project Manager, has proposed to USACE's North Atlantic Division to separate the Groundwater HTW project from the rest of the Spring Valley remediation efforts in order to close out other projects as they conclude. Eventually this will leave the Groundwater Remediation as the only remaining project. USACE-Baltimore, USACE-Huntsville and EPA Region III discussed the value of separating out the projects in order to show a phase completion for the RI and Feasibility Study (FS) documents.

D. Site – Wide Feasibility Study (FS)

The purpose of this segment of the meeting was to provide an update on the Feasibility Study (FS).

USACE announced that the FS was finalized as of January 29th and has been placed on the project website. The RAB was notified and the link to the electronic copy was made available to the members. At this time, the Partners should have received an e-mail with the electronic copy as well. USACE inquired as to how many Partners needed a hard copy of the FS. Tom Bachovchin, ERT, will provide hard copies to those members that indicated they need one.

Last week, USACE-Baltimore sent the PP to USACE Center of Expertise (CX) for review during a 3 week period. After the PP is reviewed by the CX, USACE will send the PP to the Partners. The PP contained the preferred alternative for HTW, which is excavation with offsite disposal. The chosen alternative for munitions concerns was Alternative 6, which is using AC in accessible areas and only excavating those anomalies that AC identifies as munitions.

USACE-Baltimore, USACE-Huntsville, EPA Region III, and P. de Fur discussed the time frame for the partner and public comment period following the review of the PP. EPA Region III pointed out that the legal review alone for the EPA would take 30 days, so 45 days would allow for EPA to review and return the document. All agreed the 45 days would be a reasonable amount of time for the Partner's comment period. After the Partner comment period, USACE will prepare a formal draft final to be released for a public comment.

F. Institutional Analysis (IA)

The purpose of this segment of the meeting was to review the IA document.

Maya Werner, ERT, reviewed the IA document, which was first introduced by T. Bachovchin, ERT, in 2015. The IA identifies institutions and how they would be involved in supporting a site-wide Remedial

Action Objective (RAO). The RAO consists of awareness activities on a site-wide basis that would reduce the probability of residents, contractor/maintenance workers, and visitors/passers-by from handling munitions and explosives of concern (MEC) encountered during residential or construction/maintenance activities conducted within the Spring Valley Formerly Used Defense Site (SVFUDS). The focus of the IA is to highlight institutions that have been involved with the SVFUDS, and outline how those institutions might implement the site-wide RAO.

Standard IA questionnaire tables have been developed to assess each institution's position on supporting the RAO. Each table lists Origin of Institution, Basis of Authority, Mission of the Agency, and Public Safety and Land Use Control Functions, if any. The IA and tables are being tailored to the unique SVFUDS, where there are private entities that may support implementation of the site-wide RAO.

Table questionnaires have been sent to AU and EPA-Region III, DOEE. USACE-Baltimore seeks feedback on the questions in the tables. The basic questions were laid out by the DoD guidance and policy, but these institutions may have other questions to add to the tables. After initial feedback from today's meeting, the tables would then be sent out to the other institutions.

AU forwarded the tables to Paul Chrostowski, CPF Associates, AU Consultant, and Dan Nichols, Director of AU's Risk Management and Compliance Office. AU expects feedback from both offices.

EPA-Region III noted that the Secretary of Defense has recently delegated Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) 104-(e) authority to USACE, which grants property access authority equal to that of the EPA.

EPA-Region III commented that the EPA may not be 'willing to commit' to implementing the USACE remedy, however, it may be a matter of semantics. EPA will provide technical and legal support to the USACE remedy effort, but want to be careful about what they say in reference to committing EPA resources in the future.

EPA-Region III's questioned where this document will be placed and whether IA will be released as a document and reviewed. USACE and ERT explained that the tables are a data call that is used to complete the IA document, and that the IA will be a standalone document identified as an addendum to the FS. The first part of the IA is evaluating which institutions would be willing to support implementation of the RAO, but not how it would be implemented. That information would contribute to the planning phase.

P. deFur asked why not have the IA as an appendix to the Record of Decision (ROD) document. EPA-Region III explained that because of the level of detail, if the IA were part of the ROD someone could file a citizen's suit based on the document. In addition, if anything should change in the IA going forward, changing parts of the ROD would be a difficult process.

USACE-Baltimore, EPA-Region III, USACE-Huntsville, ERT, and P. de Fur discussed whether it would be beneficial to have a sample final IA from a similar project, in order to see the document in context. Two similar projects include Ft. A.P. Hill, Virginia and Blossom Point Research Facility, Maryland. ERT will send EPA-Region III examples of both final IAs from other projects that used questionnaire tables to develop the rest of the document.

AU posed a question of cost: If AU signs on in support, would that mean a greater cost to the institution? AU already has a disclosure policy in place for hiring vendors or anyone using the athletic fields. USACE replied that since the area was built up over the FUDS, those expenses are inherent regardless. USACE is setting the objective for itself to achieve an RAO, and seeking what other institutions plan to do or would be willing to do on their own property to help achieve the RAO. Since AU already has protocols in place, that reduces the burden of developing an RAO for the entire site. The existence of AU's Risk & Compliance Office indicates that the institution is prepared to go forward in time dealing with the FUDS site. Rather than asking for a commitment, USACE is asking to formalize what each institution plans to do. ERT agreed with USACE, noting that in addition to assessing commitment, the data gathering tables would provide

information on constraints which may limit each institution's ability to participate. Information on factors such as funding or organizational constraints would be helpful to USACE when formulating a plan.

In response to a question by P. deFur concerning the criteria for deciding which institutions are included in the IA, USACE and ERT explained that institutions were chosen primarily based on whether those institutions have an existing infrastructure for informing the public about the FUDS situation. USACE considered churches as private property owners; and Horace Mann Elementary to be part of the school system, without a localized risk management office. USACE further explained that the IA is designed to assess which institutions will help with risk management and informing the public.

USACE-Huntsville asked if there is a permitting and/or training awareness process in place for property owners in the Spring Valley area. ERT responded that this was part of the DOEE review. DOEE explained that would be a completely different department, once the ROD is signed. DOEE is taking an interest in the IA now while there is still funding available.

Once comments are reviewed and additional questions have been added to the IA, USACE will send the tables to Washington Aqueduct, National Park Service, Sibley Memorial Hospital, and Wesley Theological Seminary, with the addition of Horace Mann Elementary after today's discussion.

G. Open Issues

1. Comfort Letter

DOEE commented that he did recall receiving the Comfort Letter in November, and thought he had returned it with the changes he had made. He will review it again and send it back. EPA-III requested no new wording in the document.

2. Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR)

USACE noted that ATSDR had said they would hold a public comment period in February, but have moved it back to March. USACE-Corporate Communications office indicated that he understands the ATSDR intend to share their communication plan in March and attend the March RAB meeting and claim that to be their official public meeting. USACE believes ATSDR are not required to have a public meeting, and have extended an open invitation from the RAB. USACE suggested stressing the importance of ATSDR briefing the property owners before discussing their properties publicly. EPA-Region III made the point that the RAB should be reminded that the ATSDR's visit will only address 4825 Glenbrook Road, and no other properties.

H. Future Agenda Items

1. Briefing by Dr. Herb Nelson in April.
2. Groundwater RI Update

I. Agenda Building

The next meeting was tentatively scheduled for Thursday April 7, 2016.

J. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 11:24.