

McClellan AFB Restoration Advisory Board (RAB)

Meeting Minutes

April 23, 1997

6:30 p.m.

Vineland Elementary School

RAB Members Attending:

Chuck Yarbrough, Community Co-Chair; Elaine Anderson, McClellan AFB Co-Chair; Randy Adams, Department of Toxic Substances Control; Pete Berghuis; Brad Gacke; Mannard Gaines; Bill Gibson; Dennis Green; Sheila Guerra; Joe Healy, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency; Jeannie Lewis; Ben Norman; Simeon Okoroike; Bill Shepherd; Burl Taylor

RAB Members Not Attending: James Bryant, Del Callaway, John Leuthe, Alex MacDonald, Susan McKee, Cody Tubbs

Alternates Attending: Dennis Lewis

Others Attending: Stephanie Benedict, Mary Bridgewater, Starr Dehn, Patrick Foy, Margaret Gidding, Ron Hergenrader, Jack Holderby, Don Jones, Terry Lindeman, Diane McLellan, Frank Miller, Mike Prall, Maj. Robert Senchy, Rick Solander, Sudakar Talanki, Jerry Vincent, Gerald Vogt, Mike Ward, Blue Wrigley

Action Items:

Action Item	Champion	Timeframe	Status
<i>PREVIOUS MEETING</i>			
Report back to RAB on the outcome of the discussion of the GWMP.	Technical Report Committee members	Next RAB meeting	Open
Discuss alternate pool (from CR committee)	RAB members	March 6 Executive Session	Closed

Discuss Rideshare program at next ECF.	McClellan AFB EM	May ECF meeting	Closed
Discuss the matter of the security guard	RAB members	March 6 Executive Session	Closed
Distribute RAB calendar to public so they can attend committee meetings	McClellan AFB EM	Next RAB meeting	Closed
Elect new committee chair for coming year	Each RAB committee	By April RAB	Closed
Review draft GWMP and submit comments by March 10.	Chuck Yarbrough, Del Callaway	By March 10	Closed
Review proposed changes to bylaws and charter. Give comments to any committee chair or community co-chair.	RAB members	March 6 Executive Session	Closed
<i>CURRENT MEETING</i>			
Follow-up with CR committee on issue of microfilm reader	Kevin Wong	June 18 CR Committee meeting	Open
Explain cost of new microfilm reader (for comparison)	Kevin Wong	June 18 CR Committee meeting	Open
Explain costs of IR in the 1980s	Margaret Gidding	June 18 CR Committee meeting	Open
Discuss mailing list for OU E-H residents with Sheila Guerra and CR Committee	Margaret Gidding	June 18 CR Committee meeting	Open

Determine whether televising RAB meetings on cable TV is possible.	EM	ASAP	Open
Put security guard on Executive Session agenda	EM	June 5 Executive Session	Closed

INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME

Mr. Yarbrough called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. He asked the RAB to introduce themselves to the audience.

APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MEETING MINUTES

Mr. Yarbrough asked for approval of the last meeting minutes. The following changes to the 5 February 1997 RAB meeting minutes were noted by Mr. Yarbrough and Ms. Anderson:

- Page 10, paragraph 2, second line, second sentence should read — McClellan Air Force Base (AFB) is considering two additional items for the budget for FY98 and FY99.
- Page 11, paragraph 7, first line should read — Mr. Yarbrough announced that he had received five passes from Richard Bennecke, . . . conference.

Mr. Yarbrough moved to approve the minutes as amended, Mr. Berghuis seconded. Minutes were approved unanimously.

Mr. Yarbrough reminded the RAB members of the informal community RAB members meeting. He suggested RAB community members meet again informally, perhaps at a picnic. Mr. Taylor suggested that the meeting could be held at one of McClellan's parks.

Mr. Yarbrough said that he had an idea from the Planning Team of the Local Reuse Authority (LRA). The Planning Team meetings are televised by Sacramento Cable Television (SCT). Mr. Yarbrough proposed that SCT broadcast RAB meetings. He

discovered that the airtime would be free and could be scheduled for the July 1997 RAB meeting. Mr. Yarbrough asked the RAB how they would feel having a general meeting broadcast on SCT. He said that it would allow more community members to view and indirectly participate in the RAB, would inform the community about environmental issues at McClellan AFB, and would allow alternate RAB members to start with current information. By general consensus, the RAB agreed that this was an idea worth pursuing. Ms. Lewis advised that the agenda should be developed with this in mind and should be strictly adhered to in order to maintain an audience. Mr. Yarbrough moved that he further investigate this idea, and if Environmental Management (EM) agrees, the RAB would invite SCT to broadcast the July RAB meeting. Mr. Gibson seconded. The vote was 10 in favor with 3 abstentions.

NEW BUSINESS

Budget Process

Ms. Anderson briefed the meeting participants on the budget process. She explained that EM prepares programming documents for a two-year time frame (FY98 and FY99). The programming documents contain information about program requirements, timeline, and cost estimates. Once this is completed, the technical project descriptions from that budget are sent to the Air Force Center for Environmental Excellence (AFCEE) for review of the technical merits of the project. The technical review includes costing, level of effort, and the remedial solutions that EM has chosen.

In early March 1997, McClellan AFB EM and AFCEE went through peer review for each proposed project. The revised programming documents will be submitted to the Base Closure Agency by 30 June 1997. Funds are expected in October, at the beginning of the fiscal year.

The peer review is a technical review of cleanup actions. The focus of this year's peer review was on long-term operations and monitoring costs. The review of the program was completed by representatives from the Base Closure Agency and Air Force Materiel Command. Although it was requested that EM go back and review the costing for a few projects, McClellan AFB has full validation on all of its projects.

Ms. Anderson reviewed a summary of the FY97 and FY98 projects. For FY97, one-third of the budget was spent on Remedial Investigation efforts. This consists of finding contamination and identifying what is needed for cleanup. Approximately 40% of the

budget was used for running cleanup systems. Approximately 16% of the budget went towards RD/RA, or, the design and installation of cleanup systems. McClellan EM has a budget of approximately \$24.2 million for FY97.

Some of the projects funded in FY97 included operating a groundwater extraction and treatment system. McClellan has very good groundwater plume capture on the west side of the base. Soil vapor extraction systems (SVE) have also been installed to address contamination in the soil vapor.

Fiscal Year 98 programs are expected to grow considerably in dollars. McClellan will request approximately \$39 million. This will allow the groundwater plumes on the east side of McClellan to be fully addressed. Base Well (BW) 18 will be decommissioned and replaced with a well field extraction that will keep the plume in the area contained.

Ben Norman asked if there is a reason BW 18 must be decommissioned instead of just sealing it at a deep level so water could be pumped from a shallower level. Bob Shirley and Kevin Wong of EM stated that it would be more cost effective to decommission it. As far as a water supply to the base, there are two other existing water supply wells on base and two hookups to municipal water districts. Mr. Norman asked if BW 18 is being used for drinking water now. Mr. Shirley said that it was being used for base consumption. The Groundwater Interim Record of Decision (IROD) Phase II remedial actions will contain the plume in that area. The design would capture the contamination in shallow wells. BW 18 is an extremely deep well.

Ms. Anderson continued, explaining that McClellan has two additional soil vapor extraction (SVE) systems planned for installation on the east side of the base. Over three quarters of the funding in FY98 will be directed towards installing and operating remedial actions.

One of the things McClellan is doing is looking at taking actions in support of reuse. EM is looking at those areas that are part of the depot competition that is currently taking place. These areas will be transferred over to the private sector, should they win, in January 1998. EM is staging the installation of systems that are needed prior to transferring the property. There are several actions planned in these areas: two examples are SVE installation and excavation for metals in surface soils.

In summary, approximately three-quarters of the budget is allocated to install and operate systems in 1998. McClellan has full validation of its budget and expects full funding in 1998. Ms. Lewis asked if two SVE systems were to be placed on the east side of the base in 1998. Ms. Anderson answered yes.

Remedial Investigation Process

Ms. Anderson explained the remedial investigation (RI) process is the process used for finding the contamination and assessing the risk posed by that contamination. The goal of the RI is to determine if there are public health risks that need to be addressed. If there is an immediate threat, such as the polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) at Operable Unit (OU) B 1, action is expedited to take care of the contamination. The potential future threats are also assessed. Future land use and the current laws determine what the cleanup levels will be. This information is needed to assure that the public is safe and that the property is cleaned up for transfer.

One of the first steps in a RI is to develop a Field Sampling Plan (FSP). Aerial photos, interviews with former employees, record searches, and any previous sampling are reviewed to locate potential contamination sites. The FSP contains all the information to explain why the sites are being sampled, how the site will be sampled, what type of samples will be collected, and what compounds will be analyzed for. The FSP can take up to one year to develop.

Sheila Guerra asked if a record of all people interviewed was available. Ms. Anderson said that Ms. Gidding has the report containing that information.

After the FSP is complete, the Phase 1 RI is conducted. Samples are collected and analyzed to confirm the presence of contamination. The Site Characterization Summary (SCS) contains information on: what was found, what it means, whether an immediate action is necessary or an action is required, or whether additional sampling is necessary.

Attempts to find sources of contamination are investigated during Phase 1. If additional sampling is required, then the next step for those sites will be the Phase 2 RI. Phase 2 evaluates how much contamination is present. When the investigation is complete, a Remedial Investigation Characterization Summary (RICS) is prepared (this is actually the RI Report).

It takes several years to get through the entire process. However, the process allows for: early identification of "source" areas; early identification of actions; early identification of "clean" sites; and cost reduction due to focused sampling.

Groundwater and subsurface soil contamination in OUs E through H have not been fully identified. McClellan is currently investigating 46 sites in OUs E-H. Operable Units E and F have potential ecological issues; therefore an ecological risk assessment will be conducted as well as a human health risk assessment. The FSP for OUs E through H was finalized on 18 April 1997. The first phase of sampling will be completed in October 1997. The second phase of sampling will be completed by October 1998. The final RICS will be concluded in late 1999.

In summary, the RI is a critical part of the process to identify areas needing cleanup and to ensure property is transferable. It is a series of events that goes from making plans and recommendations (FSP/RICS), to sampling, to interpreting the data for possible additional sampling, to final reports. This process will be complete at McClellan AFB in 1999.

Dennis Green asked where the risk assessment fits into the process, and whether the wet season vs. dry season taken into consideration during sampling. Ms. Anderson answered that the risk assessment is part of the RI. A risk assessment calculates risk under various exposure scenarios such as residential, construction worker, and indoor worker. This risk value is then used within the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) process to determine if action is needed. Wet and dry seasons are not much of a concern at McClellan AFB. The water table at McClellan does not fluctuate up or down; rather, there has been a steady decline in the water table over the years, of approximately one to two feet per year. At McClellan, groundwater contamination has been another driver that determines the need for cleanup. The groundwater contamination has a regulatory component; that is, maximum contaminant levels for drinking water. This law may set the cleanup level for groundwater.

Mr. Green asked how the declining water table impacts the process. Ms. Anderson said the water table at McClellan was approximately 30–40 feet lower than it was three decades ago. Some of the contamination on the west side of the base originated in chemical disposal pits that were dug to the top of the water table. This resulted in the water being immediately contaminated. As the water table falls, contamination is pulled

down through the soils. This is the source of the contamination found throughout the soil column found on base. This soil has been cleaned by the SVE systems on base. One thing that McClellan is looking at in the future is designing groundwater extraction wells in such a manner that when the water table falls, the well can be switched from a groundwater pumping well to a SVE well.

Election of RAB Community Co-Chair

Mr. Green announced that the nominating committee only received one nomination for the RAB Community Co-Chair, Chuck Yarbrough. Mr. Yarbrough was unanimously elected as Community Co-Chair.

Introduction of Subcommittee Chairs

Mr. Yarbrough introduced the committee chairs. Mr. John Leuthe is the Technical Report Review Chair until a new chair can be elected; Mr. Del Callaway is the Base Reuse Committee Chair; Mr. Dennis Green is the Relative Risk Committee Chair; and Ms. Sheila Guerra is the Community Relations Committee Chair.

Security Guard

Ms. Anderson discussed the issue of the security guard being retained by McClellan EM. It is EM's position that the security guard will continue to be present at all future RAB meetings. The security guard is not meant to intimidate anyone, but provides extra comfort for evening meetings. (A letter was given to the RAB members at the meeting on this issue [Attachment 1].) This issue will be discussed at the next Executive Session.

COMMITTEE REPORTS:

Relative Risk Committee

Mr. Green said that the committee will meet every other month at Building 269D. The next meetings will be held on 12 June, 7 August, and 2 October. All meetings are open to the public. He said that the major areas of interest of the committee are as follows: review current projects and provide comments; review cleanup levels; budgets and funding priorities; assign relative risk values; and monitor investigations and schedules.

There have been two meetings since the last general RAB meeting. At these meetings the committee went over the FY97 budget with Ms. Anderson to see how the base is doing in obligating funds.

Mr. Green encouraged the public to attend the 12 June 1997, meeting which will be looking at how the relative risks have changed over the last year and a half.

Mr. Green acknowledged Mr. Gibson for his outstanding performance as the Relative Risk Committee Chair.

Community Relations Committee

Ms. Guerra said that everyone should have received the 19 March draft meeting minutes. Comments should be submitted by 18 June, which is also the next meeting date. Meeting minutes for 18 December 1996, 14 January 1997, and 12 February 1997, were approved by community members at the February meeting. EM had a few changes that were not incorporated into the January minutes when the minutes were made final, so they will have to be approved again.

At the next meeting, the committee will continue to discuss the IR issue. They are concerned about the amount of the microfilm. They will also review the FY98/99 budget. Ms. Guerra thanked Sue Sher for her work as Community Relations Committee Chair.

CLEANING OF FACILITIES/EQUIPMENT TO SUPPORT REUSE

Mr. Yarbrough said that Boeing and American Airlines, Inc. (AAI) held open houses for McClellan AFB personnel. Hill AFB is also coming to have an open house at the NCO Club on 24 April 1997.

Mr. Dave Green, chief of the EM Compliance Division, had been previously asked by Mr. Callaway to address the issues regarding the cleanup efforts and the transfer of equipment and facilities of McClellan AFB. Two private companies and Hill AFB are competing for McClellan's aircraft workload. The contract will be awarded in January

1998. The objectives for EM are to clean the facilities for reuse, facilitate transfer of facilities and equipment, and to minimize Air Force liability.

An assumption being made in this effort is that reutilization of McClellan will be for "like use." The County has McClellan AFB zoned as an industrial complex; therefore, the assumption is made that it will continue to be an industrial complex. For example, a spray painting facility will remain a spray painting facility. Any adjustments to the "like use" concept will be handled on a case by case basis. Another assumption is that there will be no break in service. Federal employees working on the facilities will overlap with private companies who are expected to follow. Permitted facilities will also be transferred to the private sector.

The cleaning effort will involve general housecleaning to leave the facilities in good shape for the new tenant. McClellan will follow the closure plans for those permitted facilities that have closure plans. Those permitted areas that do not have closure plans will be addressed to ensure that there is proper cleanup.

Mr. Green emphasized that this effort does not include:

- Decontamination of groundwater and soil contamination;
- Areas with asbestos and/or lead (to be addressed on a case-by-case basis to ensure that these areas do not pose a health risk to the new occupants); or,
- Permitted radiation sites (to be handled according to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and the Air Force Radioisotope Committee Guidelines).

EM is using the Environmental Baseline Survey (EBS) to determine which areas need housecleaning. The EBS is used as a tool to determine if there are areas that require more than general housecleaning. It establishes a baseline environmental condition of property. McClellan is also completing an inventory of hazardous materials and ensuring that they are properly disposed of.

For permitted areas, general housecleaning, filter changing, and waste disposal will be done. The industrial wastewater lines (IWL) will be flushed, sludge will be removed, and Industrial Wastewater Treatment Plant #1 (IWTP #1) will be closed. The IWL will be connected directly to the existing sewer system. McClellan is currently working with

Sacramento County on this project. The County is currently conducting sampling to ensure that McClellan meets the sewage discharge permit requirements.

In conclusion, all of the above efforts are designed to prepare facilities for reuse in 1998 and to minimize Air Force liability.

Mr. Dennis Green asked if the base had done a comprehensive asbestos and lead survey. Mr. Dave Green said that a contractor recently did an asbestos survey, but McClellan has not completed any surveys on lead-based paint.

Mr. Yarbrough announced that the Hill AFB open house will be held at the NCO Club and anyone interested should see him for details. Mr. Yarbrough said things will be happening rapidly, particularly next January.

Mr. Yarbrough mentioned he had heard that there is a possibility that the airfield will not be used if the private sector (Boeing or AAI) does not win the competition and Hill AFB takes the core workload back to Utah. Also, unless someone else operates the airfield, the Coast Guard plans to relocate to Beale AFB. Mr. Yarbrough said that the County does not want to accept the responsibility and expense of operating another airfield.

Rick Solander of EM gave an update on reuse issues. He said that past references to reuse have talked about the C-130 workload and the workload competition out of Warner-Robbins. That competition is complete, and the C-130 workload will not be located at McClellan AFB.

The Environmental Impact Statement is on an accelerated schedule to meet the workload competition. The Air Force and the County of Sacramento are jointly preparing this document. It is referred to as a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report (EIS/EIR). The County is preparing an EIR to meet the state requirements, while the Air Force is preparing the EIS to meet federal requirements. This document must be complete before property can be released.

The draft Programmatic EIS/EIR was submitted for public review on 28 March 1997. The comment period ends on 12 May 1997. There will be a public hearing on 24 April 1997, for this document. It will cover the results of the analysis, the impacts that are associated with reuse, and then the forum will open up for public comment. The final document is scheduled to be out in July 1997.

Mr. Solander said that the meeting will be chaired by a military judge, and a court reporter will be present. The official record will be generated from the court reporter. Copies are available upon request.

Community Bulletin Board

Margaret Gidding of McClellan Public Affairs announced that the Environmental Compliance Forum will be held on 12 May 1997. This will be the last Environmental Compliance Forum held in this format. Ms. Gidding asked those present to take the time to complete the comment cards for suggestions on a forum that would work for the environmental compliance issues.

On 7 May 1997, Mr. Dan Stralka of United States Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA), will be conducting training on Risk Assessment for RAB members.

Ms. Gidding said that there were approximately 50 volunteers who helped clean up Magpie and Don Julio Creeks during last week's "Creek Week." A sculpture contest using the debris collected was held—McClellan received an honorable mention. Ms. Gidding will place a picture of this sculpture in the next newsletter.

Agenda Development

Mr. Yarbrough said that the issue of the security guard will be discussed at the next Executive Session. Discussion will also take place concerning the bylaws.

The next general RAB meeting agenda will be developed at the co-chair luncheon.

Questions/Comments

The following questions were asked by members of the public during the meeting.

Frank Miller said that an issue was raised in the last minutes to all regulators concerning last October's spill, which resulted in a \$15,000 penalty. Mr. Miller asked if the penalty has been paid, and if not, when will it be paid, and/or what the status on it was.

Ms. Anderson said that the penalty has not been paid. The Air Force has acknowledged the penalty. A letter has been sent to U.S. EPA acknowledging the violation and the Air Force has put into place a plan to request the funding to pay the penalty. The request has to go to the Base Closure Agency and then to Congress for a special funding allocation. The penalty will tentatively be paid in February 1999. Ms. Anderson explained that this is the process for how penalties are to be paid. Joe Healy, of U.S. EPA, concurred with that explanation.

Mr. Miller asked how McClellan awards contracts, if there is a competitive process, and if there is a peer review process to look at the contracts. He asked several other questions regarding the process for criteria, the scoring, and awarding contracts.

Ms. Elaine Anderson said that the peer review described in the presentation is for McClellan's projects with regard to technical merit and cost. The award of McClellan's delivery orders is something that EM decides. They may choose to use one of the contracts that EM manages to have the work done, or they may choose to use contracts that AFCEE has already awarded. Ms. Anderson said she would take the detailed question down as an action item and respond later. (See Follow-Up Responses to Questions section.)

Mr. Miller asked why it cost approximately \$1,500 a year, for a total of \$9,000 over the past six years, to maintain a broken microfilm machine. He asked how much the machine would cost new.

Ms. Guerra said that the Information Repository issue is something that the community relations (CR) committee has to clear up.

Mr. Miller also asked what Administrative Record support includes, referring to the \$1.57 million cost breakdown from 1990 through 1996. He also asked how much it cost to maintain the IR in the 1980s.

Ms. Anderson answered that Administrative Record support included establishment of the Administrative Record and transferring all the documents to microfilm. At the time, the contractor actually worked on site. Ms. Anderson agreed to include more detail in the minutes. (See Follow-Up Responses to Questions section.)

Mr. Miller asked how much it costs to produce the *Environmental Action Update* (EAU).

Members of the CR Committee responded that they had discussed the newsletter costs at their committee meeting. Currently, the EAU costs approximately \$5,000 per issue.

Mr. Miller asked if EM is funding the foundry or has any employees there.

Mr. Shirley said EM has been involved in air emissions permits for the foundry. Mr. Miller said the newsletter article creates the illusion that EM is responsible for the foundry. Ms. Gidding said that newsletter topics are not necessarily only Installation Restoration Program (IRP) issues, but also include issues of interest to the community. The foundry article was placed in the newsletter because of community interest. The foundry will be discussed at the Environmental Compliance Forum on 12 May 1997. Ms. Gidding thanked Mr. Miller for bringing up the issue of possible misperception, although the article does state who is responsible for the project. She agreed that the tag line on the front page of the newsletter could be misleading.

Mr. Taylor announced Fred Higgs died on April 18. Mr. Higgs was one of the first people whose property was discovered to have contamination in his well. He was also one of the first individuals to receive water other than his own groundwater. He lived at Ascot and 20th Street, adjacent to Area D. Mr. Higgs suffered from Hodgkin's disease. Mr.

Yarbrough said that he will bring a card for the RAB members to sign at the training session.

Jack Holderby said he was concerned about the economic impact of base closure, particularly on businesses in North Highlands. He said that an aggressive effort must be made to bring new companies in to fill the shoes of the Air Force. He also said that he spoke to an executive in New York with the Toyota Company and said that with all of the expansion of their American plants, they have not considered McClellan because they did not know it was closing.

Mr. Yarbrough suggested that Mr. Holderby contact the Reuse Office at McClellan and discuss his ideas with Rob Leonard or Randall Yim. Mr. Yarbrough informed Mr. Holderby that the Planning Team meets on the first Tuesday of every month. Mr. Taylor said Mr. Holderby should also contact the local Chamber of Commerce.

-

-

Follow-Up Responses to Questions

Two questions were submitted on a comment card from a community member during the RAB meeting. The questions were:

"I'm interested in:

- (1) Possibility of leasing building space and parking space (approximately 5 acres) that would be suitable for our truck terminal.
- (2) Any future work at the base in the nature of landfill closures."

The community member was provided with a name and number for a contact person at the Business Development Center, an organization that deals with reuse interest requests.

Mr. Miller asked what Administrative Record support includes, referring to the \$1.57 million cost breakdown from 1990 through 1996. He also asked how much it costs to maintain the IR in the 1980s.

The Administrative Record (AR) and Information Repository (IR) have recently been topics of focus and the RAB Community Relations Committee has been working these issues and looking for ways to improve the availability of information on McClellan's cleanup program.

In the past, Radian contractually supported the efforts of the AR/IR from October 1990 through March 1996. During this six-year time frame, approximately 1,500,000 pages of information were gathered, entered into a database, reviewed for appropriate placement, microfilmed (including quality assurance check), and filed as hard copies.

The initial efforts were extensive, as the monthly costs chart below shows. This effort accomplished what the base needed and did a very thorough job of creating, maintaining, and making accessible to the public a large amount of information pertaining to the base environmental cleanup program.

As shown by the monthly averages, the costs fluctuate with workload, but have decreased over time as processes were established and refined, and as the bulk of the initial work was completed. The Community Relations Committee will be going over the past costs as well as future improvement processes being developed for the IR at their quarterly meeting 18 June, 6:00 p.m. in the main conference room in Building 269D at McClellan.

Anyone interested in this topic is invited to attend. The chair of the committee, Sheila Guerra, will be giving updates on progress at the RAB public meetings including accessibility to cleanup documents on McClellan's home page.

Chart of Monthly AR Costs for Contracted Support	
Timeframe*	Cost per Month
October 1990 – September 1992 (24 months)	\$ 24,000**
October 1992 – March 1993 (6 months)	\$ 12,775
April 1993 – March 1994 (12 months)	\$ 18,064
April 1994 – March 1995 (12 months)	\$ 19,263
April 1995 – March 1996 (12 months)	\$ 14,263
* Starting when AR was first established	
** Excluding equipment purchases	

Mr. Miller asked how McClellan awards contracts, if there is a competitive process, and if there is a peer review process to look at the contracts. He asked several other questions regarding the process for criteria, the scoring, and awarding contracts. For ease of reference, the questions have been numbered, as follows.

1. Is there a competitive contracting process or are contracts just arbitrarily given out. How does this peer review process integrate with the awarding of contracts?

No; peer review is focused on the technical merit of proposed projects, not the potential source of the entity who will ultimately perform the work described in the projects.

2. What process or objective criteria are used in awarding contracts?

See the answer to question number 3 regarding the criteria used in awarding contracts, and question number 4 for a detailed explanation of the process for awarding contracts.

3. Do you have a plan or an objective criteria where contract bids are scored?

Yes; for both our Architectural & Engineering (A&E) and our McClellan Environmental Technology Remediation Implementation Contract (METRIC) source selections, we provided to all interested bidders detailed instructions on how to prepare and submit their technical and cost proposals for these projects, as well as the factors the Air Force would be using in objectively reviewing and evaluating these proposals. The specific criteria are source-selection sensitive; however, you may either ask to receive this information through our Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) office, or possibly ask a contractor to provide to you a copy of the solicitation they received.

4. What is the process? How does it work?

Some (but certainly not all) of the major milestones in the contract award process were:

- a. Develop and receive approval of an Acquisition Plan (describing why we need the contract, what work will be done under it, how big it will be, how it will be administered, etc.)

- b. Write a basic Statement of Work (SOW) describing the activities, or "scope," of the work the contractor is to perform under the contract.

- c. Submit a Request for Proposal (RFP) in a general announcement (e.g., in the Commerce Business Daily) soliciting interested parties to submit their bids to

perform this work. In this RFP are instructions to any interested bidders on how to prepare their cost and technical proposals, and some description of what the government considers important capabilities that will be reviewed by the government.

d. Review the proposals received for technical merit and rank them according to a standard criteria for evaluation. This is done through a source selection team that reviews and ranks every proposal submitted.

e. The recommendations of the source selection team are then reviewed in turn by a Proposal Review Analysis Group (PRAG) that checks the recommendations to ensure consistency and fairness in the source selection team's review.

f. The recommendations are then briefed and reviewed by other interested parties, such as the legal office, procurement office, and command section of the base. Once approved, the contract awardees are notified, a public announcement is made and the initial orders are placed against these contracts.

Again, this is a generalized process description, and does not account for every step in the procurement process or entirely for changes in acquisition law that occurred between the time the A&E and METRIC contracts were awarded (1993 vs. 1996).

5. Then who in your group scores the proposals?

The source selection team is a cross-section of government employees in EM who will be using these contracts to meet their technical requirements. This team reviews, and in the case of a source selection, ranks the technical merits of the proposals. The PRAG is a team of different individuals with a cross-section of contracting (AF procurement office) and technical experience. The PRAG reviews the work of the source selection team to ensure consistency in cost proposal reviews.

6. Who scores them?

Again, the source selection team in a source selection scores the proposals for technical merit.

7. Do you have a plan that objectively scores these contracts?

As mentioned in the response to Question No. 3 above, detailed descriptions are provided to the bidders regarding what the Air Force expects to see in their cost and technical proposals, and what will be evaluated by the source selection team.

8. We would like to see how these things are scored. How they are judged and how they are scored. These are easy questions that you should be able to answer and show.

Again, the specific criteria are source-selection sensitive. This protection is necessary to ensure the government engages in fair pricing competition for requested services, and does not supply information, inadvertently or otherwise, that may give companies seeking federal contracts an unfair advantage in submitting competitive bids for work. For the Air Force to respond to this request, you should first contact our FOIA office to find out how to receive this information.

GENERAL INFORMATION PERTAINING TO ENVIRONMENTAL CONTRACTING

The A&E and the METRIC contracts are the two major contracting vehicles available to EM. Additional information on awarding of contracts and the issuance of delivery orders against these contracts is provided below.

AWARDING CONTRACTS

1. *A&E Contracts:* In the case of awarding our A&E contracts, a process referred to as a "source selection" was held to determine who would receive the award to do work for our environmental program. This process took nearly a year to complete and resulted in the award of three A&E contracts in the summer of 1993. The contracts were awarded to CH2M HILL, Jacobs Engineering Group, and Radian Corporation. A fourth small business set-aside was awarded to Lee & Ro as well, but the option to renew this contract was not exercised, and the contract ended in 1996. Our A&E contracts are generally referred to as "study" contracts, and in the CERCLA process, their scope focuses on the area of Preliminary Assessments through Remedial Design.

2. *METRIC:* In the case of METRIC, a similar, but far more detailed, process occurred to award to our four contractors. This process took over 15 months to complete (July 1995 - October 1996), and resulted in an award to four bidders: CET Environmental, Metcalf & Eddy, Radian International LLC, and URS-Laidlaw. METRIC serves as a construction or "remedial action" type of contract.

ISSUING DELIVERY ORDERS

1. *A&E Contracts.* Once the A&E contracts were awarded through a source selection competition, EM has the ability to "direct source," or pick directly without further competition, one of the three A&E firms to perform the work on a given project, provided it falls within the scope of the basic contract. For the restoration program, our Project Management Groups (PMGs) typically select the contractor to do A&E work by group consensus. Factors that are reviewed include the contractor's familiarity with previous phases of the project, whether they have a unique capability in a particular area germane to a given project, etc. The rationale for selecting a contractor to perform specific work is documented in the delivery order's contract file.

2. *METRIC.* METRIC also allows our office to perform "direct source," but with the passage and promulgation of the Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act (FASA) in 1995, the preferred procedure is to compete

work, to the maximum extent practicable, among our four METRIC suppliers. As a general description of what happens in this case, our procurement office issues a Performance Work Statement (PWS) or Statement of Objectives (SOO) to each METRIC contractor asking them to prepare technical and cost proposals. With our contract project manager taking the lead, the PMG reviews each proposal for technical acceptability, but not cost. Of the bidders determined to be technically acceptable, the contractor with the lowest price is awarded the order.

-

This is the "master memo" for FINAL minutes. Unless we hear otherwise, the final minutes of all meetings should go to everyone on the distribution list.

-

-

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: See Distribution

FROM: Jamie Cameron-Harley

DATE: 13 June 1997

SUBJECT: Final Minutes of 23 April 1997 RAB Meeting

Enclosed are the final minutes of the 23 April RAB meeting. All comments received on the draft minutes have been incorporated. The minutes will be voted on at the next meeting.

Call me at 643-1742, ext. 352, if you have any questions. My fax number is 643-0172.

DISTRIBUTION:

RAB members

Elaine Anderson

Randy Adams

Peter Berghuis

James Bryant

Del Callaway

Brad Gacke

Mannard Gaines

Bill Gibson

Dennis Green

Sheila Guerra

Joe Healy

John Leuthe

Jeannie Lewis

Alex MacDonald

Susan McKee (Rep Fazio's office)

Ben Norman

Simeon Okoroike

Bill Shepherd

Sue Sher

Burl Taylor

Cody Tubbs (Rep Matsui's office)

Dorothy Wilson

Chuck Yarbrough

McClellan AFB

Paul Brunner

Jamie Cameron-Harley

Margaret Gidding

Admin Record

BCT Members and HQ Counterparts

LtCol Tony Cervone

Dave Green

Richard Bennecke

Dale Clark

Martin Keck

Terry Yonkers

Randall Yim

Rob Leonard

Cynthia Bryant

Rod Whitten

Elaine Ross

Tom Kempster

Tony Gallegos

Linda Hogg

Ron Hunter

Others

Dave Calhoun (Rep. Pombo's office)

Chris Richards (Rep Doolittle's office)