

1 Mr. Bill Gibson: Bill Gibson.

2

3 Ms. Sheila Guerra: Sheila Guerra, Community Relations Chairperson.

4

5 Mr. Del Callaway: Del Callaway.

6

7 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Chuck Yarbrough.

8

9 Mr. Paul Brunner: Paul Brunner, Military Representative to the RAB, also the Co-Chair to
10 the RAB.

11

12 Mr. Mannard Gaines: Mannard Gaines, community member.

13

14 Mr. Alex MacDonald: I'm Alex MacDonald. I'm with the Regional Water Quality
15 Control Board.

16

17 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Okay.

18

19 Mr. Paul Brunner: Chuck, I had one or two comments I wanted to make. As we go through
20 the minutes, since we won't actually be able to conduct formal business (not a quorum) we'll be
21 going through for the information on the agenda. If people do speak, the minutes, what we
22 moved was to have it transcribed. So, as Chuck mentioned, state your name, but the minutes
23 come out transcribed as to what's being said. So it is important for you to understand that as you
24 go through the discussions.

25

26 There's also a statement that I started to put on the agenda, too. So if you could go to that one
27 slide. It's on there? From the Air Force perspective I'd like to read for the record, "McClellan Air

28

1 Force Base is here tonight because our past industrial operations and disposal actions created
2 pollution. We regret and apologize for those actions. Although no one here in this room tonight is
3 directly responsible for the contamination caused in the past, we're responsible for fixing it. We
4 know we have a problem and we're doing our best to solve it. We want your opinions and your
5 advice. That is why we're here." Okay.

6
7 **Review of Action Items**

8
9 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Okay. So why don't we go ahead and do the action items?

10
11 Mr. Paul Brunner: Okay. Have we passed out the action item list?

12
13 Ms. Merianne Briggs: There should be one at each desk.

14
15 Mr. Paul Brunner: And is this action item list available at the back, too, for those who come
16 in?

17
18 Ms. Merianne Briggs: **(inaudible)**

19
20 Mr. Paul Brunner: Why don't we, if we have extra copies, make it available for the audience
21 to be able to review with us as we go through?

22
23 For the RAB members, do you all have the action list? Okay.

24
25 The first action that we have, and it's open, is to send a letter to Brad Gacke removing him as a
26 RAB member. And Chuck, you had that as a particular action item. Did that get done?

1 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: That's right. You'll have to leave that on there. I haven't had a
2 chance to do that, yet.

3
4 Mr. Paul Brunner: Okay. So that's still open. The next action item was to make changes in
5 the RAB Charter and mail it to RAB members. And I have that as being done. It is open, but we
6 did complete that task. So did RAB members get that in the mail?

7
8 Mr. Del Callaway: I didn't see it. When was it mailed?

9
10 Mr. Paul Brunner: I'll turn to my trusted colleagues here.

11
12 Ms. Sheila Guerra: I never got one.

13
14 Ms. Roxanne Yonn: That was mailed in October. you got it with a whole packet, I believe.

15
16 Unknown Female: You have extra copies?

17
18 Mr. Paul Brunner: Okay. Well, it didn't jog a lot of memories. So if we have those let's send
19 them out. And Merianne, let's follow up on that to make sure that the other RAB members are
20 aware that it came out. Add to complete that action item. So let's leave that one open and make a
21 verification that it was done.

22
23 The next one was listing of number, whoops, I skipped one. "Clarify letter from attorney advisor
24 dated 27 September 1998," "R-E" that is, the RAB is a quasi-government entity. That's still
25 opened, too. Sheila, you were the one that was asking that. I drafted a draft. So I'm still looking
26 at it to try and make sure that it's in laymen terms as to what that means. So I'm still working
27 that.

1 Ms. Sheila Guerra: Sheila Guerra speaking. Are you talking about the letter I received from
2 Todd Norton?

3

4 Mr. Paul Brunner: No. This is the letter that came from...

5

6 Ms. Sheila Guerra: Or the letter from Colonel Gibson?

7

8 Mr. Paul Brunner: From Colonel Gibson. You'd asked that.

9

10 Ms. Sheila Guerra: I had requested that I had this on my update. Merianne said that she was
11 going to check in with Todd Norton on breaking that letter down in laymen terms.

12

13 Ms. Merianne Briggs: Merianne Briggs. We do have a breakdown of that letter. It's ready
14 to go over and have Todd Norton take a look at it and make sure that he agrees that our
15 interpretation is correct. So you will be getting that.

16

17 Ms. Sheila Guerra: Okay. Thank you.

18

19 Mr. Paul Brunner: Okay. The next one was "Listing of number of employees from 1995 to
20 current divided by civilian, military, and tenants." And I believe that Major Gonzales provided
21 that and you have that listing. Sheila, I believe you asked that specifically and that you have that.

22

23 Ms. Sheila Guerra: Yes, that's correct, that can be closed.

24

25 Mr. Paul Brunner: Okay.

26

27 Ms. Sheila Guerra: Let me go back to the last one. That one's still open, right, until we receive
28

28

1 the letter?

2

3 Mr. Paul Brunner: Correct.

4

5 Ms. Sheila Guerra: Okay.

6

7 Mr. Paul Brunner: The next action item is "Send each RAB member a proposed mailing list
8 expansion briefing from the CR committee meeting of September 16th 1998." And I have that as
9 being accomplished and being done. Did you receive that?

10

11 Ms. Sheila Guerra: Not yet. No.

12

13 Mr. Paul Brunner: Okay. When did we mail this one?

14

15 Ms. Merianne Briggs: Merianne Briggs. That was mailed on the 10th of November.

16

17 Ms. Roxanne Yonn: Roxanne Yonn. What might be confusing is that there's a package that
18 went out with quite a few papers, to save the mailing cost. We had a whole group of papers and
19 that was in there.

20

21 Ms. Sheila Guerra: Is this the old mailing list?

22

23 Ms. Roxanne Yonn: This is not the mailing list itself. Remember? This is the one where we had
24 given a briefing to Community Relations, and then some folks hadn't gotten a copy of the
25 briefing, so we sent the briefing to all of them.

26

27 Mr. Paul Brunner: This is the expansion briefing.

28

1 Ms. Roxanne Yonn: Where we were proposing to expand to 60,000 by ZIP code of the mailing
2 list itself.

3

4 Mr. Paul Brunner: At which we decided last time not to do. But that was an action item.

5

6 Ms. Sheila Guerra: We're not going to do that \$17,000.

7

8 Mr. Paul Brunner: Right.

9

10 Ms. Sheila Guerra: Budget thing.

11

12 Mr. Paul Brunner: We talked about that in length last time.

13

14 Ms. Sheila Guerra: Okay. Because I didn't know if we had closed — because we haven't had
15 a CR meeting, so I don't know if...

16

17 Ms. Roxanne Yonn: This was brought up at the last RAB, that some people hadn't received
18 that, and they just wanted to receive a copy of the briefing, so that was mailed out.

19

20 Ms. Sheila Guerra: Okay. We will touch base at the next CR meeting on it?

21

22 Ms. Roxanne Yonn: Right.

23

24 Ms. Sheila Guerra: Okay.

25

26 Mr. Paul Brunner: The next item is "Determine cost of RAB meetings." Merianne Briggs has
27 a handout that she'll go over.

28

1 Ms. Merianne Briggs: Okay. Roxanne is handing out copies of that. The way the sheet is
2 broken down on this is that I took the general contract cost and these are the larger items.

3
4 Mr. Paul Brunner: Merianne, let me break in to set the stage for this — the question came up
5 within the RAB as to what is the cost of holding one of these RAB meetings. And that's what
6 Merianne will go through and try to explain how we broke this out.

7
8 Ms. Merianne Briggs: Okay. All of these are, like I said, the general points: the room
9 rental is \$25, security is \$60, and these are all per meeting. The sound system is \$400, the public
10 ad that we place costs \$1,300. The cost to transcribe the minutes is \$1,800, and that is providing
11 copies of minutes. 30 copies cost \$210, and those may vary with membership and people
12 requesting copies. Mailing the minutes, that's also something that is variable, but generally it's
13 around \$80. Copy and mail the agenda that's \$1,000. And Radian attending the meeting per one
14 person for the 4-hour period, and that includes the setup and take-down and being here and
15 participating at the meeting, is \$240. And then posterboards, an average of one per meeting
16 would be \$1,000. So the total current contract cost is \$6,100 per RAB meeting.

17
18 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: I understand that those posterboards — number of times you reuse
19 posterboards did you include that in there?

20
21 Ms. Merianne Briggs: This is just a general cost. This doesn't say that every meeting we
22 do have a posterboard made. Lately we have been having our own group at EM do the
23 posterboards. So like I said, that would be a general contract cost of an average of one per
24 meeting. It doesn't mean that we would use it at every single meeting.

25
26 Mr. Paul Brunner: Chuck, if I understand your question, as do we reuse the posterboards each
27 time?

1 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Well, that's what I understood you did.

2
3 Mr. Paul Brunner: We do. And if we at times have to create a new one for any project, that
4 we would create. I know that internally we've tried too — we have the capability of producing
5 posterboards now instead of doing it contractually. We make them internally. That helps saves
6 cost.

7
8 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Also, a number of times, if I'm not misunderstanding things, you
9 use these posterboards not only at RAB meetings, but other functions, too. Is that about right?

10
11 Mr. Paul Brunner: We use them extensively at other functions.

12
13 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Right.

14
15 Mr. Paul Brunner: We would use them at the BRAC Cleanup Team meetings or meetings in
16 the community. If we go someplace else, or tomorrow we have a general officer visiting, which
17 we have to do a briefing, we'd take the posterboards, which are pretty neat devices to go tell the
18 story. And so we use them multiple times.

19
20 Ms. Merianne Briggs: I would also like to add that when you see the cost of the
21 posterboard, it doesn't just mean for the contractor to take a picture and produce it larger on a
22 board. They're actually doing the design of the board. They're going around and collecting the
23 information and having pretty much like a dry run of the board; so there's several working copies
24 of the board done on smaller paper, of course, not mounted. And when it's finally approved, it is
25 printed out and then put on a large board. So that does include design cost and research cost.

26
27 Mr. Frank Miller: Merianne, Frank Miller. I have a question. Does that mean that if there
28

1 were four RAB meetings, four quarterly RAB meetings, that you give the contractor...

2
3 Mr. Paul Brunner: Frank could you intro...

4
5 Mr. Frank Miller: Frank Miller. Does that mean that you give the contractor \$4,000?

6
7 Mr. Paul Brunner: Frank, as we go through the meeting in here we're trying to conduct — if
8 you have a type of question from the audience as we go through, why don't we take question
9 during the questioning?

10
11 Mr. Frank Miller: I thought since she's addressing it right now it would be reasonable to pop
12 in a quick question. Since you're saying that it's \$1,000 per posterboard. And if you have four
13 quarterly RAB meetings, does that mean that every meeting you're paying the contractor \$1,000
14 whether you have a posterboard or not? \$4,000 a year for the posterboard?

15
16 Mr. Paul Brunner: Of course not.

17
18 Mr. Frank Miller: Could you address that?

19
20 Mr. Paul Brunner: We wouldn't pay any contractor money for work just to pay money. I
21 mean for something that is not being done. So if there is an expense there for a posterboard that
22 we ask the contractor to do, then we pay that expense. But if there's not a posterboard that we
23 asked them to do, then we're not going to pay for something that's not being done.

24
25 What we attempted to do here is, Merianne was explaining, was to try to come up with a baseline
26 of what one of these meetings was costing, as a basic — a generic expense that one could look at
27 as we do our business here. And each meeting is to come and say, "This meeting here tonight,

1 just to set up and come here, is around the \$6,000 number.”

2
3 Ms. Merianne Briggs: And also, if I may add that the cost — \$6,100 — does not include
4 government employee cost.

5
6 Mr. Paul Brunner: Any other questions on that one? Sheila.

7
8 Ms. Sheila Guerra: Yes. First of all I'd like to point out that this amount of money comes out
9 of the Community Relations budget, which is different from the other budgets. First of all I
10 would like to know — Radian, Roxanne — is she included in this meeting?

11
12 Ms. Merianne Briggs: Yes. She would be the Radian attendance, one person.

13
14 Ms. Sheila Guerra: One person. Okay. The other question I would like to say is, there's other
15 committee meetings. Now, are those based on the same as the RAB meetings?

16
17 Ms. Merianne Briggs: The committee meetings weren't addressed at all in this chart.
18 That's because...

19
20 Ms. Sheila Guerra: And how many committee meetings do we have?

21
22 Ms. Merianne Briggs: Well that's variable also. The Technical Report Review Committee
23 hasn't been meeting for a while now. They are meeting more frequently than once per quarter.

24
25 Mr. Paul Brunner: This is not trying to attempt to do a costing of what those committee
26 meetings are. The question was, what is the cost of the RAB meetings that we have here at
27 Vineland School. Usually, those are much smaller scale, not the same scale of sound systems

1 and...

2

3 Ms. Sheila Guerra: But it's all in the budget. It's all in one bundle.

4

5 Mr. Paul Brunner: Well, if there's something else that we need to try and quantify, we can
6 take another action item to quantify.

7

8 Ms. Sheila Guerra: I'm looking at the budget cost and this is just one figure for this
9 particular...

10

11 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Sheila, I would appreciate it if you would go over this at the
12 Community Relations meeting rather than dragging the meeting out in front of the public here. I
13 would rather, my own personal feelings are, let's go into it in our committee meeting rather than
14 dragging this time out. I think they did answer the question. And if you have those other kind of
15 questions, why don't we find those things out at our committee meeting, which I think would be
16 a better place. But if you must, you must.

17

18 Ms. Sheila Guerra: Well, I just wanted to bring it up because it's...

19

20 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Okay. Well why don't we bring it up again at your committee
21 meeting and go over it there? That'll be all right?

22

23 Ms. Sheila Guerra: That's fine.

24

25 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Okay. Appreciate it.

26

27 Mr. Paul Brunner: All right. The next one is, update the items on the Web site. And

28

1 Merianne, I think that's your action item, too.

2

3 Mr. Del Callaway: Is that one still open?

4

5 Mr. Paul Brunner: Determine cost of RAB meetings? I would recommend that we close that.

6 The committee meetings are not RAB meetings. They're sub-committee meetings. I would agree

7 with Chuck that if we need to quantify those costs we can do that. It just wasn't the task that we

8 had to do. We can do that in the Community Relations and try and work that cost out. So Del, I

9 would recommend that we close that one.

10

11 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: I concur.

12

13 Mr. Paul Brunner: So that brings us to the next one that is open. "Update the items on the

14 Web site." Merianne, you have that one.

15

16 Ms. Merianne Briggs: All right. We did go ahead and update the Web. We added the final

17 June 3rd minutes to the Web site and we also added the July 15th minutes. And under the RAB

18 membership we did delete Brad Gacke. And there was also a typo in the meeting portion of the

19 Web page, we went ahead and corrected December 2nd it was — I can't even pronounce it — we

20 listed "December 2rd" so we went ahead and corrected that.

21

22 We are still in the process of working some other issues. We are having to retype the one

23 document that says, "What is the RAB?" If you can remember when you click in on the Web

24 pages it has big black borders on it. So that one has to be retyped in Microsoft Word, so we are

25 working that. When we go ahead and submit that for approval, to add this new document onto

26 the Web, we're also going to add on all the 1999 RAB meeting dates to that. We will also at that

27 time be updating the Information Repository information page with the actions on that.

28

1 Mr. Del Callaway: Did you drop Ben Norman also?

2

3 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Ben Norman's been dropped.

4

5 Ms. Merianne Briggs: He is no longer on the membership.

6

7 Mr. Del Callaway: Okay.

8

9 Mr. Paul Brunner: Okay. So with some of the action items that one page still needing to be
10 updated, is your recommendation, Merianne, that we keep it open or closed? I presume it's still
11 open.

12

13 Ms. Merianne Briggs: That's one that would be still open, or we could close this and do a
14 new action item.

15

16 Mr. Paul Brunner: Well, if something is still open, from that we will give an update. Why
17 don't we just leave that open?

18

19 Ms. Merianne Briggs: Okay.

20

21 Mr. Paul Brunner: The next one is, "Discuss need for an alternate RAB membership
22 application as mentioned in the bylaws." Sheila, that was your action item.

23

24 Ms. Sheila Guerra: I guess we are going to take this up at the CR meeting.

25

26 Mr. Paul Brunner: Okay. So that's still open on that? The next item is, "Need to discuss the
27 mailing list issue." That was extensively discussed at the last one, so I think we closed that one.

28

1 And the mailing list is now available — that long discussion that we had. I know, Del, you had a
2 lot of questions on that during that time. I think that's closed.

3
4 Mr. Del Callaway: Okay.

5
6 Mr. Paul Brunner: The next one was, "Report back to the Relative Risk Ranking Committee
7 the names of bidders for the TAPP program." And Chuck, I have that down as yours. I know the
8 TAPP is a briefing that we have later on the agenda, too, but that was your action item.

9
10 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: We have four different companies that have applied for or have
11 given us resumes for the TAPP, that are interested in the TAPP program. And I have given the
12 information out to the whole RAB. Del should have it. If he doesn't he can get it from me.
13 Otherwise, we should hear on how to proceed later on this evening.

14
15 Mr. Paul Brunner: Okay. So we can close that one.

16
17 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: That's fine, unless you feel different.

18
19 Mr. Del Callaway: You didn't come back to the committee because we haven't met yet. We
20 don't meet until the 7th of January.

21
22 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Oh, you want to bring it up before your committee?

23
24 Mr. Del Callaway: Well, that's where I understood where it was going to be brought up.

25
26 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: I could bring it up there, if that's what you want. I have no
27 problem. We have four companies. Oh, by the way, we have two others possibly that may come

1 in. One I know that is interested hasn't gotten his resume into me. I told him, "Well, you got until
2 January." I gave him a deadline of January. If they don't we've got four we'll proceed on. I'm not
3 going to wait around any longer.

4
5 Del Callaway: Until January 7th, that's our meeting.

6
7 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Okay.

8
9 Mr. Paul Brunner: All right. So is this one open still or closed?

10
11 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Open.

12
13 Mr. Paul Brunner: Open. The next item is, "Assist Imogene Zander and the Piercy's to obtain
14 base passes." Merianne, you have that one.

15
16 Ms. Merianne Briggs: Okay, that is still open at this time. I need to get with Imogene
17 Zander and also the Piercys both. I have been in contact with them. I do need to make an
18 appointment time that's convenient to their schedule to bring them in and get a pass.

19
20 Mr. Paul Brunner: I think the effort has been there to try and do that. They just haven't been
21 able to connect to make it happen. So that's still open.

22
23 The next item is, and the, last one, "Set up meeting with Rebecca Garrison on the Ride Share
24 program in the near future." Sheila, that's still yours.

25
26 Ms. Sheila Guerra: That's still open.

1 Mr. Paul Brunner: Okay, That's all the action items.

2
3 **Committee Reports**

4
5 ***Community Relations***

6
7 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Okay. We'll go to community reports now and Community
8 Relations — Sheila Guerra.

9
10 Ms. Sheila Guerra: Okay. Well we haven't had a Community Relations meeting. Our next
11 meeting is the 16th. You did capture some of the things that I had down here just to update you.
12 On the Ride Share issue, I did get a copy of the Hoyt report. If anybody would like a copy of that
13 I can get a copy for you. This item is still open and I'm still receiving information on it.

14
15 I still have to meet with Paul Brunner on this. Maybe later on down the road I'll meet with
16 Rebecca Garrison. She might even want to come to this meeting or our CR meeting if possible. I
17 think maybe some of the other RAB members should be able to ask her some questions, too, if
18 they want to ask her some questions.

19
20 I have been trying to get a hold of Timothy Miller with the SMAQMD and he has not yet
21 returned my calls. I had some more questions about the Hoyt report and I haven't received
22 anything for the '96 contract. So I'm waiting for that also.

23
24 We do have some new applicants for RAB members. One I'd like to welcome is Erwin Hayer
25 and Gary Collier. They're going to be at our next CR meeting. We'll make a motion to accept
26 them at that time. Also we have lost Jeannie Lewis as a RAB member. She wishes to continue on
27 the mailing list and her husband also will be on the mailing list. He possibly later on might be

1 able to come back as an alternate for someone. Jeannie said that some day she may come back
2 also. They'll keep updated with what's going on with the RAB and we'll see them from time to
3 time.

4
5 One other thing we're working on that's going to be at our next CR meeting, is discussion on the
6 RAB minutes. I've got input from a lot of the RAB members and they're not happy with the
7 minutes as far as the verbatim. So we are going to have more discussion on that. Also, I'd like to
8 make mention that our RAB agenda didn't have an address on it. Did anyone get one with a
9 Vineland School address? Mine didn't have that on it, so we have to — if that got omitted, we
10 need to include that. That's about it for me.

11
12 Mr. Paul Brunner: Okay. I guess we go to the next. Del?

13
14 Mr. Del Callaway: Are you open for questions?

15
16 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: We're going to go on.

17
18 Ms. Sheila Guerra: Oh, yes.

19
20 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Is there a question?

21
22 Mr. Del Callaway: I'd like to know where the report is. You have some charts here but there's
23 no report. Is this it?

24
25 Ms. Sheila Guerra: That is the report and that's why I've been trying to reach Timothy Miller.
26 It took me a while to get this report and it doesn't really say anything about the, let me step back
27 to the performance evaluation that I discussed at the last RAB. There was also an amended copy
28

1 of that report and the reason it was amended. They felt secure with what the Ride Share
2 contractor turned in as far as their evaluation on the emissions. I requested this and they felt that
3 this was good enough. Well, anyone could look at it and see that it's just a pie chart, a bar chart,
4 and a list of ZIP codes, which really doesn't tell you what you really need to know as far as the
5 air emissions go and the amount of cars that are coming in and out of this base. That's basically
6 what this Hoyt report is and that's all I can tell you about it because it doesn't tell me anything
7 else.

8
9 Mr. Paul Brunner: Do you have any other questions Del?

10
11 Mr. Del Callaway: Yes. There's nothing here to back up any of these figures on here.

12
13 Drive alone: they have 65.61% on Monday. There's nothing to show how they arrived at that
14 figure.

15
16 Mr. Paul Brunner: I think where we had the item was that on the Ride Share discussion we'd
17 discuss that at the Community Relations meeting and not go through this discussion at this
18 meeting on it. That's what we had talked about doing and not delaying the meeting here on it. We
19 don't have the answers. That's a County document and their response back to it, at which we
20 don't have a representative here to respond to.

21
22 Mr. Del Callaway: It's a County document?

23
24 Mr. Paul Brunner: Well, it's a County request that the Ride Share person turned in, so we
25 don't have the people here to address it.

26
27 Ms. Sheila Guerra: Excuse me.

1 Mr. Del Callaway: I think this was presented tonight in Sheila's committee report as a
2 documentation to go over and to discuss. Now you're telling me that you don't want me to
3 discuss it. You just want me to wait until she has her meeting and discuss it at that meeting?
4

5 Mr. Paul Brunner: Where we left it, Del, was that we had an item on the Ride Share
6 discussion point. Chuck made a point that we were not going to go through with a long
7 discussion for the group. We don't have the appropriate people here to really have a discussion
8 about it. I don't know what the point is to go on and discuss it any great...
9

10 Mr. Del Callaway: I don't want to discuss it any further than anyone else. But when you give
11 me something I would like for all the information to be there necessary to analyze the chart and
12 see what I'm looking at and see where this information comes from.
13

14 Mr. Paul Brunner: The table that you have in front of you, I don't think we gave it to you.
15

16 Mr. Del Callaway: If you're not ready to discuss it then don't give it to me tonight. Save it for
17 the **(inaudible)** time.
18

19 Mr. Paul Brunner: I didn't give it to you.
20

21 Mr. Del Callaway: Okay.
22

23 Mr. Paul Brunner: I don't know where that report came from. Did you give it to him, Sheila?
24

25 Ms. Sheila Guerra: Yes I did. You should have received a copy of it.
26

27 Mr. Paul Brunner: The point is, I didn't bring it tonight to discuss it.
28

1 Ms. Sheila Guerra: Excuse me but. Okay, wait a minute Paul. You passed out the amended
2 performance evaluation at the last RAB meeting. Is that correct?

3

4 Mr. Paul Brunner: I did.

5

6 Ms. Sheila Guerra: Okay. If you received that from the Air District, you should have received
7 the copy of the Hoyt report also.

8

9 Mr. Paul Brunner: The point that Del raised was if we bring something to the table to discuss
10 then we should have the full document. Del was making the point that I brought the document;
11 therefore, I should have brought it. I was responding that I did not bring the document to talk
12 about on the issue tonight.

13

14 Mr. Del Callaway: He's right in that respect.

15

16 Ms. Sheila Guerra: All right.

17

18 Mr. Del Callaway: He didn't give it to me, but it came up under your committee report.

19

20 Ms. Sheila Guerra: I was just mainly updating you on where we're at as far as that issue goes,
21 and we will work it in the CR meeting.

22

23 Mr. Del Callaway: Okay. All I have to say about this is, it is not a report. It's nothing but a
24 bunch of pie charts and a bunch of bar charts that don't mean anything without the rest of the
25 report to back it up or to substantiate where these figures come from.

26

27 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Well, maybe you can request...

28

1 Mr. Del Callaway: If you want to press on, press on.

2
3 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Maybe you can request that for when the Community Relations
4 meeting meets.

5
6 Ms. Sheila Guerra: I hope to have some more information for the RAB at that time.

7
8 ***Base Reuse/Relative Risk Ranking***

9
10 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Okay. Why don't we go to Base Reuse Relative Risk Ranking. Del
11 Callaway.

12
13 Mr. Del Callaway: Okay. Well, I haven't had a meeting yet either. Our meeting is set for
14 January 7th. If anyone is interested in attending, please do so. Out of our meeting today, I
15 understand that the plastic company, Euro, is still in the mill for their bid for 783, 786, and 788. I
16 was aware of the first two. I wasn't aware of the 788 until today. But that doesn't pose a problem
17 I guess.

18
19 Also today on this same sheet of paper as City Police Department with a piece of land along side
20 Building 684, the old air freight terminal. I'll have to go back through my notes. I recall some
21 incidents on that particular vacant piece of land. I think they're going to discuss today that they're
22 going to put up some prefab buildings. Was that it? Or quonset type, quick assembly building, or
23 some sort.

24
25 Mr. Paul Brunner: Yes, I don't remember. The meeting that Del is referring to is our BRAC
26 cleanup team meeting that was held earlier today. Is Rick Solander here from my office? Do you
27 know what the buildings were?

1 Mr. Rick Solander: Yes, Rick Solander from McClellan Air Force Base. Yes, that particular
2 thing that you were talking about LRA did say that, in that area west of 684, they did plan to put
3 up some prefab buildings for the City Police.

4
5 Mr. Del Callaway: Yes.

6
7 Mr. Rick Solander: Keep in mind, Del, that those issues that you're talking about are in the
8 very preliminary stages with the LRA. EM hasn't even started to look at those yet. If you have
9 information as you say, about some things that have been going on, we would like to know so we
10 can pass it on to the LRA and disclose everything we can about the condition of that property.
11 Appreciate you looking at that.

12
13 Mr. Del Callaway: I worked in that building for seven years. I was there when Southern Air
14 Transport came in and TransAmerican and Evergreen and all the rest of them and National
15 Guard. I know I should have some documentation on some of the fuel spills and other things that
16 took place out there. But that's beside the point.

17
18 I spoke with Rob Leonard of the LRA yesterday and we were setting up a meeting, but it's now
19 Mark Manoff of his office. He and I will meet and discuss reuse issues that are pending before
20 the LRA. He'll be at our next meeting on January the 7th for the rest of the members of that
21 meeting to receive that information. Basically, that's about it as far as Reuse and Relative Risk
22 Ranking, unless Mr. Gibson knows of something. I'm sure he hasn't attended any meetings with
23 the agencies.

24
25 Mr. Bill Gibson: This is Bill Gibson. I was unable to attend the November meeting. The
26 minutes that were being transmitted on my fax, I ran out of paper, so I only have a partial
27 transmission. Both my wife and I came up with some medical problems within a couple of days
28

1 of each other. She is being treated, and until both of us get stabilized, I'll be sort of keeping a low
2 profile.

3
4 Mr. Del Callaway: Okay. Thank you, Bill. Speaking of fax, I have a new fax number: 648-
5 1776. I also have a fax machine on base which is 643-1196. So during the day you can get me on
6 base and the rest of the time you can get me at the other one. That's it.

7
8 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Okay. Once again that was January the 7th. The Reuse Committee
9 meeting will be held right here at Vineland. They'll be discussing the reuse of McClellan Air
10 Force Base and different possibilities as far as companies coming in and establishing themselves
11 in different buildings and so forth on McClellan. We will have Rob Leonard at that meeting who
12 is...

13
14 Mr. Del Callaway: No.

15
16 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: He won't be at the meeting?

17
18 Mr. Del Callaway: No.

19
20 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Who's going to be there then?

21
22 Mr. Del Callaway: Mark.

23
24 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Mark?

25
26 Mr. Del Callaway: Manoff.

1 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: What's his last name?

2
3 Mr. Paul Brunner: Manoff.

4
5 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Manoff. He will be there. He's Rob Leonard's assistant and they
6 update us on what's happening as far as reuse on McClellan. So if you're interested, January 7th,
7 and that's at 6 p.m. Right? 6 p.m?

8
9 Mr. Del Callaway: 6 p.m.

10
11 ***Technical Report Review***

12
13 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Right here. Now I'm going to go into the Technical Report Review
14 Committee. Right now I'm acting Chair of that committee, along with my other responsibilities
15 here as the co-chair. Right now we're reviewing what they call the *Basewide Feasibility Study*,
16 the draft final. And also our committee is reviewing a document regarding the soil vapor
17 extraction systems on base. We've got one of those, also the *Quarterly Monitoring Report*. And a
18 number of the other reports are due out soon and we will be going over them, too. Also we're
19 looking at a TAPP, Technical Assistance Program grant, to bring on a company to help us go
20 over these reports, making sure that everything is in order and that the cleanup is being done
21 right.

22
23 I'd like to make one point as far as this draft final to the *Basewide Feasibility Study Report*. For
24 some reason, about half of our adhoc committee comments were left out. At least out of the draft
25 final report that I was looking at tonight, just this evening before coming over here. I just got it
26 last week and due to Thanksgiving I hadn't been able to look at it. I don't know what happened,

1 but about half of the RAB comments were left out of this report. something we'll have to look
2 into.

3
4 Mr. Paul Brunner: The comments, Chuck, weren't listed with the response as to how they
5 were dealt with?

6
7 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: No. About half of them were left off. I don't know why, at least out
8 of my report, unless they were inadvertently left out just this one report that I got.

9
10 Ms. Elaine Anderegg: Elaine Anderegg from McClellan Air Force Base. Chuck, let me
11 give you a call tomorrow to look at those. I do know that some of the comments we received
12 were on the *VOC FS*, and some of the comments that we received from the committee actually
13 pertained to the working copy *Proposed Plan*, which has not come out yet. We plan to address
14 those comments when the *Proposed Plan* comes out.

15
16 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Correct me if I'm wrong. Bill or Sheila, you're on the committee. I
17 thought all our comments were addressing the *Feasibility Study*, the *Basewide Feasibility Study*.
18 I didn't know we were addressing the plan.

19
20 Ms. Sheila Guerra: Bill?

21
22 Mr. Bill Gibson: This is Bill Gibson. I provided most of the comments on the plan.

23
24 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Oh.

25
26 Mr. Bill Gibson: **(inaudible)**

1 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Because I noticed your comments were missing from our general
2 comments.

3

4 Mr. Bill Gibson: Right, because they didn't apply to the *Feasibility Study*.

5

6 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Oh, that's clears it up.

7

8 Mr. Bill Gibson: Identified in the matrix I sent you, which was which. You notice I refer to
9 the *Feasibility Plan* and your comments to the, well, I call it the draft plan (**inaudible**).

10

11 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Okay. Well that's the reason why. Because all your comments are
12 not there.

13

14 Mr. Bill Gibson: They were addressed in one of the meetings.

15

16 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Okay. Well, I thought that was part of the *Feasibility Study*. When
17 I looked through the ones you brought up they weren't there. That answers that then.

18

19 ***Technical Assistance for Public Participation***

20

21 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: I guess we can go on to the TAPP with Doris Bajka.

22

23 Mr. Paul Brunner: Doris couldn't be here.

24

25 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Oh, she couldn't?

26

27 Mr. Paul Brunner: I'll fill in for her.

28

1 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Okay.

2
3 Mr. Paul Brunner: On that. So we have a handout for the folks, too?

4
5 Ms. Merianne Briggs: Yes. We have two actually.

6
7 Mr. Paul Brunner: For the audience's sake, I do have some overheads that'll help with some
8 of the handouts that are being handed out. What we're asked to do is give an update and the
9 strategy on getting the TAPP. TAPP is the Technical Assistance Public Participation Proposal, a
10 way for the community to get contract help to assist reviewing of documents. Technical
11 documents that come in and to help out so that they would have a contractor to work with them
12 that the Air Force will fund and work through with them on — to give a third party review help
13 in this area. This is a relatively new concept that has come out and the RAB is in the process of
14 obtaining those services in that area.

15
16 On the first slide here that I've got, what we try to do here, on the briefing here too, for the folks
17 is reference in the various documents like the FRA, the Federal Regulations on Acquisition, and
18 other things as to where they are. For the members of the RAB and the public if you have
19 questions about the reference, we did bring the FRA and different things for people to review
20 here tonight.

21
22 The guidance of doing these things is the program was set out and its general framework, this is
23 one of our handouts I believe. Right, that you have for the folks? When Jeannie Lewis was
24 briefing last time she kind of referred to this a couple of months ago on the TAPP. So I'm not
25 going to spend a lot of time here tonight to go through that. The way of obtaining services, there
26 are two ways of obtaining services. One is what we call micro purchases. These are for efforts for
27
28

1 less than \$2,500. I have a slide that I will explain why I don't think that's all that viable for the
2 group here.

3
4 The second method is to have a competitive process of efforts in excess of \$2,500 that needs to
5 be done. When we do acquire a service under TAPP for the RAB to use, it would be done under
6 an Air Force contract and have to go through our contracting process for them to use. Both
7 options, however, we get the contractor to help out, must meet the selection criteria outlined in
8 the TAPP guidance — that's this guidance here. And there are rules — specific rules on how that
9 would be applied. The TAPP program is reserved for small business. That's referring back to
10 earlier when Chuck was mentioning that various companies have turned in their applications and
11 different things in review in that area for us at least to consider. And then the Department of
12 Defense selects the provider, which is the contractor, and I know we have had extensive
13 discussions within the RAB. There is a process in here of where we would have the RAB be a
14 part of the selection team and help make that selection. We prefer to have to work with you on
15 that.

16
17 There are some provisos in that, within the government, where as the team members that come,
18 and Chuck you had mentioned this be part of the Technical Review Team that would come. The
19 folks that do participate in this selection criteria will be asked to sign an integrity form that you
20 cannot then disclose the criteria outside. That's part of the acquisition process for allowing you to
21 participate in this process. So there is some confidentiality and some rigors that's applied to the
22 process. You can understand that within the contract it is competitive. I don't think its onerous,
23 but as you come to participate, you need to participate with those rules as to what we do.

24
25 The next slide speaks to the rationale for best value acquisition. I've been recommending to the
26 group that we go with more of a blanket acquisition where we acquire a contractor. Instead of
27 individual awards, or try to have just individual awards less than \$2,500 that wouldn't require
28

1 competition, is that the overall efforts that we have at McClellan tend to be fairly complex. Large
2 documents with long history involved in them. I think it would be better served for the RAB to
3 have someone with continuity where you already have them selected one time and you've gone
4 through the process versus going through each time. And you have them on-call and then you
5 don't have to bring them up-to-speed on history on that area.

6
7 **End of Tape**

8
9 Overall help you on your process of getting the person to service you. The next slide goes
10 through some of the specifics on the award that the members of the team would participate, we
11 would have a set of criteria that we'd lay out that would be part of the confidential nature as the
12 team sits down to write up the criteria. Most of it's already in this document here, as to what
13 needs to be done. But if the people that help build criteria for the selection wanted to supplement
14 it, the supplemental criteria would need to be in confidence and not shared with bidders before
15 hand as to what's going on, as we did that.

16
17 The award would not necessarily be based just on low dollar value. There would be a best value
18 of what criteria could be built into it. It could be on experience or other factors that the criteria
19 was built on, so we take that into consideration. The basic contract dollar amount would not
20 exceed \$100,000. That goes back to TAPP guidelines that the life of the TAPP program could
21 not exceed \$100,000. The most you can spend in one year on the TAPP is \$25,000. So its not a
22 large amount of money. We award a contract for that amount and we administrate with orders
23 against the contract that we'd work with you on what to do.

24
25 We would proceed going with two contracts, potentially award to two folks for your own
26 flexibility. If one didn't perform to your service, you have an alternate all ready in standby to
27 help you out in that area. The way that these contracts are, you could either in small dollar have
28

1 them compete against each other to see which one could give you the best value after they were
2 awarded (**inaudible**). That's pretty good. A 5-year ordering period is what we recommend, 6-
3 year performance period, and then have the best value selection. For the selection team to be
4 comprised of Air Force (**inaudible**) and also RAB members do that selection. And some of those
5 details once we get into the committees, Chuck, that you guys deem to be on it. Then we flesh
6 that out as far as the details of how that will work.

7
8 The next slide is a time schedule where we anticipate that in the month of December that the
9 RAB with the Technical Report Committee. How we want to do is that we identify the
10 evaluation team to work through that and work with the folks to get the signing of the
11 procurement integrity thing that says that you'll hold things in confidence as we go through this
12 process and nondisclosure statement. Then hopefully, still this month, and this is somewhat
13 ambitious depending upon the holiday schedule here, and your needs internally, that we build the
14 selection criteria. And then hopefully, if we can do that, then we'd issue the request for proposal
15 in January, review the proposals in February, where the team would come and do that review of
16 the proposal, and then, hopefully, have the contract awarded in the March time period. And we
17 can start to use it. So that's the schedule. You need Chuck for the briefing?

18
19 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Well, the only thing that I want to know; basically, we talked about
20 this, Sheila and Del. It seems like, if I remember right, correct me if I'm wrong, is that we wanted
21 the committee to go over the different people that have, or companies, that have submitted their
22 resumes and so forth and want to be included in as interested parties into our selection process.
23 Seems like to me we wanted it to go before the Technical Report Committee. Is that correct or
24 not correct?

25
26 Ms. Sheila Guerra: That's correct.

1 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: That's correct?

2

3 Ms. Sheila Guerra: That's correct. Yes. I think we're supposed to review the applications on
4 that committee, too. right?

5

6 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Well, that's what the process calls for, the way I understand.

7

8 Ms. Sheila Guerra: Well, I'd like to see them.

9

10 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: But I'm wanting to know from Paul now then if that's correct that I
11 just pointed out. Can we have the other people come from EM and contracting, to our Technical
12 Report Committee meeting?

13

14 Mr. Paul Brunner: Well, you need to be. Let me try to — I think I know where you're going.
15 And if I'm not then correct me, Chuck, and that is you need to be somewhat careful here. In the
16 competitive process, if you have the various proposals, like people have come to discuss their
17 activities and show you what they can do, and that's okay, but through the selection process you
18 don't want to get to the point that you have selected your person before you've gone through the
19 process, or give the appearance that you have.

20

21 The idea of who we have as far as proposals and people coming, if you think that they could meet
22 your needs and that — I think you can do that. The government does that when we look for
23 companies at times to send out applications and different things to folks, or request for proposals
24 to do. So within that you need to — from that aspect, if you're doing it from that point of view,
25 you're just seeing if people meet basic criteria that you want to have someone submit something
26 without already selecting someone — then I think that would be all right. I know Ralph Munch
27 from my contracting unit is here. Am I on target, Ralph?

28

1 Mr. Ralph Munch: **inaudible.**

2

3 Mr. Paul Brunner: Is to do that, so, the Technical meeting meets when?

4

5 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: We have a meeting selected in January. Do you by any chance have
6 that? Do we need to have that meeting before January?

7

8 Mr. Paul Brunner: Well, potentially, if that desire is that it go through that beforehand on the
9 criteria, I think you can meet some of those criteria. Let's see, the proposals would go out, issue
10 proposals in January, so potentially you could still meet the need and do it at your meeting. We
11 just need to have that information. If there is someone you, particularly out of four, that you don't
12 want to get a proposal back from, you need to have your meeting to tell us to don't do that,
13 before we send out. Right now, we don't have a date, so we could hold the issuing of proposal
14 after your Technical Review meeting.

15

16 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: So what you're saying is, at our meeting, we need to decide out of
17 the four right now that we have.

18

19 Mr. Paul Brunner: Who would you not want to get a proposal from?

20

21 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Who you would not want, too, so that way you won't submit a
22 proposal to them?

23

24 Mr. Paul Brunner: I think so. Ralph?

25

26 Mr. Ralph Munch: Ralph Munch. Anybody that wants to submit a proposal on this, once
27 they're made aware of it, can submit a proposal. We can't deny submission of proposals. The

28

1 only time you can deny somebody is in your technical review, if you don't like their submission
2 or the price, obviously. But as far as pre-selecting and eliminating people before the proposals are
3 actually issued, you can't do that. We can't do it, not in the government.

4
5 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: That's fine. I'm just trying to find out what we're supposed to do.

6
7 Mr. Paul Brunner: Okay. Well let's get clarification. Thanks, Ralph.

8
9 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: So we have four companies right now. So if some others come in,
10 or I only have two others that I know of. Merianne, do you know when our next — Roxanne, do
11 you know when our next Technical Report Committee meeting is? I don't have my calendar in
12 front of me.

13
14 Ms. Roxanne Yonn: It's January 6th.

15
16 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: January 6th.

17
18 Mr. Del Callaway: That's your meeting?

19
20 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Is this gentleman out here?

21
22 Mr. Paul Brunner: Is that right — January 6th?

23
24 Mr. Del Callaway: You're planning a meeting on January the 6th?

25
26 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: We tried to make sure that your meeting isn't anywhere around
27 ours. When is your meeting?

1 Mr. Del Callaway: January 7th.

2

3 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: The 7th?

4

5 Mr. Del Callaway: You don't want to have meetings two days in a row. Change it to the 7th,
6 combine them.

7

8 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Combine the meetings?

9

10 Mr. Del Callaway: Sure.

11

12 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: No, we go over too many reports. It would draw your meeting way
13 out. I thought we made sure that didn't occur.

14

15 Ms. Roxanne Yonn: Del had asked that we change his meeting from the 14th to the 7th.

16

17 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Oh, we traded around. That's what happened.

18

19 Ms. Roxanne Yonn: Yes.

20

21 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: He needed the meeting moved back. So why don't we move it to
22 the next week, then?

23

24 Ms. Roxanne Yonn: The 14th?

25

26 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Well, that's Thursday, isn't it?

27

28

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Ms. Roxanne Yonn: Right.

Mr. Del Callaway: Did you mail it out yet?

Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Which one is Wednesday, the 13th?

Ms. Roxanne Yonn: The 13th is Wednesday.

Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Okay, make it the 13th.

Ms. Roxanne Yonn: Okay.

Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: The reason being is it would make it awfully confusing for your meeting, because we go over reports. It's just not this.

Mr. Del Callaway: Do we want to get on this as fast as we can, or we want to have it as quickly as we can?

Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Well, let's see. In this particular instance, we could go ahead and have it on your meeting night if your meeting isn't going to be too intense.

Mr. Del Callaway: The point I was going to make is they haven't mailed anything out yet and the only people that know is the ones that are here. So if we change it...

Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Well, that's all right with me as long as your — if I'm not going to interfere with your meeting. If you're not going to have too much on the agenda that you're going to be going over that night.

1 Mr. Del Callaway: Yes. I was just advised I do have some other people coming. That's going
2 to take some time.

3

4 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: So it would be best to have it on my meeting night. Okay. See?
5 Your meeting fell back on top of mine.

6

7 Mr. Del Callaway: Sorry about that.

8

9 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: No, that's all right. So we'll just meet the 13th then. Now is this
10 gentleman out here, is he going to be working with us now on this, the contractor from your
11 office?

12

13 Mr. Paul Brunner: Ralph will be — either him or his staff will be involved with you guys,
14 yes, along with Doris.

15

16 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Could someone meet with us on the 13th of January? We meet at
17 6:30 in the evening. We'll make this the first thing on our agenda?

18

19 Unknown Male: **(Inaudible)**

20

21 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Okay. And then someone from your office. Will that be Phil or
22 someone else?

23

24 Mr. Paul Brunner: During the Technical Meeting it will probably be Phil. I'll let Doris know.

25

26 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Have Doris there, too?

27

28

1 Mr. Paul Brunner: She'll have to plan. She lives out of town or up in the foothills, so it's the
2 commute back and forth. Different issues for her. So yes, if she preplans the issue well it should
3 work out for her.

4
5 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Okay. So then we can have those covered and we could do this
6 then.

7
8 Mr. Paul Brunner: Right.

9
10 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Good. Just wanted to make sure we're covered.

11
12 Mr. Paul Brunner: So I think that's the TAPP report.

13
14 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: That's it. And now it's you.

15
16 **RAB Advisory Worksheet Report**

17
18 Mr. Paul Brunner: Okay. On the worksheets. There is only one worksheet that's out for a
19 response and that's on the *Five-Year Plan*. Chuck had mentioned that. The response time period
20 for the *Five-Year Plan* has moved on — we're still working it. So I think where we are on that
21 within the Technical Review is being reviewed. And in talking with Phil Mook from my staff, is
22 that as you guys develop the comments, we'll try to incorporate them as they come in. Hopefully
23 we will be able to accommodate them. I don't know why we wouldn't at this point.

24
25 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Well you've already accommodated us as far as I know. Did Phil
26 take note of your comments, Sheila? Your comments regarding the *Five-Year Plan*, Phil took
27 note of them and was going to see that they were changed, right?

1 Ms. Sheila Guerra: Yes, I'm still looking at the two reports that I have. You forgot to mention
2 the *Community Relations IRP*.

3

4 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: No, don't get up on another report. We're just talking about the...

5

6 Mr. Paul Brunner: *Five-Year Review*.

7

8 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: *Five-Year Review*. And that's been answered. As far as I know all
9 of our comments were verbal comments because they were so...

10

11 Mr. Paul Brunner: Okay.

12

13 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: ...so small. So that's all taken care of, you can...

14

15 Mr. Paul Brunner: Okay.

16

17 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: ...close that worksheet.

18

19 Mr. Paul Brunner: Okay.

20

21 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: That's what I was trying to do.

22

23 Mr. Paul Brunner: Good. All right. And I know that we have a *Community Plan* out there.

24 You're right, Sheila, on that. We didn't send that out on a worksheet though — I think we just
25 sent that out for review. So we probably should have a worksheet item on that to track that.

26

27 Ms. Sheila Guerra: I'm reviewing it right now. I have some questions about it. So I'm going to

28

1 call Phil...

2

3 Mr. Paul Brunner: Okay.

4

5 Ms. Sheila Guerra: ...on it.

6

7 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: That might be a good idea to get a worksheet going on it. I concur.

8

9 Ms. Elaine Anderegg: Elaine Anderegg. Sheila, you say you're going to call Phil Mook
10 about the *Community Relations Plan*?

11

12 Ms. Sheila Guerra: I'm looking at the draft.

13

14 Ms. Elaine Anderegg: I don't think that Phil is necessarily...

15

16 Mr. Paul Brunner: Phil is probably not the right person. The person you need to contact on
17 the *Community Relations Plan* is probably Merianne. And the *Community Relations Plan* — that
18 is working it. Phil is not unless there's a technical issue on the *Community Relations Plan*. It's
19 not the point of contact for it. It's fine to call us to get the right input back to you.

20

21 Ms. Sheila Guerra: I misunderstood then, because I thought that he was the person that we
22 were to contact on any of the reports we were reviewing.

23

24 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Not on the *Community Relations Plan*. That is in your committee.
25 That's covered in your committee. That's the only report that isn't.

26

27 Ms. Sheila Guerra: What I'm getting at is the Technical Reports Committee gets that draft.

28

1 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Members of it would get the draft, but it would be covered on your
2 committee. That's the only report that's covered on your committee and not on mine. Okay.
3 Because it is a community relations item — it's a community relations report.
4

5 Ms. Sheila Guerra: I don't think we did this like this last time.
6

7 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: It's always been that way. We've always covered the *Community*
8 *Relations Plan* in the Community Relations Committee. It's always been that way from day one.
9

10 Mr. Paul Brunner: I think it works out. I was just trying to clarify that the contact point to get
11 to be responsive to you — Phil would not necessary understand what the question was coming
12 for (**inaudible**).
13

14 Ms. Sheila Guerra: I thought that maybe they had changed something because I know it did
15 come through the CR committee before when we did it. And since I just got on this other
16 committee when it came through on that meeting — I thought it was being done differently for
17 some reason.
18

19 Mr. Paul Brunner: No, It's not.
20

21 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: On the reason why that was brought up because there was another
22 report coming out. Phil Mook said that we would not be covering that on the Technical Report
23 Committee. It would be referred to the Community Relations, which was correct.
24

25 Ms. Sheila Guerra: Yes.
26

27 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: So that's in your ball (**inaudible**)
28

1 Ms. Sheila Guerra: More work for me I guess. That's okay.

2

3 Mr. Paul Brunner: Okay. That's the only worksheet that we have open is that one that we
4 covered there.

5

6 **RAB Decision Items**

7

8 That moves us to the RAB decision items. Since we don't have a quorum, we really don't have
9 any decisions, too. That brings us to a break. Do we want to take the 5 or 10 minute break?

10

11 **Public Comment and Questions**

12

13 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: 5-minute break.

14

15 Mr. Del Callaway: 5-minute.

16

17 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: 5-minute break.

18

19 Mr. Frank Miller: What about public comments?

20

21 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Oh. Public comments.

22

23 Mr. Paul Brunner: Oh, that's true.

24

25 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Okay, we're open for public comments, Frank.

26

27 Mr. Frank Miller: Frank Miller. Has anybody seen the security guard, the contractor that
28

28

1 we're paying for? I take it no one has seen the contractor. As of 7:25 p.m. I went outside and the
2 contractor is not in sight. I hope that EM is not going to pay for this contractor tonight. They
3 ought to be fired.

4
5 Mr. Paul Brunner: Well, the contractor, as advised by Merianne, did not show up for this
6 meeting, of which they will not be paid for. The various contract actions that we have, will take
7 action to make sure that's corrected — and with the appropriate actions taken. So we have the
8 right people here. We have our contracting agent and we also have Merianne here to speak to the
9 action.

10
11 Mr. Frank Miller: I have a question I'd like to direct to Mr. MacDonald. The recent news
12 release on or about December 1st says that, to quote: "A base sewer line leaked an undetermined
13 amount of raw sewage into Magpie Creek today." I would like for you to address this
14 undetermined amount of raw sewage.

15
16 Mr. Alex MacDonald: I just got this press release actually today, too. But I was actually
17 contacted on the phone yesterday by McClellan Air Force Base. The discharge from the sanitary
18 sewer (**inaudible**) force main — occurred yesterday afternoon. The actual amount is very
19 difficult to determine. Estimates are 500 gallons up to 4,000 gallons, somewhere in that range.
20 Out of the manhole but not directly into the creek. Most of the water ponded adjacent to the
21 manhole before it got to the creek. The creek was then dammed up with sandbags. Water was
22 pumped out of the creek for a period of four hours. The flow that had ponded behind near the
23 manhole and between the creek was also dammed up, chlorinated, and then taken away with a
24 vacuum truck.

25
26 McClellan actually took all of the proper actions as fast as they found out about the problem. So
27 yes, the estimate is 500 to 4,000 gallons, somewhere in that range. It's very difficult to tell from a
28

1 manhole that basically pumps periodically. Since it's a lift station, basically it's a force main. The
2 pump kicks on for a period of time. It shuts off again. So how often does that turn on and off
3 during that period of time? By the time they noticed it to the time they shut it off is the issue.
4

5 Mr. Frank Miller: So we have no way of knowing for how many minutes this forced pump
6 main was spilling sewage.
7

8 Mr. Alex MacDonald: Up to an hour, an hour and 20 minutes, somewhere around that
9 range. And so during that period of time it's not flowing all the time. As it is, it's a forced main.
10 It goes on and off.
11

12 Mr. Frank Miller: Okay. So that explains why you say an undetermined amount.
13

14 Mr. Alex MacDonald: Yes, this is what they said. They have to do a rough estimate,
15 Frank, based on visual observation.
16

17 Mr. Frank Miller: The next question is regarding the soil vapor extraction system. The
18 release from that extraction system. This is an air quality question. According to the Air Force
19 news release, they claim, quote: "This emission represents only one-quarter of one percent of
20 what is allowed by the air district per quarter." And perhaps Mr. Healy could address this
21 question. When you drag that out, spread that out over one quarter, isn't that being a bit vague
22 and evasive? I mean, isn't that really just a transparent cop-out? What about the acute release that
23 actually happens in the 49-hour period, the toxicity of that acute release in the 49-hour period?
24

25 Mr. Joe Healy: As far as the acute toxicity, I believe that McClellan is preparing a report
26 on exactly what happened and trying to determine more accurately how many pounds were
27 released, as best they can figure. I expect this report will get into what that does mean. The report
28

1 is being prepared right now.

2
3 Mr. Paul Brunner: Okay. Frank, within the confines of your question, the emissions that come
4 out, the solvent types of things from operations and industrial operations that are currently on the
5 base now that emit air emissions on it so — the poundage that was estimated from coming up
6 from the ground, the five pounds is very similar to one of our operations on base today. So the
7 averaging that we have over there represents what we're allowed to discharge from operation of
8 the system, that we have, that's permitted by the district. So it's within the parameters — it's
9 unfortunate that the unit did not work right. And we shut it down and took appropriate actions
10 but that's the answer to your question.

11
12 Mr. Frank Miller: Well, I represent to you that to claim that this is the emissions allowed
13 over an entire quarter, a calendar quarter of time, when in actuality it was a 49-hour release that
14 no one even saw, for 49 hours this acute release was occurring, to represent what you stated in
15 the news release is an obvious evasive cop-out.

16
17 Mr. Paul Brunner: I don't agree with your comment. But I won't...

18
19 Mr. Frank Miller: The facts speak for themselves. The 49-hour acute release is factually what
20 happened and you represented it as something that you can drag out over a quarter, and that
21 seems to be fine with you.

22
23 Mr. Paul Brunner: Do you have any other comments?

24
25 Mr. Frank Miller: No. Just one other quick comment to Mr. Munch. Regarding the TAPP —
26 regarding this potential TAPP acquisition, if I understand it right, you're going to acquire this
27 person. It will be a similar process to the way you acquired the Ride Share Coordinator. Is that
28

1 the way you're going to go about this? Because Mr. Brunner said that you want to avoid the
2 appearance of picking this contractor before you actually pick the person. So now the model —
3 wouldn't the model be the Ride Share Coordinator?
4

5 Mr. Ralph Munch: **(inaudible)**
6

7 Mr. Frank Miller: Is that the way you're going to model this acquisition after?
8

9 Ms. Roxanne Yonn: Excuse me, Ralph, could you...
10

11 Mr. Frank Miller: ...the way you did the Ride Share Coordinator?
12

13 Mr. Paul Brunner: What is your question, Frank?
14

15 Mr. Ralph Munch: Okay.
16

17 Mr. Paul Brunner: Do you know the question Ralph?
18

19 Mr. Ralph Munch: I'll try.
20

21 Mr. Paul Brunner: No, Frank, what is the question?
22

23 Mr. Frank Miller: The question is now the Ride Share Coordinator would be the model of
24 how you're going to pick a contractor, and is that how you're going to pick the TAPP person?
25

26 Mr. Ralph Munch: Ralph Munch speaking. The process that we use to pick any contractor that
27 is competitive, is by allowing multiple bidders to submit proposals and choosing the best one.
28

1 That's what the process will be for the TAPP program.

2

3 Mr. Frank Miller: Mr. Munch, how many competitors did you have for the Ride Share
4 position?

5

6 Mr. Ralph Munch: We had one company submit a proposal.

7

8 Mr. Frank Miller: Right. Simmons Distributing. They were picked.

9

10 Mr. Paul Brunner: Yes, so the point here is we went through a competitive process on that,
11 and your question is, did we follow a process? The answer is "yes." Will it be a similar process?
12 The answer is "yes." And in the case of the Ride Share area, we had the one that was submitted
13 and that was part of the competitive process. I think we're already to the three minutes my
14 clock...

15

16 Ms. Roxanne Yonn: Yes.

17

18 Mr. Paul Brunner: ...passed is to move on. Any other comments?

19

20 Mr. Gary Collier: My name is Gary Collier. First of all I have two brief comments I'd like to
21 well — one brief comment, actually. I have a question that I would like to ask of the EPA and
22 Cal/EPA regarding the sewer leak.

23

24 Actually, the comment is, I feel that the Air Force's response to this as far as being reported is
25 much more than it occurs in the City of Sacramento. And I'd like to find out, I was kind of
26 chagrined when I heard about this sewer leak on the radio. We don't hear about sewer leaks in
27 the City of Sacramento. It's just not done. And we don't have the type of response that the Air

28

1 Force did in this incident.

2
3 In the term of City of Sacramento, we have sewer leaks on former parts of the Air Force base,
4 which were deeded eventually to the City of Sacramento. They don't berm up the sewage. They
5 allow it to go down and pond in our streets, which were installed by the United States Air Corp,
6 previous to the Air Force taking over the base and divesting this property.

7
8 What I'd like to find out is whether that ponding and eventual desiccation of the sewage effluent
9 is posing an increased hazard beyond the regular entrained pm 2.5 when the City also because of
10 the deleterious pavement quality, since it was installed in 1942, they refuse to do any
11 maintenance and they refuse to do any street sweeping, which is best available technology to
12 provide adequate drainage and provide adequate removing the entrain dust.

13
14 By adding the sewage effluent which is desiccated, is that an increased hazard to our community?
15 And secondly, is Cal/EPA and EPA responsible or are they supposed to be notified of a sewer
16 leak in the City of Sacramento promptly, and should they be required to boom sewage effluent
17 and remove it and sanitize it with chlorine?

18
19 Mr. Joe Healy: I can speak first for U.S. EPA, and my rather limited knowledge of this —
20 but I suspect that it's the local regulatory agencies that would deal with this. And I think you're
21 correct in saying that maybe it is unusual for such coverage of a sewage leak. They happen
22 frequently in many communities, especially older ones. In fact the community I live in, Albany,
23 down near the City of Berkeley, every year there, during storm events, sewage comes up, raw
24 sewage onto streets. I don't think it's reported, you know, beyond the little tiny Albany
25 newspaper.

26
27 As far as reporting to EPA, I think EPA would defer it to local authorities. We look at much
28

1 larger problems like stormdrain overflows for, say, the City of San Francisco or on a regional
2 basis. If you'd like I can try and look into this matter further, but I suspect this would be the
3 answer.

4
5 Mr. Gary Collier: My primary interest is the entrain reentrained dust particles having
6 possible harmful bacteria. There was a mention of chloroform bacteria in the creek. I'm not sure
7 if that's natural occurring, or whether it was a result of other sewage spills. The other comment
8 I'd want to make is...

9
10 Mr. Paul Brunner: Did you want Alex's response too?

11
12 Mr. Gary Collier: Yes, if he could.

13
14 Mr. Alex MacDonald: Sure, the Sacramento Regional Sanitation District operates under a
15 NPDS or national permit issued from our office. Part of the requirements of that are to inform us
16 of spilled releases. They're not required to publicly go out. What McClellan's done is far beyond
17 what Sac Regional would be required to do. But they would be taking the same precautionary
18 measures that McClellan — they should be doing that sort of action to minimize the impact to
19 the community and impact to any surface waters nearby.

20
21 As far as the sewage causing additional problems, you'll see that the bacteria problem basically
22 dies off fairly quickly. The bacteria does not like living outside of the water. What happens when
23 it dries up, it basically disappears. You don't want to go into the sewage or wade in the water,
24 touch the water when it's there ponded. But once it evaporates, basically, the risk is very
25 minimal.

26
27 Classic example is downtown Sacramento. They have numerous occasions where you have raw
28

1 sewage, like Joe was talking about, coming up in the streets. And many homes — actually in the
2 basements of the homes, the risk is don't go in the water right when it's there. You have to
3 disinfect it and then you let it go away and the risk is gone. So you're talking about the dust
4 particles and people coming and basically drying and then getting up and having certain people
5 breathing it. No, basically, the bacteria and pathogens die off fairly quickly.

6
7 Mr. Gary Collier: Okay, yes. And by the way, as far as CSS the system downtown, we're
8 paying for it in North Sacramento and South Sacramento...

9
10 Mr. Alex MacDonald: Yes, I know.

11
12 Mr. Gary Collier: ...at a higher rate and they're getting the bulk of the tax dollars for their
13 community. So we are well aware of that one. That was a real rotten deal.

14
15 Ms. Roxanne Yonn: Excuse me, I'm going to have to call time at this particular time.

16
17 Mr. Gary Collier: Yes, could I make a 30-second question regarding the electric outage? I
18 was curious...

19
20 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Go ahead, real fast.

21
22 Mr. Gary Collier: Okay, real quick. The electrical outage. I'm wondering if that has any
23 relationship to the air pollution in terms of the electronics, whether they were surge protected.
24 Were there any relationship? It seems the timeframe is similar. Has anybody looked at that?

25
26 Mr. Paul Brunner: You're talking about the SVE unit that shut down?

1 Mr. Gary Collier: Correct.

2

3 Mr. Paul Brunner: Specifically, I don't know, but I doubt it.

4

5 Mr. Gary Collier: Okay.

6

7 Mr. Paul Brunner: I think it was a failure in the unit of which we need to find out why. I
8 doubt if it's an air pollution issue. I take your question as the air pollution causing the problem?

9

10 Mr. Gary Collier: Negative. The power outage being a factor if possibly a surge occurred and
11 it wasn't protected equipment.

12

13 Mr. Paul Brunner: I don't know.

14

15 Mr. Gary Collier: And then it went out.

16

17 Mr. Paul Brunner: It happened the other day, and as it comes back in the things that I have
18 asked to have done is, each unit on base be reinspected to make sure that they are effectively
19 operating. So we are in a phase process of making sure that happens and bring the units back up
20 to find out why this unit does this.

21

22 Mr. Gary Collier: Okay. Thank you very much. I would like to commend the Air Force for at
23 least being up front about this issue with the sewage.

24

25 Mr. Paul Brunner: Any other public comments?

26

27 Mr. Del Callaway: I would like to comment that the State of California just a few months
28

28

1 back closed the beach where they had a large sewage release in the ocean. And they closed the
2 entire thing down until it was cleaned up and it was quite extensive. So it probably comes under
3 health and safety of one of the state departments.

4
5 And also I noticed on here, I was just reading this, the fire department went by and discovered
6 the leak. And the fire department logs could have given you the time that went by because they
7 keep a log of their activities and the times and places. And then civil engineers did not shut the
8 line off, it took them an hour and a half — an hour and fifty minutes, almost two hours. So they
9 should know by the capacity of the pipe and the pump how much it pumped for a 2 hour period
10 of time, to come up with a better than ballpark figure of 3,000 to 5,000 gallons — you could tell
11 it probably within a gallon.

12
13 Mr. Alex MacDonald: Well, Del, as I said before the pump doesn't pump continuously.
14 The pump is basically a wet well that fills up and then the pump kicks on for a certain period of
15 time then shuts off. They could probably go back and attempt to figure out — if they have a
16 meter on the pump, they could figure out the duration of that pumping period. As it just happened
17 yesterday. This is low priority to figure out if it was exactly 8,000 gallons or 5,000 gallons. The
18 key was to get the problem taken care of first. Now they're going to come up with a report with
19 more details.

20
21 Mr. Del Callaway: Well, now, there's another statement in here that I don't think is probably
22 appropriate, "Air Force and the officials determine that there is no immediate health risk." I think
23 that if anybody was in that immediate area there was an immediate health risk to any workers,
24 whether they be fire department or any other individuals that's in contact with that sewage waste.

25
26 Mr. Paul Brunner: Well within that context, Del. What happened during this particular spill,
27 when we made the notification of the spill, the County Health officials were present, Fish and
28

1 Game was present, and the whole sweep of people were present at the site. That also helps make
2 that determination as far as the health of the issue.

3
4 And the intent wasn't necessarily standing right in the middle of the sewage, which we hoped
5 people wouldn't do. It's the overall impact of where people potentially would be exposed to
6 might be down stream or in the creek. So that was the conclusion from the people on scene that
7 were responding to it, not only the Air Force, but also the community members that were on
8 scene and the health officials. That was the conclusion.

9
10 This particular quote, as we go through, is attributed to one of our people in the Air Force but
11 was also the conclusion of the other people that were responding. If it wasn't the conclusion of
12 the people on it from the Air Force perspective, we'd still be out there fixing the thing because of
13 the sewage spill that we had and what we needed to do.

14
15 Mr. Del Callaway: The reason I bring this up is I was out on Raley Boulevard looking at
16 Magpie Creek and Don Julio to see the water level in the creek because the field across on the
17 west side of Raley Boulevard already had water in it. A couple of acres or so. And there were
18 several kids playing along that bridge where they've got a little statue of some sort setting there
19 where somebody evidently had an accident and died or something. They shouldn't be playing
20 there. I would agree their parents should be watching them a little closer than that, because they
21 get in that fast current and they're gone. But if it went for 2 hours it surely made it that far
22 because according to where this building's located, unless you got that boom on that creek and
23 had that creek dammed up in a big hurry, it went off base.

24
25 Major Robert Gonzales: Del, Major Robert Gonzales from the Public Affairs office, I was
26 out there on scene yesterday. The people that made that determination were the Sacramento Fire
27 Department, the County HazMat people and our base bioenvironmental engineers. They're the

1 ones who determine whether it was a health risk. And from all the discussions yesterday, that
2 question was specifically asked by me. And no, they determined that it was not a health risk. So
3 there was a consensus from the local community, the County, and the Air Force. And that's why
4 that's statement's in there. Part of the reason for that, there was already coliform in the water
5 naturally occurring. And, fortunate for us, it had just rained quite a bit the day prior so there was
6 a lot of water still running. They said that any additional coliform in there would be diluted. So it
7 should...

8
9 Mr. Del Callaway: Wait a minute.

10
11 Major Robert Gonzales: Sir?

12
13 Mr. Del Callaway: You already had coliform in there?

14
15 Mr. Robert Gonzales: It's naturally occurring. It's a bacteria that's naturally occurring.

16
17 Mr. Del Callaway: And so more went into there.

18
19 Major Robert Gonzales: To an additional amount of water.

20
21 Mr. Del Callaway: That would raise it, not lower it.

22
23 Major. Robert Gonzales: It would lower it because there was more water in there.

24
25 Mr. Del Callaway: The water may lower it, yes.

26
27 Mr. Paul Brunner: Robert, I think that you guys are actually talking past each other on it.

1 Major Robert Gonzales: Okay.

2
3 Mr. Paul Brunner: The point being on the discussion, because we're really kind of going into
4 the break time where we are, Del. Your point I take it is that the level that the coliform, the
5 sewage that happened, and there was a potential threat downstream on it. What we did try to do
6 during that time, it is unfortunate that it went into the creek, is that we did try to make the notice,
7 we took immediate actions to contain. We worked with the County folks to do whatever we
8 needed to do to prevent health issues. We coordinated and consulted them. I'm not sure what else
9 we could have done. If the Cal health officials would have indicated that there was an issue, I
10 mean we don't make the call of off base issues as to where we are. Within the base environment
11 we can because that's the Air Force entity; but if there was an indication that we needed to do
12 more downstream from the health care officials, we would have responded. But that wasn't the
13 case. So your point in there, I take for fact that you question that call — but it was a joint call as
14 to where we responded, too.

15
16 Mr. Del Callaway: I'm just questioning the manner in which this is written and the loopholes
17 that are left in it and the doubts that it creates by not having enough factual information to
18 substantiate what you're trying to say.

19
20 Mr. Paul Brunner: As we go through here on the news releases, let's talk about the news
21 release purposes. Usually from the Air Force perspective, and where we are as I even stated, is
22 that the Air Force does take the extra step to advise as to what the instances are that are
23 occurring. Our purpose in those news releases is to get the advisory out as quickly as possible
24 with the information that we have. That news release was prepared that afternoon of the spill, to
25 get the word out to the public as to what's going on. We don't have the time to go through and
26 micro manage it down to precision as to where it is. But we do take the steps to get the word out
27 on where it is. So what we do when the news releases go out is go back in and do the

1 investigation, get the details to quantify what many times the questions. But the purpose of the
2 news release isn't to have tremendous precision in it, it's to advise what the issue is. If we would
3 wait to get all that precision, then the news release would not go out. I hear what you're saying
4 but the news release...

5
6 Mr. Del Callaway: Okay. I see your comment on the other issue, that the Air Force is very
7 serious about keeping environmental control systems in tip top conditions. So that's what you're
8 saying is that you like to stay on top of things and make sure everybody is safe and that it's
9 cleaned up quickly and no one suffers and all like that. I understand all that. I just picked up on
10 this one when Mr. Miller was talking. I don't want to ride it all night. I'm just looking at it from
11 the standpoint of information was available to cover these things and so that Mr. Miller couldn't
12 say anything and I couldn't say anything. I mean, it could have been a little better done, but that's
13 okay. So break time.

14
15 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Well, just one thing I would like to say. One thing that you are
16 correct, that the chloroform bacteria the stuff that's already in the creek, it adds up. But I don't
17 quite understand here if the California Fish and Game was the agency involved here or the U.S.
18 Fish and Wildlife. You have the U.S. Fish and Game and it is the California Fish and Game, if it
19 is Fish and Game.

20
21 Mr. Paul Brunner: It was California Fish and Game.

22
23 Ms. Sheila Guerra: Could I comment on this for a minute?

24
25 Mr. Paul Brunner: Sure.

26
27 Ms. Sheila Guerra: Just before we go to break? I was just wondering why you didn't have Fish
28

1 and Wildlife on here as notifying them also?

2

3 Mr. Robert Gonzales: (**inaudible**)

4

5 Mr. Paul Brunner: Well, that's not a question, Robert.

6

7 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: I just want to know who it was.

8

9 Mr. Paul Brunner: Why didn't the U.S. Fish and Wildlife service respond? I'm not sure if
10 they're on the notification list for a response. Alex, on the list for that, do they qualify?

11

12 Mr. Alex MacDonald: They might be on the list but they're not really a responding
13 agency. Fish and Game would respond opposed to Fish and Wildlife Services. They don't have a
14 staff to go out on these type of things.

15

16 Mr. Del Callaway: That's not her question.

17

18 Mr. Alex MacDonald: If Fish and Game are the people out in the field that would come to
19 respond to a spill like this, Fish and Wildlife Service would have been notified, but they would
20 not be a responder. They would not come out and look at the spill and take action.

21

22 Ms. Sheila Guerra: The reason why I'm wondering why they wouldn't be notified, because of
23 the environmental sensitive area where the spill went. I was kind of concerned if it affects the
24 wildlife after all this.

25

26 Mr. Paul Brunner: Well, that's an aspect that, when we went after that, Kirsten
27 Christopherson from our office, I asked her to specifically go out and look for those areas and

28

1 provide that interface as to what the issues are.

2
3 From indications that we have, it's not. If Fish and Wildlife needs to have their interface with us
4 on the impact, we will do that on it. But in regards to responding, what happens for a spill is that
5 — and yesterday — we have a national spill response number that we end up calling into and
6 then they have a protocol within the state that they notify. And the agencies get notified based
7 upon that. So we would not go out ourselves and say, Fish and Game come, or Fish and Wildlife
8 Services. Usually, they rely on this national response center to make the notifications of all the
9 appropriate bodies. If we were to do the notifications, we would be busy calling specific areas to
10 come and then it would be chaotic in the field. So the State has set up this response center. One
11 call and they fan out to make sure the appropriate people are coming.

12
13 Ms. Sheila Guerra: Do you get fined for this?

14
15 Mr. Paul Brunner; For the sewer spill? I don't think so.

16
17 Mr. Sheila Guerra: No?

18
19 Mr. Paul Brunner: If we were to get fined I think the City of Sacramento and a whole bunch
20 of other folks would be fined all the time on that in that area.

21
22 Ms. Sheila Guerra: Well, it costs money to bring all these people in.

23
24 Mr. Paul Brunner: Yes, it costs money whenever you have a spill.

25
26 Ms. Sheila Guerra: That's what I was wondering about.

1 Mr. Paul Brunner: And every other spill that happens out there.

2
3 **Break**

4
5 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: I suggest if we're going to take our break, we go ahead and do it.

6
7 Five minutes.

8
9 Mr. Paul Brunner: So we're adjourned at 8:10.

10
11 **New Business**

12
13 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Real fast, before we start the next agenda item, I would like to tell
14 the RAB members here. The handouts I just gave you are referring to the water quality objectives
15 that this board backed the Water Quality Control Board on. And the difference between that and
16 MCL cleanup levels, maximum contaminant levels, Water Quality Objectives — and it explains
17 it in the document that I just gave you. But also for your information, on the 11th of December,
18 which is a Friday, at 9 a.m. they're having a meeting downtown at the Central Valley Regional
19 Water Quality Control Board, on 3443 Robert Road, Suite A, Sacramento, California. They're
20 going to be going over the brief here that Alex has prepared regarding water quality objectives
21 versus MCLs, maximum contaminate level, for the cleanup of McClellan.

22
23 I will see if I can make it to that meeting. I don't know if any others would be interested in
24 attending. I know that we as a RAB voted unanimously to back the water quality objectives that
25 the Regional Water Quality Control Board and State Department of Health Services and Federal
26 EPA have basically agreed on. If you're interested in that meeting, like I said it's January 11th, at
27 9 a.m. Do you know what exact time it might come up?

1 Mr. Alex MacDonald: I think, Chuck, you passed out an agenda with that.
2
3 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Yes.
4
5 Mr. Alex MacDonald: There's numerous things. We're item seven on that agenda.
6
7 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Right.
8
9 Mr. Alex MacDonald: Going through that list it probably won't start before 10. I can
10 almost guarantee it won't start before 10. Because there's a couple of items that are kind of
11 controversial. It'll take a while items 5 and 6 on there. So I will say before 10 we will start. But
12 definitely before lunch. So we'll be done before lunch. I'm only supposed to take 15 to 20
13 minutes.
14
15 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: So what time is lunch?
16
17 Mr. Alex MacDonald: For them they'll probably take you to 11:30 or 12.
18
19 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: So the idea is to be there by 10 if you want to make it.
20
21 Mr. Alex MacDonald: Correct.
22
23 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: If you want to listen or make comment?
24
25 Mr. Alex MacDonald: Right. What they'll have is a staff presentation and then they'll ask
26 if anyone else would want to speak on the issue. Then they'll consider adoption of a resolution.
27
28

1 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: So then they'll also hear from comments?

2

3 Mr. Alex MacDonald: Right. If you want to make comments, fine. If no one comments
4 then that's okay with them too. It's kind of an information item for them for the Board to bring
5 new items for their information and advice type of thing.

6

7 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Okay.

8

9 Mr. Del Callaway: Okay, that's December the 11th.

10

11 Mr. Alex MacDonald: Correct.

12

13 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Did I say January? I'm sorry. December. Make correction.
14 December the 11th.

15

16 Mr. Alex MacDonald: A week from Friday.

17

18 Mr. Del Callaway: December.

19

20 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Which is a week from Friday.

21

22 Mr. Del Callaway: December.

23

24 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: December the 11th definitely.

25

26 Mr. Del Callaway: Get rid of January. December.

27

28

1 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: 10 a.m. if you want to hear this item on the agenda or you want to
2 make comment to it.

3
4 **County Initiative on New Well Guidelines**

5
6 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Okay. The next item. Linda Hogg of the State of California is
7 going to be presenting the next item to us regarding County Initiative on New Well Guidelines.
8 Excuse me, Linda, you mind?

9
10 Mr. Del Callaway: Is this one of them 3 minute clocks?

11
12 Ms. Linda Hogg: Going to time me Del? My name is Linda Hogg. I'm with the Department
13 of Toxic Substance Control. I am the Reuse Coordinator for the State on McClellan, but I also
14 am the Remedial Project Manager and Reuse Coordinator for Mather Air Force. I wanted to take
15 a brief moment to give you some background before I introduce the main speaker from
16 Sacramento County on this proposed amendment to their well ordinance.

17
18 Mather has a very large and extensive groundwater plume, I think a little larger than McClellan's
19 but ours goes quite a ways off base at Mather. So we have some concerns as we're finishing up
20 the closure of Mather, which was a BRAC one closure. Mather has been closed since '93. Of
21 how to protect not only the users of groundwater, but also protect the remedial systems that
22 we've installed at Mather so that that pump and treat system can operate properly.

23
24 The military can do what we call deed restrictions or institutional controls on property that is
25 under their control. They cannot do it for property of course that they don't own. So the State, as
26 we have been trying to deal with this groundwater plume at Mather, has been looking at other
27 ways to contain the groundwater there, but also to protect the water and to protect the treatment.

1 so we turn to Sacramento County with a proposal of amending their ordinance for well
2 permitting. This is not only to place new wells, but also for abandoning any old wells. We've had
3 a couple of situations at Mather where some old agricultural wells were abandoned that were in
4 the middle of the plume. And those wells have to be abandoned properly or they become a
5 conduit for contamination.

6
7 Sacramento County is not unique in looking at this situation. I know for a fact in Monterey
8 County they are looking at the same situation. Monterey County has Fort Ord Army Base.
9 Riverside County has begun looking at this, March Air Force Base is located there. So the State,
10 myself, and the Water Board have approached the County and asked them to look at the idea of
11 amending their ordinance such that any wells that are going to be placed near a major
12 contaminated plume. That would not just be McClellan or Mather; we will be looking at Aerojet,
13 the railroad, the Sac Army Depot, any of our major things — even some of the smaller leaks that
14 the Water Board keeps track of such as the underground tanks they would be looking at. To look
15 at that and have a review process to review any well permits, not only new construction, but
16 abandonment.

17
18 With that I'd like to introduce Steve Kalvelage. He's from Sacramento County's Environmental
19 Management Division. He's the Supervising Hazardous Materials Specialist. And it's his staff
20 that will be working, not only on well ordinance, but the ones who are involved in reviewing
21 those permits.

22
23 Mr. Steve Kalvelage: My name is Steve Kalvelage, I'm with Sacramento County
24 Environmental Management as Linda said. And our agency is the local agency with
25 responsibility for issuing well permits. That's not just drinking water wells, that's monitoring
26 wells, that's extraction wells, that's well abandonment permits. So it made a lot of logic when the
27 state came to us and said, "We would like a review process," because the various state oversight
28

1 agencies have a much better understanding of plume dimensions where the contamination is. By
2 combining our ability to put restrictions on the permits and their knowledge of where we want
3 those wells drilled, we think we can better protect the groundwater. So that was our intent in
4 starting this.

5
6 I have some handouts. I don't want to really burden everybody with about 60 pages of paper.
7 They're on the back table if anybody would like them. We have actually a total of 8 proposed
8 changes to the local well ordinance. Most of these I categorize as housekeeping. How much
9 timeframe we need for notification for response to well grouts, 48 hours, 24 hours, things like
10 that. This is the critical one that Linda brought up, the fact that we are going to be coordinating
11 with state agencies not just at Mather or McClellan, but hopefully countywide. Any area where
12 there's a turnabout contamination impacting the groundwater and/or having an adverse impact on
13 an ongoing cleanup effort, we want to coordinate and make an effort to put restrictions and/or
14 provide options. Because, sometimes, you can just do different construction on a well that will
15 give you some relatively confident level that you're protecting whatever your concern would be;
16 whether it's the groundwater or the way that the reclamation projects go forward.

17
18 I don't want to talk all night long. I think you guys probably have a lot of stuff on. But I'd love to
19 answer any questions you have and elaborate from there. So I'd hoped to just say this is what
20 we're proposing to do and see if there's any questions.

21
22 Unknown Female: **Inaudible.**

23
24 Mr. Paul Brunner: Steve, as you check that, I did have a particular question for you in regards
25 to — Merianne, if you could hand that out to the RAB members — I had some interest because
26 of the ordinances that are being passed and being around for a while I have some history on the
27 cleanup program. A map that we have as far as some well ordinances that are already out in the
28

1 district area today around McClellan on the west side that we have.

2
3 In the map that I handed out, the brown area represents an action that was taken by the Air Force
4 and the community back in the mid to late '80s, in that time period — where there was a certain
5 boundary on the west side of the base that was set aside. Based upon the potential of any plume
6 movement that could be there. That's that brown area in which the City and County passed
7 ordinances that would not allow people to put drinking water wells into those area, specifically.
8 And those ordinances are still in place in the City and County, as far as I know, to do that.

9
10 People in those areas were hooked up to a public water supply system during that time, either the
11 City or Rio Linda Water District and the Air Force ended up paying for that. But it was a good
12 effort because it did allow people to get hooked up.

13
14 My question to you, with this new ordinance that's being passed, would that then shrink this area
15 or do you have any idea of how — if this will then change this that is shown?

16
17 Mr. Steve Kalvelage: Yes, and to elaborate a little bit further, and that ties into what
18 Linda was indicating as far as the language in this ordinance. To answer your specific question,
19 what we're proposing as an ordinance change is to delete County ordinance 6.29 which is the
20 local County ordinance that prohibits well construction in this area that's shown on brown on
21 your map. We'll be deleting that and substituting a section in our current well ordinance 6.28,
22 which would call for a 2,000 foot exclusion from known plumes. Exclusion is the wrong term.
23 We're not saying that we're going to exclude any wells in there. We're going to say that there's
24 going to be a thorough review process prior to well permits being issued. It may still be and
25 would need to be not an exclusion because we have monitoring wells going all over the area. But
26 there needs to be a review by knowledgeable people so that you don't have a problem. So that
27 brown area would disappear to theoretically be replaced by currently modeled 2,000-foot

1 perimeters around existing plumes. That went in '86 and it was a best guess at the time. The
2 information is much better now and it really needs to be changed.

3
4 Mr. Paul Brunner: So from the aspects of the RAB members, the buffer zones that we have
5 will shrink mostly likely now and that (**inaudible**) will change as far as the area that wells are
6 prohibited to be built now for public water or private wells. So, that is a change from where we
7 are as the County's proposing?

8
9 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: What I understand you saying is this was written in 1986, which
10 you were talking about changing this or are you changed it now? I don't understand.

11
12 Mr. Paul Brunner: Our effort, Chuck, was '86.

13
14 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Oh, your effort.

15
16 Mr. Paul Brunner: The Air Force effort was '86.

17
18 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: So this is your effort now, to change it to 2,000 feet?

19
20 Mr. Steve Kalvelage: Yes, and let me redirect just a little bit. In conjunction with the Air
21 Force's effort in 1986, a County ordinance was passed and that's what resulted in our department
22 not issuing any well permits in this brown area. So there was a local ordinance in '86 that
23 excluded well permits in that area. We're revoking that and substituting an ordinance that would
24 say, "2,000 foot of a known plume." That gives us some flexibility as the plumes move and sites
25 are remediated. We can shrink that area down and or expand it as the plume moves out.

26
27 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Well, do you realize that, part of the reason why you have an area
28

1 like this is really not only concern about that plume, but you're also concerned about if you sink a
2 bunch of wells out here, that that'll actually suck the contamination in that direction?

3
4 Mr. Steve Kalvelage: Yes, I'm aware of that. Part of the review we want to do on this 2,000 foot
5 perimeter is it's going to be depending upon well size. If you put in a 36 inch ag. well that's
6 pumping 2,000 gallons a minute; yes you're going to pull a plume over. Conversely, if you put
7 in a monitoring well that you sample once a month and extract a couple of gallons out of, you
8 shouldn't have an impact on the plume. So I am aware of that. This is 12 years ago. The science
9 and knowledge and ability of people dealing with underground plume movement has improved
10 tremendously in the past 12 years. So, I'm not sure, are you expressing a concern that there
11 might be a problem by dropping this ordinance?

12
13 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Definitely. Because you would be encouraging people in this area
14 to re-drill wells and the possibility of drawing the contamination, which is now on McClellan and
15 is now stabilized. You can unstabilize it by allowing people to drill wells all over the area.

16
17 Mr. Del Callaway: Or open up existing ones.

18
19 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Well, that's what I mean. They will be drilling new wells all over
20 the place. Why would we want to do this since we got a perfectly good area now that's covered
21 and protected, and we don't have the problem of the plumes? I mean, McClellan could be
22 required to go in there and put new extraction wells in to keep their plume stabilized and from
23 drifting off base. So why would we want to go do something else that's less protected for public
24 health? I don't understand.

25
26 Mr. Del Callaway: In other words, what's the driving force for making this decision?

1 Mr. Steve Kalvelage: Better knowledge of how plumes move, how groundwater moves
2 based on overall groundwater flow, and movement and impacts from points that do affect and
3 impact how the plume goes.

4
5 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: That still doesn't make any sense to me. Why would you want to
6 change something that is functioning properly now and is better protective of the public health?
7 Why would you want to change something that has worked fine and remove that protection and
8 go to something that is less protective?

9
10 Mr. Paul Brunner: Yes, Linda?

11
12 Ms. Linda Geissenger: I was just going to say you might want to...

13
14 Mr. Paul Brunner: You want to identify who you are?

15
16 Ms. Linda Geissenger: Linda Geissenger. Looking at this, when they say 2,000 feet in
17 some of these areas, it's going to grow. So you might want to consider that, too. Is that correct,
18 2,000?

19
20 Mr. Del Callaway: Well, there's City wells down at the south end where your arrow's
21 pointing Area Flow Direction, and if some of those residents in that area sink a well or open up
22 an existing well that's been shut down, it's going to suck that plume out into the City wells. So
23 you want to contaminate those wells as well?

24
25 Mr. Steve Kalvelage: I think we're talking degrees of impact of plumes without what I
26 would categorize as a hydrogeological plume model. To say this is — what it's moving per foot
27 — this is the volume of water that's moving — we've got a million gallons in this plume. And
28

1 it's moving 2 feet a year to the southwest. That's not accurate by any means. I'm using that as an
2 example. To extract 100 gallons 3,000 feet to the north. Is that going to have an impact on it or
3 is that going to have no impact? There's a certain degree beyond which you will not impact this
4 plume. And we're comfortable in consultation with the State agencies that 2,000 feet gives us a
5 good degree of insurance on affecting the impact of a plume. That's not to say that someone
6 couldn't develop a whole area on wells. And the aggregate of 50 one-acre lots pumping up and
7 doing agricultural operations might change the groundwater flow. But you're talking a pretty big
8 area and a awful lot of groundwater. I don't know that individual wells, unless you get a
9 tremendous number of them, are going to have an impact on that groundwater flow.

10
11 Mr. Del Callaway: Well, evidently it did or they wouldn't have gone to the extent of making
12 this brown area like it is. But what happened to the idea of treating and pumping on base to get
13 rid of the contamination rather than pull it off base?

14
15 Mr. Steve Kalvelage: Well, you're out of my area of expertise because you're talking
16 about remediation. I just issue well permits.

17
18 Mr. Paul Brunner: **(inaudible)** the pumping and treating.

19
20 Mr. Del Callaway: Wait a minute. You just said through technology, and knowledge that
21 you've gained, how to clean it up. I'm going to take it that you're saying that it's clean enough to
22 let it to go ahead and open up wells so they can exit the base.

23
24 Mr. Paul Brunner: I don't think he's saying that.

25
26 Mr. Steve Kalvelage: I'm by no means saying that I would espouse any pumping of that
27 plume.

1 Mr. Del Callaway: Well, then, I'll go right back to the first question. What's wrong with
2 cleaning it where it is and leaving this brown area brown without this 2,000 foot? It's seems to
3 me like your opening up another can of worms that's been shut. So why not leave it closed?
4

5 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Well, I can understand. For instance, you're leaving the west side
6 and the south side the way it is and then going around the east side where the plume is on the east
7 side of the base, the south-east really, and putting your barrier there, 2,000-foot barrier there,
8 where there isn't really any protection by the brown ordinance area. But, for instance, like now,
9 there's an overdraft of our groundwater.
10

11 Mr. Steve Kalvelage: True, countywide.
12

13 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: So this is protecting the groundwater at the same time. It's more of
14 a safety factor for the public out here and keeping the plumes in place. So I don't understand
15 why you'd want to change what's already there. If anything, you'd want to protect the east side of
16 the base and put your new ordinance to cover the east side.
17

18 Mr. Del Callaway: I'd like to know where the idea came from. Who presented the idea to
19 change this to the 2,000 foot, Linda Hogg?
20

21 Mr. Steve Kalvelage: In conjunction with other state experts.
22

23 Mr. Linda Hogg: If I could just add, this is Linda Hogg. One, remember this is right now a
24 proposal. When I presented this to the BCT meeting, Chuck asked if the County could come and
25 make a presentation. One of the purposes is to get your comments. I know the County would
26 really appreciate it, if the RAB wants to submit written comments to them, they would very much
27 appreciate your comments and your reasons why.
28

1 Also, you can comment on the 2,000 foot. The 2,000-foot is not set in stone. That was at first a
2 starting point. Again, a part of it is looking countywide and looking at consistency countywide.
3 It could be that a very good argument would be made that, for purposes at McClellan, things not
4 change. But again, the idea is looking at it countywide. So we weren't thinking, "Oh let's pick
5 specifically on McClellan." We were looking countywide for consistency. So definitely, provide
6 some written comments to the County on your concerns and your opinions. Part of it also is by
7 looking at a buffer zone where there's 2,000 feet or 3,000 feet is that you do then free up other
8 land, so that people who do need to put wells in aren't constrained.

9
10 And as Steve was trying to say, part of the technology that we're looking at is the ability to
11 understand how a well is constructed and where that well is screened. In other words, where the
12 opening is, where the water sucks, makes a big difference. So you can have wells placed as
13 we've had at Mather. We had a brand new well placed within 500 feet of the plume. But that well
14 was constructed a very specific way and it was screened in a zone that is having no impact on the
15 contaminated zone. So that has a lot to do with what we're also looking at — trying to provide
16 the citizens of the community the ability to not be so restricted throughout the County. Also,
17 what hasn't happened in the past is that people don't know where these plumes are. So we want
18 to make sure that part of this is going to be an education process for well drillers and contractors
19 to understand that we do have some serious contaminated plumes in the County. And we need to
20 make sure that they know when wells are constructed, that when they're abandoned, certain steps
21 are taken to protect. Again, any comments that you have, I know the county will really appreciate
22 and so will the State agencies that are helping them on this. That's why we asked them to come
23 tonight.

24
25 Mr. Del Callaway: I tell you right now. My comment is, it's a pretty dumb idea. In fact, I
26 think it's downright stupid. You already have something that is working. It works good. It's like
27 how the government used to have a maintenance program where every vehicle comes in once a
28

1 month. They jerk the wheels off, pop off the wheel bearings, repack them, put them all back on,
2 send it out on the road again. It was costly, it was extra work, it didn't accomplish a thing. Here
3 we have something that is working. Just because you want to do something over at Mather, you
4 decide you have to go to the County and get the County to change an ordinance so that you can
5 screw around with Mather. That's fine. Go over there and do that, but leave this alone. This is
6 working fine. We're not concerned with changing it. We didn't come to you and ask you to
7 make a change here. I don't think any citizen from either around Mather or here went to you and
8 asked you to change that. If somebody needed a well they would go down to your department to
9 find out about that. You have a pump you said screened out the contaminant, it doesn't allow it to
10 go into that well because of the casing.

11

12 Ms. Linda Hogg: It's not screened in that zone. It's screened in a completely different zone.

13

14 Mr. Del Callaway: Well, but it's within 500 feet of the plume. Now you have some
15 technology that we're not aware of? If you have some casing or some pipes or pump or
16 something that won't allow contamination to pass through it, then we need to know it.

17

18 Ms. Linda Hogg: Del, wait, stop. Groundwater moves in different layers.

19

20 Mr. Del Callaway: I understand, I'm not stupid.

21

22 Ms. Linda Hogg: When you put a well in you can screen a well so that it is pulling only in
23 one area. It's not going to pull in a different area — that's what I meant. It's not screening out
24 contamination, because there's no screen where there's contamination.

25

26 Mr. Del Callaway: It'll pull from the level that you have it set at to pull from.

27

28

1 Ms. Linda Hogg: Right.

2

3 Mr. Del Callaway: If you want to pull it 300 feet it'll pull it 300 feet. If there's contamination
4 and you suck down to below the 300 foot and there's contamination out there at the 200 foot, it's
5 going to flow in and it'll come in and replace the water you took out.

6

7 Mr. Paul Brunner: The aspect of where we are — the direct impact on our program that we
8 would have on the groundwater programs that we would have if this did change into the
9 boundary — then I know within our own hydrology of replacing of wells and plume movements
10 we would have to factor this into our program to make sure we don't have the effects like you're
11 talking about in other areas. And with the wells, the interaction would have to become more
12 intense. So in a way, the proposal would free up property for people to do different things. The
13 intenseness then the activity from the County having to do certain things on a larger area to a
14 smaller area I think would shift into our area of protectiveness working with the community.
15 That's why we set this up was for protection.

16

17 Mr. Del Callaway: I don't know where you're coming from, working with the community.
18 The community is on water.

19

20 Mr. Paul Brunner: Del, hear me out. I wasn't really trying to infer too much there or anything.
21 What we do now in our groundwater program and the technical review, we have our groundwater
22 pumping Air Force contours and maps that show the plumes, and I know Chuck has a lot of
23 interest in those maps. Right now we have the buffer zones on the west side, that large brown
24 area, if that ordinance was to pass — the 2,000 foot areas — then we would have to take that into
25 consideration to a greater extent than we currently do and really factor that in. So that if someone
26 was to place a well out there that we didn't experience what you're saying what would happen
27 and that they wouldn't all of sudden start pulling the plume or changing the hydraulics under the

28

1 ground. So there is an impact here, I think, to our programs. You say that the state-of-the-art has
2 moved to that level. From the Air Force perspective, we would have to validate that state-of-the-
3 art because we wouldn't want to all of a sudden have plumes starting to escape in the program.
4 My question for you is, as we go through, is the opportunity for comment from the RAB for you,
5 the County, is in the process of doing the ordinance. We ask that you come as a guest to give us
6 an update so that we can have a chance to comment. When would be an opportune time for the
7 RAB to give comments? I mean, we have our minutes from here that we can offer to you, but is
8 there a better time? Are you going to have another public meeting?

9
10 Mr. Steve Kalvelage: Yes.

11
12 Mr. Paul Brunner: And when is that?

13
14 Mr. Steve Kalvelage: We've had one meeting to date. Let me point out where we're at.
15 We've had one meeting to date and discussed in a draft sense our proposals. These will need to,
16 for change, go to the Board of Supervisors. We intend to have another public hearing and we will
17 advertise that and we'd welcome your input. I can leave you my card you can mail your
18 comments to me. You can mail me an address and we will put you on our notification list,
19 whoever would be most appropriate.

20
21 **Inaudible**

22
23 Mr. Steve Kalvelage: That's the next date of the hearing.

24
25 Mr. Paul Brunner: Okay, so that would be an opportune time.

26
27 Mr. Steve Kalvelage: And that would be the best time because then we're taking the
28

1 notes. We're looking for everybody's input on it. This is by no means set in stone. We're trying
2 to simplify rather than have a couple of sections in the ordinances that talk to different areas with
3 wells. Have one chapter in the ordinance. We'd welcome input and we want to respond to the
4 public needs. We don't want to blow it off.

5
6 Mr. Del Callaway: That's the public needs. This area is on piped water. City water. So why
7 would they have a need to drill a well? They have water into their homes. They have it for their
8 livestock, for those who have livestock. Is it monetary? Is it that they don't want to pay a water
9 bill to the State or to the County or to whoever is supplying the water? It's a money factor?
10 Then in that case, if it's just money, now we're talking about a few dollars. We're not talking
11 about a lot of money, but we are talking about health reason. And you're not certain that this
12 plume won't move and you're not certain about how fast it'll move. It depends on the level of
13 the water and how fast the water is drawn out. Why open up that can of worms? Leave it like it
14 is. Let the people pay a few dollars. I mean, I certainly would pay a higher water bill than take
15 the risk of pulling any contamination off of Mather or off of McClellan or either one.

16
17 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: One of the things you might think of is to leave ordinances in place
18 that are around installations like McClellan Air Force Base, as far as the over protection areas go.
19 Then if another area, like on the east side of the base, if you look at the plume map where there's
20 no protection established, your ordinance could cover those areas and I would see nothing wrong
21 with it. But I'd like to thank you. I don't want this to be entirely negative here.

22
23 Mr. Bill Gibson: Before you go away, Chuck, I have a comment I'd like to get in the record.

24
25 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Sure.

26
27 Mr. Bill Gibson: Seems you're changing to monitoring a moving target with a flexible
28

1 boundary of 2,000 feet. How many more monitoring wells are you going to need to keep track of
2 this? Where we now have a fixed boundary, we know where the monitoring wells are. But if
3 you're going to change the boundary, you're going to have to track it somehow, and monitoring
4 wells are costly.

5
6 Mr. Steve Kalvelage: I understand your point. The monitoring occurs to categorize the
7 plume that's going to be going forward regardless. They're not going to stop monitoring that
8 plume and say, "Well, it went off base, so we're not looking anymore." They're going to
9 continue to categorize that plume. So we're not talking additional wells.

10
11 Mr. Bill Gibson: But now it's a moving target on the perimeter.

12
13 Mr. Steve Kalvelage: The plume is a moving target?

14
15 Mr. Bill Gibson: The 2,000-foot perimeter will be moving.

16
17 Mr. Steve Kalvelage: Sure.

18
19 Mr. Bill Gibson: You're going to have to put more wells in to follow that plume.

20
21 Mr. Steve Kalvelage: Well, they're going to be putting wells in to follow the plume
22 regardless.

23
24 Mr. Bill Gibson: Yes, but they know where the plume is.

25
26 Mr. Steve Kalvelage: Right.

1 Mr. Bill Gibson: But then you would have to also track along the 2,000 border to see if
2 there's any changes there.

3

4 Mr. Steve Kalvelage: Right. The 2,000 foot distance would have to reflect any changes
5 that are brought to light by the movement.

6

7 Mr. Bill Gibson: It seems there's more cost here.

8

9 Mr. Steve Kalvelage: Right now we don't have a 2,000-foot perimeter around this entire
10 plume.

11

12 Ms. Linda Hogg: **Inaudible** ...how we draw along the 2,000 foot boundary, that is,
13 we'll be using annual data from the Air Force and the Water Board. We won't be putting new
14 wells in.

15

16 Mr. Bill Gibson: You may have to. If you change the boundaries you have to track where
17 everything is.

18

19 Ms. Linda Hogg: It will be based upon the annual groundwater monitoring reports from all
20 the different sites.

21

22 Mr. Bill Gibson: Okay.

23

24 Ms. Linda Hogg: That's the proposal.

25

26 Mr. Steve Kalvelage: So I guess what I want to conclude is that this is not a done deal.
27 We're open to input and we want to respond to the public. So if that's the best solution to this, to
28

29

1 leave that intact and add 2,000 foot around the rest of the exterior, then that's not by any means
2 an impossible option.

3
4 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: That sounds reasonable to me.

5
6 Mr. Steve Kalvelage: I have a business card here.

7
8 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Yes. No, give it to me right here. And we will be briefing more to
9 our RAB members at the next RAB meeting that we have and maybe some of us can attend your
10 meeting on the 13th.

11
12 Mr. Steve Kalvelage: January 13th. We'll make sure that this group is notified.

13
14 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Yes, I'd appreciate it.

15
16 Mr. Steve Kalvelage: We'd welcome the input.

17
18 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: But I appreciate you coming tonight. Thank you very much for
19 being here.

20
21 Mr. Del Callaway: I want to thank you myself. I wasn't jumping on you. I was jumping on
22 the idea and the motive behind it. I know the County is eager to get industry in Mather and
23 McClellan and this is a good way to do it. Knock this down so that they can get industry in here
24 and get rid of homes around the plume area. So it'll help in that respect.

25
26 Mr. Paul Brunner: Thank you very much for coming Steve, and Linda, for also coming.

1 **SAFCA Update**

2
3 That leaves us the next stop, new business item, which is the SAFCA update, and Merianne, I
4 think you have that one.

5
6 Ms. Merianne Briggs: Yes I do. We received a letter from Grant Kreinberg from
7 Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency. They're going to be doing some work in Magpie Creek
8 and would like to have some time at the January 20th RAB to speak to you about that and also to
9 get your input. So the reason for this letter is a request from Sacramento Area Flood Control
10 Agency to have time on the January 20th RAB agenda.

11
12 Mr. Paul Brunner: So that would be an agenda topic for them to come and talk to us on the
13 20th of January. And is that it, Merianne, for that one?

14
15 Ms. Merianne Briggs: Yes.

16
17 **DoD Co-Chair Comments**

18
19 ***West Area Update***

20
21 Mr. Paul Brunner: Okay, if we move to the next new business item Chuck, which is going to
22 be yours, do you want me to move to the next one while you're back there?

23
24 Okay, well that brings me to the DoD Co-chair comments and I have several to go over for you
25 on that. The first one is on the west area update. Do we have the schedule? Okay, this is the
26 schedule of events that took place. We did have the public meetings that took place on the
27 description of the scoping meetings to get your comments. From my perspective, the meetings

1 were a success on those dates that took place. Many of you RAB members came and spoke at
2 those meetings. The comments from the folks that spoke are back there. I got the answers to why
3 the entire transcript is not back there. Those are just portions of it. The transcripts are not all
4 there to answer that question. Within here what I did bring was the written comments that came
5 from the people that weren't at the meeting so that you could see what were provided. They're
6 on the table back there. If you'd like to see what those were you can review those.

7
8 What we did as we worked through and took those comments, and we've now built our various
9 description of proposed actions and alternatives the DOPAA from that perspective. I know today
10 at the BCT meeting I didn't have the answers but I did get the stats summary sheet back from the
11 Commander from the preferred alternative. The Air Force will do the preferred alternative from
12 the Air Force. We'll proceed with the onsite mitigation on the actions to restore the activities and
13 do the mitigation on site. That was a question that came back and forth. So that will be the Air
14 Force preferred solution.

15
16 The NEPA documentation that we have in the package we'll go through and look at different
17 alternatives, the Fish and Wildlife alternatives, that they have for off site and on site. It will also
18 be analyzed in the environmental assessment that we have. The Air Force preferred solution
19 would concentrate on preserving property and the various options that are given to put forth
20 preservation aspect to the property on the west side. And it will also try to be done in the most
21 cost-effective manner. Out of the efforts that came from those meetings that we had in the
22 scoping two things that came from the public during those meetings was, one, that we do it on
23 site, and that we also try to do it as cost affective as possible in that area. The ballpark guess that
24 we have on the preferred alternatives the way that we understand it today that we're working
25 through, is somewhere around the \$400,000 range. And the activity if you combine the efforts
26 with the preservation and other things that we believe are allowed under the Fish and Wildlife
27 letter. That's the ballpark guess what we have right now. What we will be asking our consultants
28

1 to do on the schedule we have here is we will be giving them the feedback as to where we are.
2 We will ask the consultants to start the NEPA documentation to do the analysis on the
3 alternatives that we have and also ask the consultant that we have to do the restoration plan itself
4 to start to build it. And you'll start to see the results of those efforts then in those January time
5 rames where they'll be published for people to have their comments on. So we're fairly close to
6 that timeline that we proposed. You might see a little bit of slippage on it but we're pretty close.
7 The intent is to do the restoration still this year before the end of next summer, or before the fall,
8 to get it in place. There will be a monitoring time period that we will have to make sure
9 whatever we replant stays. And that will be laid out in those plans that we publish in January.

10
11 So that's the west area update that we have from the perspective of the RAB comments and the
12 general public that came. I think it's on target with what was being asked in the meetings.

13 14 **GWTP News Release**

15
16 The other topics that came up during the meeting, I do have a couple of other items to mention.
17 A couple of them we already did talk about. I was going to mention the release of the memo of
18 the SVE news release. We already covered those, so I won't repeat in those areas. We had a
19 couple of other news releases that came out since the last RAB meeting to mention for the group.
20 There was a hydraulic spill that happened the other day on December 1, 1998. That happened late
21 at night within one of our facilities. That news release went out in that particular case.

22
23 When we do issue a news release to the public or to the media, there's not an obligation of the
24 public to print anything or report in that area. We do the advisory, and it's up to their judgments
25 to what they do. So in this particular case, we did make a news release. In this case 300 gallons
26 of hydraulic fluid or oil was spilled inside a building. One of our hydraulic testers ruptured at
27 night and we had to come in at night and contain it. There wasn't a threat. We were able to clean
28

1 it up and take care of it.

2
3 Ms. Sheila Guerra: I thought it was 300?

4
5 Mr. Paul Brunner: That's what I thought I said — 300 gallons.

6
7 Ms. Sheila Guerra: Oh, I thought you said 2 something.

8
9 Mr. Paul Brunner: I think I said 300. If I said 200, our press release said 300. Again, the Air
10 Force notified something that is not necessarily typically notified out there, but we did. There
11 was also a release that went out this time period about one of our groundwater wells that we had
12 on base. That was its pumping did not shut off. This was on November 10th when we were doing
13 some work on the plant and the well kept on pumping and overflowed inside the groundwater
14 treatment plant area. It was self-contained in that area. But we did go on and released on that and
15 we cleaned up the area inside the groundwater treatment plant. Not an environmental threat but
16 something did happen. We went on and released in that area and we did notify people on that.

17
18 Another item that came up in the media since the last RAB meeting was that we did have a suit
19 that came up that was settled in the County, at least from one perspective. This deals with an air
20 pollution issue that had some news media aspects to it. We had a violation of an air code that the
21 Air Force corrected years ago, but in that aspect, the County did go forward and fine us. In that
22 particular case each environmental statute is different as to whether the federal government can
23 actually pay the fine. In our particular case, or the way the federal government works and our
24 laws, is that for us to pay a fine, Congress must say in that statute, in that law, that we can pay it.
25 If Congress doesn't say that we can pay it, we don't have the option just to pay. Now each
26 environmental statute is different, by statute like they have retro law, the clean air law, each law
27 is differently stated. Some will happen to be the same but they all kind of have different statutes.

1 Congress has not been consistent in this area. In the Clean Air Act, the Air Force, actually in our
2 area the federal government we're not allowed to pay that fine. Congress hasn't authorized it and
3 in the case of federal government, they have to authorize us to pay. We cannot just pay. So they
4 didn't authorize us to pay the fine. It doesn't mean that we're above the law. We don't fix it, we
5 don't take corrective action immediately; we work through all those things. Which we did. But
6 we can't pay it. On the case of the County, the County did not have the same opinion. They
7 believe that the law did allow us to pay and that's what happened in the court. It went to District
8 Court and the County went and presented its case in the Federal District Court in the area ruled in
9 behalf of the Air Force that Congress hasn't waived, hasn't allowed, us to pay that. The County
10 may take additional action in that area, but there was some news media interest that came up. I
11 think in the back there was a news article that ran in the paper where, "Fed gets pass on Clean
12 Air law shielded from (inaudible) McClellan." So that did happen in that area to mention that.

13
14 In response, in last Sunday's paper, there was an article too that came up from our commander
15 that the inference in the article, is that, "Gee, the Air Force is above the law." That is not the
16 case. We just can't pay the fine, but we're not above the law. We have to follow the procedures
17 and make sure that the items are protected. That is what the commander is trying to make his
18 point in his statement here. That's also back there for people who did not see the commander's
19 response to it.

20
21 On a different point, there is a handout for the RAB members. There is an upcoming training
22 workshop schedule that we've got for people to look at and where it is. The next one we have is
23 in February, which is on SVE. In March there is a workshop on Biological Opinion. That'll be an
24 issue by Fish and Wildlife. It'll be on the entire base as to what are the habitats in the area. I
25 know at the Chair Lunch we talked about that in the scheduling. So the next workshop and
26 training...

1 **End of Tape**

2

3 Mr. Paul Brunner: Biological Opinion?

4

5 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Right.

6

7 Mr. Paul Brunner: I don't see why we can't ask.

8

9 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Okay.

10

11 Mr. Paul Brunner: ...and do that I think that would be an excellent idea. And then my last
12 item from my comments is that I know Merianne for the RAB members has worked the calendar.
13 Merianne, you might. Merianne the calendar aspect that we have there's a format here for RAB
14 members. We talked several times about calendars, different ways of presenting it. From our
15 perspective, if you would look at what she's done to record the meeting, and if you would give
16 her your feedback. You don't have to do it right now. But if you'd just let her know as to if you
17 like it. And those are my comments, Chuck, as I went through those items. Elaine, on the west
18 area, or the project itself on restoration projects, do you have any comments, an update on the
19 west area?

20

21 **Restoration Projects**

22

23 Ms. Elaine Anderegg: Elaine Anderegg. You wanted an update on the west area or the
24 restoration work we're doing?

25

26 Mr. Paul Brunner: Well, on the restoration work, and also on the other creek work that we've
27 done.

28

1 Ms. Elaine Anderegg: We are having a very busy time right now on the base in terms of
2 fieldwork going on. We've shown that at the last couple of RABs and briefed it. So I just wanted
3 to let everybody know. The groundwater Phase II work, which that graph picture we're showing
4 earlier, shows the yellow plumes contained. That's what the plumes will look like at the end of
5 that work projected to be completed at the end of February. So there's a lot of well construction
6 and modifications to the treatment plant going on right now. We also have a lot of fieldwork in
7 the buildings on base. Doing some radiation scanning as well as sampling in some cases through
8 the floors of the buildings. We've got some results of that back. It's showing that we do not have
9 large sources that we didn't know about under the buildings. So that's been good news.

10
11 We're about two-thirds of the way through the second phase of fieldwork in the northern area,
12 operable E through H. Our SVE work right now for this year — we're about 45 percent complete
13 with well installations and anticipation of SVE actions will be taken. So if you come out to the
14 base or if you'd like to come and see some of the stuff that's going on, there is a lot of fieldwork
15 right now. We're making good progress.

16
17 We have about 5 of our 8 SVE systems working, as Paul mentioned earlier. Though we are going
18 to be shutting them all down and going through a check of the fail-safe systems on all of those,
19 given what we saw happen recently.

20
21 On the west area, an update, as we did complete the vernal pool sign installation in November.
22 We also had an unauthorized entry onto the base. A truck out on the northwest west side around
23 Ascot Road. We did go and check that out. And even though it was into some of the natural
24 areas, there was no impact to our vernal pools.

25
26 We are starting this week with a re-characterization. I've talked about that a couple of times — of
27 the Don Julio and Magpie creeks. Because that creek work that was done last year has moved
28

1 some of the soils around, there was some low levels — not a human health risk — but potential
2 ecological risk contamination out there. So we need to do some re-characterization and make
3 sure we understand what's out there. If we do find anything it will be incorporated then into
4 those plans that we'll be making for the restoration project for the creek.

5
6 And we are working right now, if you do drive even across the north end of the base you might
7 see this. But if you're driving on base, a lot of cleaning of the lined creeks and drainage ditches
8 on base for the flooding this year. We're not going into any areas that are not lined, but in the
9 lined areas they do have equipment in some cases, hand cleaning in some cases going on, where
10 we're taking the vegetation out. And they are working yesterday and today, probably into
11 tomorrow too, up on that north end. So you might see it if you were driving across Elkhorn.

12
13 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: The only thing that I would like to ask is, any consideration been
14 given to people that live off base and the flow that this could create going off base? I know that
15 one particular resident in Rio Linda was concerned who lives on, the either call it Robla Creek or
16 Rio Linda Creek, she and her husband were concerned considering the County has not cleaned
17 out the creek for several years where they live. And when McClellan does any kind of cleaning of
18 the creeks on base it seems to force the water even faster across their property. Has any
19 consideration been given to that now that you're cleaning out the lined portions of the creek,
20 creeks I should say?

21
22 Ms. Elaine Andereg: The portions that we're cleaning are upstream of where it leaves
23 the base. I would say we are clearing those areas. As we saw what the last rains this weekend,
24 parts of the base are flooding over, too. I know they're clearing out those edges that are above
25 the runway. There's still quite a long section before it leaves the base that's natural creek that
26 we're not touching. So there's still quite an area there where the base is still a buffer zone before
27 the outside.

1 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: I just wondered, because I know that's going to be a question from
2 the community.

3
4 Mr. Paul Brunner: There is an aspect on the creek cleaning, as we go through, is that if you
5 own property, and Chuck you have, that there's a natural permitting process, which when we
6 damaged the creeks last time, we had that glitch we went through and that failure. There is a
7 natural process if you have a creek backing up in your area, the corps of engineers and some of
8 the people that monitor those things are supposedly taking those considerations into account
9 (inaudible) permitting authority to allow certain activity to take place. I do know that in these
10 particular cases, that each and every creek cleaning project that is happening at McClellan today
11 I'm aware of and we go back through personally and check each one of those to make sure they
12 are okay. Like Fish and Wildlife, other folks, they okay all those activities. I think the
13 consideration is taken in form. There are approvals already there to do that type of work of
14 cleaning out a creek that we've got that are nationally set to allow it to protect your assets that
15 you have.

16
17 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Well, I realize that. I just meant that the people that are living off
18 base sometimes have to suffer because work was done and that you had to alleviate your
19 problem. I know that's a question.

20
21 Mr. Paul Brunner: I'm aware. Actually, I know we've been the recipient of that when other
22 people cleaned up. That is an endless cycle as to where we are on flood. The real answer to that
23 is downstream people responding to be able to clean the creeks or do their things downstream,
24 too. I think that's my answer to your question.

25
26 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Go ahead.

1 Mr. Del Callaway: I'm not sure I heard what I heard. Another truck got stuck out near the
2 vernal pool?

3

4 Mr. Paul Brunner: No. What we had was out there on Ascot Avenue. Someone drove through
5 the fence.

6

7 Mr. Del Callaway: Drove through it?

8

9 Mr. Paul Brunner: Yes. It wasn't an Air Force person. From what I understand from looking
10 at the photos, is that not the case?

11

12 Mr. Del Callaway: Is that what you were talking about?

13

14 Ms. Elaine Anderegg: Yes, it was someone from off base that drove through the fence
15 **(inaudible)**

16

17 Mr. Paul Brunner: In other words, someone crashed through the fence. I don't know if they
18 were intoxicated or what but they crashed through it. Then we went out to check to see where the
19 tire tracks were and if they damaged anything.

20

21 Mr. Del Callaway: I heard her say vernal pools and I thought, "Wow."

22

23 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: I just wanted to clear up one of the things about one of the news
24 releases regarding the fines. I thought it might be a good idea. The furnaces, the way I understand
25 it, they were actually causing more... What do those furnaces give to the environment? I
26 mean...

27

28

1 Mr. Paul Brunner: They put out most (**inaudible**)

2
3 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: (**inaudible**) nox and so forth. What I'm trying to say is the nox and
4 so forth that were above was created because the Air Force report underestimated the amount of
5 heat they needed for the building and the form of heat was natural gas. So basically, the way I
6 understand it, is the reason why the regulations were lessened in years after this was because of
7 the fact that they needed more heat for the buildings. Evidently, the workers in this particular
8 building were freezing because they underestimated the amount of heat that was needed, causing
9 the nox emissions to go up, causing the fine to be levied.

10
11 Mr. Paul Brunner: Specifically, the Air Force applied for a permit and the calculations that
12 when the application was underestimated as to how long we would use the boilers to supply the
13 heat for the facility, which when you do that you end up in this particular case having so many air
14 credits or emissions that would be part of the process. As we were running the facility, we found
15 that there was an aspect of it, it was in the winter time when it was cold and the boilers were
16 running. We actually caught that after we had already gone beyond the limit. Because we had not
17 caught that in the permitting process, which then made us go back and declare that we didn't do
18 this work right with the County. The lesson of it is, we went back through the permitting process,
19 got the right amount of credits to make it work right, and it was re-accomplished to be okay. That
20 was the lesson of the thing. But since we didn't follow the code and we did actually go beyond
21 what the permit authorized — was what caused us to be fined.

22
23 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Well, one of the things I thought you would like to know was, it
24 was natural gas was the cause of the whole thing.

25
26 Mr. Paul Brunner: That was the source of the energy.

1 **February 1999 National Caucus of RABs & DERTF**

2
3 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Now I'd like to get back to one of the things on the agenda that we
4 passed by. On the last part of January/February timeframe there's going to be a National Caucus
5 of RABs in San Francisco. Its going to be in conjunction with a DERTF meeting, which is a
6 national meeting. DERTF is a, I can't remember, this is an acronym. Maybe next time we'll get
7 it spelled out. But they oversee various cleanups and they were established by Congress and they
8 have some congressional aides that are on the committee and they even come to the National
9 Caucus of RABs. I think they're going to call this a Convention of RABs. But anyhow, its
10 coming up the last of January or February for those who might be interested in attending. We will
11 have more on this later on as time draws near and I know all the dates and times and all.

12
13 Mr. Paul Brunner: The comment that I have on that, Chuck, I know that it was the funding for
14 travel for RAB members and that to go to these types of conferences. The word I got back was
15 that DoD will not do that on it. The only aspect as to what they might do for us is to continue to
16 advocate for us maybe on this particular meeting to go do. But I sent letters back and forth, and
17 I've gotten feedback that the answer is no. DoD will not do that for the RAB funding. So the
18 only hopes of getting RAB funding is if DoD, or that conference like they did on the last one we
19 went to, they came up with a special thing for this particular effort. I did, based upon our last
20 Chair Meeting, carry that message back and made a specific request that they do that in this
21 particular case. I haven't heard back from that e-mail. But from what I've heard, so far from the
22 letter traffic and everything, I can't say that it has much hope. But I will continue to pursue it.

23
24 **Other Business**

25
26 ***Develop Next RAB Agenda***

1 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: So now we go on to develop the next RAB agenda. I think the next
2 thing we should continue on with, this “County Initiative on New Well Guidelines.” Also on the
3 “West Area” because I believe January/February timeframe, they’ll be coming up with another
4 public comment period and I’m sure the RAB wants to be in on that one. So I think those two
5 we should leave on our agenda for next time.

6
7 Mr. Paul Brunner: Okay, what Merianne just handed out was a draft of an agenda that might
8 be used of which these items could be added if you just mention, Chuck, if they’re not already
9 there.

10
11 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: I don’t think they are. So any other items you can think of right
12 now and also the “DERTF Meeting” would be on there, so we can cover the dates and times and
13 so forth.

14
15 Ms. Sheila Guerra: I have a question Chuck.

16
17 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: And the “TAPP” naturally is going to be on there.

18
19 Ms. Sheila Guerra: Where did we put the, we were going to address the SEED program. We
20 are going to do that?

21
22 Mr. Paul Brunner: That was, I think, in Del’s Reuse Committee.

23
24 Ms. Sheila Guerra: Reuse, okay.

25
26 Mr. Del Callaway: That’s coming up on the 7th.

1 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: So it looks like those four things we would have to put on, the
2 “DERTF Meeting,” the “West Area,” and the “TAPP.” I don’t remember what the last one was.

3
4 Mr. Bill Gibson: There’s this memo on the Magpie Creek cleanup. There’s to be a
5 hazardous waste cleanup briefing, memo to Paul from Grant Kreinberg.

6
7 Ms. Merianne Briggs: That would be, Merianne Briggs, that would be the request from
8 Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency wanting to be on the agenda to...

9
10 Mr. Paul Brunner: And they should be on the agenda in January, too. The Flood Control
11 people.

12
13 Mr. Bill Gibson: That’s what it says here.

14
15 Mr. Paul Brunner: Right.

16
17 Mr. Bill Gibson: It should be for January.

18
19 Mr. Paul Brunner: Yes.

20
21 Unknown Male: They should go on the agenda.

22
23 Mr. Del Callaway: I make a motion that we bypass public comment and adjourn.

24
25 Unknown Male: I oppose that.

26
27 **Recap Current Action Items**

1 Mr. Paul Brunner: We haven't done cap of actions yet.

2

3 Mr. Del Callaway: Oh.

4

5 Mr. Paul Brunner: Can we...

6

7 Ms. Roxanne Yonn: Before I get to the action items November, 10th, a memorandum for all
8 RAB members had a mailing list information and it also had the RAB Charter in it so you might
9 want to check through the mailings that you received in that week. If you don't have a copy of
10 the Charter, let us know and we'll mail you a new one. But I hesitate to mail it to everybody if
11 they've gotten it once. But if you can't find it or you didn't get it let me know.

12

13 To recap the action items: we're going to do a worksheet for the RAB on the *Community*
14 *Relations Plan*. Remove Jeannie Lewis as a RAB member. And as you said say, "Stay on the
15 mailing list." You mean the general mailing list, is that what the reference was?

16

17 Ms. Sheila Guerra: Right.

18

19 Ms. Roxanne Yonn: Okay, fine.

20

21 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Hold it just a second. You can't remove Jeannie Lewis as a RAB
22 member because I really think one of the Co-chairs should check with Jeannie if that really is the
23 case before...

24

25 Ms. Sheila Guerra: Excuse me, didn't she turn in her resignation tonight?

26

27 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: No, she hasn't. I don't have it.

28

1 Mr. Paul Brunner: The only thing. Jeannie, Chuck ,came to me before the meeting or just as
2 the meeting started and said that she was going to resign.

3

4 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Oh, she told you.

5

6 Mr. Paul Brunner: She mentioned that to me.

7

8 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Oh, okay.

9

10 Mr. Paul Brunner: You mentioned it.

11

12 Ms. Sheila Guerra: She mentioned that to me but I thought she turned in a written...

13

14 Ms. Roxanne Yonn: Perhaps then maybe we should rephrase that to contact Jeannie Lewis to
15 see if she wants to continue as a RAB member?

16

17 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: That has been changed because she went up to Paul and formally
18 announced her resignation. I did not know that.

19

20 Mr. Del Callaway: I think the Community Co-chair should contact her and see what the
21 problem is and ascertain whether that's really what she wants to do or not. There may be
22 something underlined there that we're not aware of.

23

24 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: I can sure do that. I'll be happy to.

25

26 Mr. Del Callaway: I think that would be the best way to go.

27

28

1 Ms. Sheila Guerra: She spoke with me before the meeting started and expressed her feelings.
2 It doesn't have anything to do with the RAB; it has to do with personal things.

3

4 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: I can still contact her regardless of what we do. We can go ahead
5 and remove her until I find out something different.

6

7 Mr. Paul Brunner: Well, potentially. I mean she's asked for it. Most likely the action item to
8 officially remove her would probably come as a vote.

9

10 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: No, we don't have to.

11

12 Mr. Bill Gibson: Not on a resignation.

13

14 Mr. Paul Brunner: I take that back.

15

16 Ms. Roxanne Yonn: Well, why don't we word it in such a way that there's going to be a contact
17 made. It's a potential then until the next RAB meeting. That way it's kept up.

18

19 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: You can go ahead and remove her unless she tells me different. I'll
20 contact you.

21

22 Ms. Roxanne Yonn: Okay.

23

24 Mr. Del Callaway: What about Dennis?

25

26 Ms. Sheila Guerra: I already reported on this. He is not going to be attending any meetings
27 because he's working until 10:30 at night. But in the future he may come back as an alternate,

28

1 that's all I know.

2

3 Mr. Paul Brunner: Okay, why don't we finish.

4

5 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Well, we don't have to remove Dennis as a RAB member. I mean
6 we don't have to remove...

7

8 Ms. Sheila Guerra: Dennis is not a RAB member. He's an alternate.

9

10 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: There's nothing in the Charter or Bylaws or any governing body
11 that says you have to remove an alternate.

12

13 Mr. Paul Brunner: Why don't we finish the recap of items.

14

15 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Oh, that's fine. I just wanted to finish that up.

16

17 Ms. Roxanne Yonn: Okay, the last item is, "Ask Fish and Wildlife to participate in the training
18 in March on the Biological Opinion." And that's all I have.

19

20 Mr. Paul Brunner: Okay, any other action items that people remember? If not then I think we
21 go to public comment group.

22

23 **Public Comment and Questions**

24

25 Mr. Frank Miller: Frank Miller. I would like to address the issue of the new County proposal
26 to open up the west side of McClellan for new production wells. I think that you don't have to be
27 a environmental engineer to know that this is a bad idea. I think that Mr. Callaway and Mr.

28

1 Yarbrough are right on the money in seeing that this is a bad idea. However, I am an
2 environmental engineer and I think it's a horrific idea. I would like to address this issue to the
3 County representative that is here tonight. I would like for you to keep in mind to reiterate what
4 Mr. Yarbrough and Mr. Callaway said, that you're headed into an area to destabilize the area.
5 There are unknown dumpsites out there in that area. You may poke holes out there near an
6 unknown dumpsite. There may be unknown dumpsites on McClellan yet. Keep in mind that this
7 brown area is already a contaminated area. There is contamination out there and there has been
8 lawsuits out there suing the base for contamination. Wells have been closed down because
9 they've been contaminated. There is a contaminated plume that's out there.

10
11 Mr. Paul Brunner: Actually, Frank, that's not totally accurate.

12
13 Mr. Frank Miller: Well, it's accurate to say that there is already...

14
15 Mr. Paul Brunner: For the record. You made that comment for the record. As we go through,
16 it's for you point if you're going to continue.

17
18 Mr. Frank Miller: I haven't finished. We'll let you speak. I haven't finished.

19
20 Mr. Paul Brunner: Okay.

21
22 Mr. Frank Miller: I'm saying that there's already a contaminated zone out there. And also,
23 the water table under McClellan and surrounding McClellan has been lowered quite a bit
24 throughout the years. Perhaps some would say it has been dangerously lowered, that water table.
25 Moreover, if you want to put more production wells on the west side of that base, you're going to
26 open up a can of worms. Where if you approve 2 or 3, before you know it there'll be 10 more
27 people wanting to do it and then they'll say, "Well, if the other people did it, why can't we do
28

1 it?" And then if you do that, it's going to open up that can of worms to more monitoring of those
2 wells. There'll be constant anxiety to do more monitoring out there. You're already into a
3 contaminated zone. To proceed into this contaminated zone already, given this situation, I think
4 is a bad idea.

5
6 Mr. Steve Kalvelage: (inaudible)

7
8 Mr. Frank Miller: If you want to.

9
10 Mr. Steve Kalvelage: I don't know how much time you want me to take on this. I'll try
11 and be brief.

12
13 Unknown Male: Well, okay.

14
15 Unknown Male: Not long.

16
17 Mr. Steve Kalvelage: Steve Kalvelage, Sacramento County. In response to that, it was
18 never our intent to open up area for well development. It was our intent to make the codes more
19 concise and address a capability that we have now of categorizing plumes and saying that we
20 want to stay 2,000 feet away from this plume. Where as before we were guessing where
21 contamination was. That's where that brown area resulted from — was our best guess. There's
22 nothing that says we need to remove that restriction. We can leave it in place and add 2,000-foot
23 perimeter. I will take back to our staff that developing this is that this group has expressed a
24 concern and desire to leave that intact, unless we hear from people that have an opposite view
25 point. We in our office have no problem representing that to the Board of Supervisors
26 (inaudible). I appreciate your input and we'd welcome comments at our next public meeting.

1 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Could you tell us when you'd like to have, or when we should
2 have, our written comments, and if we're going to submit them? When would that be?
3

4 Mr. Steve Kalvelage: It'll be plenty of time after the next public meeting we're
5 scheduling the 13th. It just won't go to the Board of Supervisors until probably May.
6

7 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Oh, okay.
8

9 Mr. Steve Kalvelage: So there'll be plenty of time.
10

11 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: So our next RAB meeting in January, we'd have plenty of time to
12 cover that.
13

14 Mr. Steve Kalvelage: Sure. Would you like for me to be at that if you're going to put it
15 on the agenda?
16

17 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: It's up to you. If you'd like to come and speak on it some more, it's
18 fine. I think.
19

20 Mr. Paul Brunner: It may help.
21

22 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: If you'd like to come, that's fine. I'm not going to insist.
23

24 Mr. Steve Kalvelage: If you're going to discuss the issue I'd like to be able to get your
25 input and also clarify what our intent was.
26

27 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Sure. Hopefully by the next time we will have some more people
28

1 here because we are down tonight.

2

3 Mr. Frank Miller: Just in conclusion, I think that it's a very bad idea to open up an already
4 contaminated zone that's setting next to one of the worst Superfund sites in the country, and to
5 go poking holes out here. It may hit some other...

6

7 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: I think he understands that.

8

9 Mr. Frank Miller: I think it is a horrible idea.

10

11 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: I think he understands that. Thank you very much. Is there any
12 other comments for the public?

13

14 Mr. Erwin Hayer: I've seen the trucks hauling the dirt and brush from the north creek, which
15 I call Robla Creek, there at the north end of the runway. I didn't know that those were lined
16 creeks out there. Downstream of that on the west side of the runway it is not lined and it was dug
17 out last year to maybe 3 or 4 times larger than what the creek is on the other side of 26th Street.
18 By cleaning these creeks across McClellan, it's creating a problem downstream, more flooding
19 potential. If I want to clean it on my own property I have to get a permit. I don't know if you're
20 still getting permits on this or not on that north area. Is there a permit on that right now?

21

22 Mr. Paul Brunner: Well, the cleaning of the creeks that we have are being done on a national
23 floodway permit for the efforts that we've got. Do I have a permit other than a national permit
24 that says we can do this? No. But we're not required to for this cleaning that we're doing to have
25 a permit for that activity. As far as the comment on the lined. There are lined creeks up there on
26 the north area. Elaine, you have been up there with your eyes, and my staffers, out there where
27 we are on the lined creeks visually observing the activity. There are portions that are not lined,

28

1 I'll agree, but are lined portions up there.

2

3 Mr. Erwin Hayer: What would it take for me to get out there and look at some of this?

4

5 Mr. Paul Brunner: Just like before, where you'd come and call Yvette and it's open.

6

7 Mr. Erwin Hayer: If I've got passes to get on the base, if I have a Military ID card?

8

9 Ms. Merianne Briggs: Mr. Hayer.

10

11 Mr. Erwin Hayer: Can I go out on the perimeter?

12

13 Mr. Paul Brunner: I think the perimeter road is open now.

14

15 Mr. Erwin Hayer: Oh, it is. I wasn't sure of that.

16

17 Ms. Merianne Briggs: Mr. Hayer. I'm sorry, just go ahead and give me a call and I'll
18 arrange to go ahead and have someone go out there with you and get you on base also.

19

20 Mr. Paul Brunner: Just like my offer before, we're open. You can come.

21

22 Mr. Erwin Hayer: Okay, thank you.

23

24 **Closing Remarks/Adjourn**

25

26 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Okay, this session of the RAB is now closed unless there is some
27 objection. Oh, you...

28

1 Mr. Paul Brunner: Well, I think we can close, he was just...

2

3 Ms. Merianne Briggs: You can close. I was just talking to...

4

5 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Unless you want to stay and observe this, our session is now
6 closed.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28