



McCLELLAN AFB
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING
VINELAND ELEMENTARY SCHOOL AUDITORIUM
6450 20TH STREET, RIO LINDA



June 2, 1999
AGENDA

Meeting Start		6:30 p.m. (Approx. Length)
Introduction, Welcome & Announcements	Del Callaway, Paul Brunner	20 minutes
Attendance and Sign-in	Del Callaway	
Member Purpose of the RAB and Ground Rules	Del Callaway	
AF Statement	Paul Brunner	
Approval of the April 21, 1999 Minutes	Del Callaway	
Current News	Paul Brunner	
Review of Action Items	Paul Brunner	
Committee Reports		55 minutes
Community Relations	Sheila Guerra	
Base Reuse/Relative Risk Ranking	Del Callaway	
• Reuse Efforts Status	Rick Solander	
• Stanford Ranch/Dames & Moore	Frank Meyer (Stanford Ranch)	
Technical Report Review	Chuck Yarbrough	
• TAPP Update		
RAB Advisory Worksheet Report	Paul Brunner	
RAB Decision Items and New Business	Del Callaway	15 minutes
DoD Co-Chair Comments		15 minutes
Restoration Projects Update	Phil Mook	
Well 1019	Cpt George Joyce	
West Area Update	Paul Brunner	
Public Comment and Questions		10 minutes
Other Business		10 minutes
Next RAB Agenda Topics?	RAB Members	
Recap Current Action Items	Meeting Coordinators	
Closing Remarks/Adjourn	Del Callaway, Paul Brunner	

** Questions will be accepted orally or from comment cards provided at the meeting. Each agenda item will conclude with time for questions that concern that subject. Because of time constraints, speakers are asked to limit their questions or comments to three minutes. Thank you for your cooperation!*

1 there. Did you have any objections to that?

2
3 Ms. Linda Piercy: No.

4
5 Mr. Paul Brunner: No. Bill, I know we talked briefly; you're OK with that?

6
7 Mr. Bill Gibson: Right.

8
9 Mr. Paul Brunner: And the regulatory, Joe and Alex — OK. So who we do have tonight is
10 Rob Leonard from the LRA and Larry Kelley, president of the Stanford Ranch, who did make the
11 special effort to come tonight to talk to us about their initiatives they have at the base. With that,
12 Del, unless you have something else you would like to say, I will offer it up to Rob.

13
14 Mr. Del Callaway: Welcome and thank you for coming and lay it on us.

15
16 Mr. Rob Leonard: Thanks Del and Paul. It's good to be back with you. As you know, Mark
17 Manoff from my office normally attends the RAB meetings. And sorry we are missing so many
18 people here this evening.

19
20 I wanted to make a point to come before the RAB this evening to provide an introduction of
21 Larry Kelley, president of Stanford Ranch, who was selected by the Sacramento County Board of
22 Supervisors as the LRA or the Local Redevelopment Authority for McClellan Air Force Base, as
23 its equity development partner for the future of McClellan Air Force Base.

24
25 As a means of introduction of Mr. Kelley, I want to indicate what this action of the Board of
26 Supervisors represented and what it did not represent. What we selected was a business and
27 development partner, an investment partner for the future of McClellan Air Force Base. What we

1 didn't select was a reuse plan for McClellan Air Force Base. We're looking for somebody to join
2 with the county as the LRA in preparing the final reuse plan and then, in turn, serving as the
3 implementation agent, in essence the driver, doing things that quite frankly local government
4 doesn't do best — and that's market and develop real property. And this is a very complex
5 marketing and development project, so we wanted to look to the best and the brightest that the
6 public sector could bring to bear on that project. I feel very good about this selection of the Board
7 of Supervisors; the Stanford Ranch/Morgan Stanley team.

8
9 And so with that, this evening we have Larry Kelley, president of Stanford Ranch, to share with
10 you some comments as it relates to where he sees the project now and what are the critical issues
11 facing us in the future. What we're not talking about again, I want to reiterate, is the reuse plan
12 — jumping to conclusions that quite frankly we are not in a position to deal with at this point. So
13 with that, Larry.

14
15 Mr. Larry Kelley: Thank you, Rob, and members of the commission here. It's nice to be
16 here. I appreciate the time. Paul and I have visited before, going back almost over a year ago
17 when I first got interested in McClellan. And he shared with me some of the projects he was
18 working on out there. And, candidly, I kind of knew that Paul and I will also end up being
19 partners, of sorts, because we will probably spend the better part of the rest of our lives out there,
20 I think.

21
22 But, we are very pleased to have been selected by the county. I know there was a lot of discussion
23 and debate about what was going to happen at McClellan and, candidly, our perception is that the
24 market will also make the greatest part of that decision for us, because we're going to spend a
25 couple of years really testing the market and trying to do everything we can within our power to
26 reuse the facilities that are there, to bring jobs there as quickly as possible. It's our plan not to
27 wait until the military is out of the way and is gone to try and bring jobs back to the base. We'd
28

1 like to start, as they move out, going as quickly as we can to bring new employers and jobs back
2 in.

3
4 Having said that, as you know and particularly I know that Paul knows, it is not a matter of just
5 changing the name on the light meter and turning the lights back on in your name as the new
6 tenant. There is quite a lengthy process that is involved in getting buildings turned over, getting
7 facilities available to be used by the private sector. So we're working through that. I think Paul
8 and his group and the LRA have done an incredible job of establishing procedures working to put
9 the buildings back into reuse by moving forward and establishing clusters, groups of buildings
10 where baseline studies can be obtained, so that we can evaluate where they are and making the
11 process where the military is concerned as simple and easy as possible.

12
13 We are here tonight really just to meet you because we know we will be working with you. We
14 understand what needs to be done, to some extent, at McClellan. But we'll still going to be
15 learning and will be learning for a good time because it is, as Rob said, a very, very complicated
16 asset. It's not as simple as a building or even a group of buildings. You've got many, many
17 different types of products that are available for use at McClellan: everything from very nice
18 offices, to good warehouses, to fabulous manufacturing facilities. And, candidly, we're going to
19 be working as diligently as we can, as those are turned over, to put them back to use as soon as
20 we can.

21
22 It's not going to be an easy process and we certainly welcome everybody's input through that
23 process. If you all have some suggestions or ideas of things, don't hesitate to call us. There are no
24 dumb questions. There may be some dumb answers from us, but we welcome opportunities to
25 have interaction from the community. We will be working with the county and with the LRA to
26 finalize the Development Reuse Plan for McClellan.

1 In addition to that, the one thing we did suggest, and I think the county has at least tentatively
2 agreed with, is given the fact that there is a possibility that the runway may not end up being
3 reused — and I say it's a possibility, it's certainly not a certainty — but that as one alternative we
4 want to make sure we don't wait for two years when the military is gone to start planning for that
5 eventuality. So, in addition to marketing the property early, we want to put a plan in place
6 alongside the Final Reuse Plan that uses the runway — an alternative that if it doesn't work, we
7 don't have to start in two or three years to go through the process to plan for an alternative that
8 assumes the runway is closed. So, it gives us some flexibility that we won't have to start over
9 again at a later date.

10
11 And that's really the simplest way I can put it — that we will plan two uses simultaneously for
12 reuse. One would be the plan as it exists, more or less, with some refinement and approval by the
13 Board of Supervisors, and an alternate plan, which would show some other uses where the
14 runway currently sits. And, again, that would have to go through the public process at the same
15 time and be approved by the Board of Supervisors. This is in many respects no different than any
16 other land-use decision that's made in California. It's a public process, it involves public
17 meetings, public input, and basically ratification by the Board of Supervisors in this case.

18
19 So that will be going on over the next year or so. We look forward to working with you all
20 through that process. We're absolutely excited about the prospects for McClellan. As
21 complicated as it is, as challenging as it is, it's going to be a very exciting opportunity, one which
22 we will execute properly, which I'm committed to doing. I think it could create as many or more
23 jobs than were ever at McClellan and really become a very essential part again of our local
24 economy here. And that's what we are committed to doing.

25
26 With that, I would be happy to answer any questions. I would like to introduce Alan Hersh. Some
27 of you may have met Alan. Alan is vice president of our company and will be involved in
28

1 McClellan in a variety of ways, working with Rob and the county and me and everybody else on
2 the reuse plan. He's working now on helping us to just get an understanding and try and put our
3 arms around this. It's quite a big undertaking and one which will have a lot of people involved.
4 But Alan will be involved from the "get go" on it and be responsible for a lot of the land and title
5 issues and all the issues related to how the base gets ultimately developed.

6
7 I would be happy to answer any questions. If not, I'm more than happy also to sit down. Yes sir.

8
9 Mr. Bill Gibson: This is Bill Gibson.

10
11 Mr. Larry Kelley: Yes, Bill.

12
13 Mr. Bill Gibson: Since you're uncertain about the use of the runways, is it necessary to
14 maintain the flight paths and reserve them? How does the FAA work with this so that the county
15 doesn't build a lot of housing and such below the current flight paths?

16
17 Mr. Larry Kelley: Until a decision is made to close it, the decision is that it will stay open.
18 And we may do some things with regard to the level of service that is maintained on the runway.
19 By that I mean the type of maintenance that we do on the runway, whether it is 24 hours, whether
20 it is the fire and crash protection they have, or whatever. But right now our intention is to keep it
21 open so nothing changes until we have given ourselves a really good chance at bringing some
22 good employers here that can use that. It's a valuable asset. Once you close it, as you said, it will
23 not be reopened. Because things will happen, the paths will be closed and it will no longer be
24 available to us. So we're going to give it a good shot. I mean, as it is if we can make it work, it is
25 far more valuable to us than if we close it.

26
27 Mr. Bill Gibson: OK.

1 Mr. Rob Leonard: **inaudible...** If I can add something to Bill's question.

2
3 Mr. Larry Kelley: Yes.

4
5 Mr. Rob Leonard: I just got a signal for the microphone. From a planning perspective, the
6 County Board of Supervisors early on in the reuse planning process for McClellan froze the
7 Comprehensive Land Use Plan, the CLUP, in place for McClellan. That's the document that
8 governs off-base land use, acknowledging the presence of the airfield, that factors in the aircraft
9 traffic patterns and also noise exposure. So, although there are some incompatible land use, some
10 existing incompatible land uses, the process that would have to be, that new projects will have to
11 be tested against, will remain the same as it's always been, until such time as a decision is made
12 by the Board of Supervisors. So, we have the same level of protection we have always had until a
13 decision is made.

14
15 Mr. Bill Gibson: OK. Another question. Early on, you — the way you talked, you're going
16 to maintain existing facilities and property on the base in your long-range planning. Will you try
17 also to sell to industries or business who would renovate, put something new in?

18
19 Mr. Larry Kelley: I think I understand your question. Our model of what we do is, we bring
20 the buildings and certainly we would sell somebody a building out there, a user or a tenant that
21 wanted to occupy the building, and let them renovate it. But our typical model is most
22 manufacturers would rather have the building brought up to standard before they would get
23 involved with it. So what we would do is, we'll take over the facility. We'll spend the money to
24 bring it up to code.

25
26 As you can imagine, some of these buildings are a little bit older. Some of them don't have
27 compliance with existing laws, so when we bring in a private industry, you know, there are code-

1 compliance issues, there are American Disability Act issues, that have to be resolved that military
2 didn't necessarily have to follow because these were grandfathered from being built years ago.
3 So we'll be working to do all those things. And then certainly our attention is to be as flexible as
4 we can, either in leasing the buildings to a company that wants to occupy them, or if they would
5 rather, buy it as soon as they can. That takes a little bit longer. Again (it's) the process that Paul's
6 group goes through to get all the work done so that we can do transfers on all the buildings.
7 Some maybe can go sooner than others, but the idea ultimately from our prospective is to sell
8 them.

9
10 Mr. Bill Gibson: OK. I'm on the Building Board of Appeals for the County of Sacramento,
11 so I may be seeing you in the future.

12
13 Mr. Larry Kelley: OK. Any other questions?

14
15 Mr. Del Callaway: Chuck, you have a question?

16
17 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: No.

18
19 Mr. Del Callaway: I was kind of interested in cleanup and reuse. I guess Building 624 is
20 sticking in my mind, that there are some issues that floors are cracked and some contamination of
21 some sort. So you don't plan on using any of those buildings that have contamination around
22 them or in them until they're cleaned up and turned over to you, or are you going to take over the
23 cleanup?

24
25 Mr. Larry Kelley: No, we won't take over the cleanup. That's something I don't want to get
26 involved in. That's something the military is going to be spending a lot of money and Paul will
27 be spending a lot of time doing for the foreseeable future. We certainly will try and prioritize, to
28

1 the extent that we can, to tell Paul and the Air Force to an extent possible that we would like
2 things in this area done or in that area done because they're more marketable, or whatever, but
3 you know that's a subject of negotiation with the Air Force and with Paul's group. It's also a
4 subject of the availability of the annual budget appropriation from Congress. So there are a lot of
5 things that are beyond our control. But it's not our intention to get involved in what, we believe
6 is the military's role of cleanup. Now we will take care of, under the agreement we have in some
7 buildings, the idea of not just upgrading in code compliance, but either encapsulating or
8 removing asbestos, if that has to be done, lead-base-paint types of things that the military is not
9 doing. But we don't want to get involved in the removal. I just read the notice — PCB cleanup
10 and all that; that's not something we're going to be doing.

11
12 Mr. Del Callaway: Well, the reason I asked that question is that Dames and Moore and
13 Stanford Ranch and the group that you just mentioned awhile ago purchased Radian, and they're
14 the ones that are doing the analysis of the groundwater and other things. Seems like that's a
15 conflict of interest there.

16
17 Mr. Larry Kelley: Well, we don't own Dames and Moore.

18
19 Mr. Del Callaway: OK.

20
21 Mr. Larry Kelley: They're not our company. They're owned by somebody else. They're no
22 different than any other consultant we would hire to do work for us. And, candidly, you know, I
23 think the Air Force sets the criteria for the work that they do with their contractors. We have no
24 influence in that. And, if it does become perceived as a conflict, you know, we'll take a look at
25 whether or not we should work with them or not. They're not an investor in our company; they're
26 not an investor in McClellan; they're not a partner in the deal in the sense of economic
27 involvement. They're strictly a third party arm's-length consultant, you know, like any other
28

1 consultant that we would hire.

2

3 Mr. Del Callaway: Well, their results could be tainted by virtue of who owns them. So when
4 they're given...

5

6 Mr. Larry Kelley: We don't own them.

7

8 Mr. Del Callaway: Huh?

9

10 Mr. Larry Kelley: We don't own them.

11

12 Mr. Del Callaway: No, but it could be tainted to the people that you're trying to do business
13 with and establishing a manufacturer or something out there.

14

15 Mr. Larry Kelley: Well, again, I think the way the process works, Paul's group has a contract
16 with them to do the environmental baseline surveys. And it would not be to our best interest at
17 all. If anything, I want to hold them to as high a standard and as tight a standard as possible for
18 the simple reason that if there's ever anything that comes back, I want the Air Force to be on the
19 hook for it. And if I set a sloppy standard or I encourage somebody to do a lousy job so that I can
20 get something, it's to my detriment. If anything, I would rather the Air Force spend more money
21 and bring it to a much higher standard. So my interest is counter to what you're saying. Now,
22 whether or not that's a conflict, or if it's ever perceived as one, we won't use them.

23

24 Mr. Del Callaway: OK. Very good.

25

26 Mr. Paul Brunner: In fact, Del, there's an element there with — I know that Sheila has raised
27 the question and you have raised the question on conflict of interest. For us, it actually makes the

28

1 Air Force to do more due-diligence in the whole approach as to what are the proposals, is there
2 something being proposed that may not be to our benefit, or to the community's benefit, or where
3 it is? There is that element to it. Ultimately, the decisions on cleanup and what we do do are the
4 Air Force's. In conjunction with the inputs that we get from the regulatory agencies and advice
5 we get from the RAB and that, ultimately, the final decision on that is ours.

6
7 Mr. Larry Kelley: And the EPA actually has to review on some of that I believe. EPA, both
8 Cal and federal, has to review the plan, don't they?

9
10 Mr. Paul Brunner: Oh yes, they do review our plans. Most definitely.

11
12 Mr. Larry Kelley: And there is a third party. Believe me, I'm on your side of that one if
13 you're concerned about them not cleaning it up. I want it cleaned up as good as possible for the
14 very simple reasons it makes it more marketable, it eliminates future problems and hazards, and
15 it makes my life a lot simpler. When I go to sell property, one of the first things that shows up on
16 anybody's due-diligence list is environmental representations and warranties. And, given the fact
17 that this is a Superfund site, I don't like to make any.

18
19 Mr. Del Callaway: Another reason I mentioned that is, I was out over the weekend looking at
20 a piece of property next to the base. I can't remember the name of the building, right across from
21 786, "A" Bay, there's a vacant lot, a triangle in there. And when I approached a person there who
22 was putting a roof on a house, he tells me that there was a burial site there for contaminated
23 materials. And it's one that I'm quite sure we haven't discussed in the past. Chuck, do you know
24 what that building is that's sitting off to the west of Building 786?

25
26 Mr. Phil Mook: Building 781.

1 Mr. Del Callaway: Seven-eighty-seven, probably?

2

3 Mr. Phil Mook: Seven-eighty-seven is the one most to the west. It's the hazardous material
4 storage area.

5

6 Mr. Del Callaway: OK, just north of that building along that fence line.

7

8 Ms. Roxanne Yonn: Excuse me, Phil. Did you want the mike?

9

10 Mr. Del Callaway: What, you need a name?

11

12 Mr. Phil Mook: Oh, sorry about that. Phil Mook. I believe the building you're talking
13 about is Building 781.

14

15 Mr. Del Callaway: OK. Along that fence line north of 781, that vacant property there is for
16 sale between 781 and the next building, which is an old house, and a garage or shed of some sort,
17 and two or three old cars sitting around there. And up to that street there's a narrow little aisle--
18 way that goes from that street back to the property. It's the only way to get in there. In fact, it's a
19 closed-in piece of property. And the guy tells me, he says you would be foolish to buy this
20 because it was a burial site in the past. So.

21

22 Mr. Paul Brunner: OK, I hear that, Del. And if we missed a site, we should include and get
23 the information and go look — but in relationship back to the point here, how does that tie back
24 in? I didn't quite catch the connection with Stanford Ranch.

25

26 Mr. Del Callaway: No, it brought to mind Building 624 and your enthusiasm in getting the
27 buildings as fast as you can and turning them over for reuse. And I wanted to hear you say that

28

1 you were not going to cut any corners and that you were going to make sure that they were
2 cleaned up and the proper...

3
4 Mr. Larry Kelley: Well, I hope I said that.

5
6 Mr. Del Callaway: ...relationship. **inaudible** anybody. I mean, speed isn't the key factor here.

7
8 Mr. Larry Kelley: We all would like to have things done quickly, but if you don't do them
9 right you end up paying twice. So my motto is, basically, do it right the first time; it's the
10 cheapest way. And in this one, since it is not only the cheapest way, it's the free way, because
11 that is the military doing it. If I take it earlier and have a problem, I suspect that it could end up
12 creating a bigger problem for me, which is like the last thing I want to have. So, we're not going
13 to get things done out of sequence.

14
15 Mr. Del Callaway: OK.

16
17 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: I have one question I would like to ask.

18
19 Mr. Larry Kelley: Yes sir.

20
21 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Regarding housing on base or home development, apartment
22 development. What is the way you see and feel right now? I mean, do you foresee more housing
23 and more apartments and that kind of development on McClellan than already exist today?

24
25 Mr. Larry Kelley: If the runway is left open, I would probably see less.

1 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: So what happens, you have any feelings as far as if the runway is
2 closed?

3
4 Mr. Larry Kelley: If the runway closes, then we have to go through the land-use process and
5 take a look at it. There is enough land where the runway is, and I think that whole flight line area
6 that you would have to take a look at and see what can be done. I wouldn't preclude anything at
7 this point and time with regard to that because it would be premature. And I think we'd have to
8 look at it and see what's the level of cleanup that exists, what will exist, what exist in those areas,
9 and then you'd have to look at the compatibility with the surrounding areas.

10
11 I mean, there are houses I think on the base today that will come down. The Wheary Housing, as
12 an example, that I don't see being rebuilt generally, probably as housing just because of its
13 proximity to some of the other land uses around it. On the other hand, there may be some pieces
14 that are closer to the perimeter of the property that might replace the total number of living units,
15 some of that. Again, we haven't gotten that far. That will be part of the reuse plan. But in general
16 I'd say I don't really see more houses under the current reuse plan when it's finalized, but
17 possibly less.

18
19 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: But there's a lot of contamination. For instance, the runway and the
20 taxiways are right in the middle of the industrial area.

21
22 Mr. Larry Kelley: Well, the north end of it is slightly different. I think if you look from the
23 area where the Coast Guard is and north, it's probably slightly different than the area that's down
24 behind the back shop and some of the other hangars. Again, that's something we'll address at a
25 later date. I don't think we're prepared to — we didn't come to the county originally with a plan
26 that said what was going to be. We said that we wanted to keep this option open and that's really
27 designed to be both economically viable and produce what is actually going to be the best plan

1 for the whole base when it's done, whichever scenario evolves.

2
3 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: I just know that the cleanup scenario was going to be different if
4 you go residential versus industrial.

5
6 Mr. Larry Kelley: And that's something, again, that we have to evaluate during the process. I
7 don't have an answer for you. I think there's a lot of work that's been done in some of those areas
8 already, but I don't think its finalized, to my knowledge. I think the evaluation, as well as the
9 remediation, hasn't been done in those areas to the best of my knowledge.

10
11 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Thank you.

12
13 Mr. Del Callaway: I want to ask you one last question in regard to the wetlands. Do you plan
14 on making that into a park or leaving that out there as is?

15
16 Mr. Larry Kelley: Well, there are some things that you have a say in, and there are some that
17 you don't. My sense is that may be one that we don't. I think the county was looking at it for
18 certain uses. My understanding is that was based upon some environmental issues, the decisions
19 were made, and I don't think it's within my purview to change that.

20
21 Mr. Del Callaway: Thank you.

22
23 Mr. Larry Kelley: Anything else?

24
25 Mr. Paul Brunner: Linda, do you have any questions?

26
27 Ms. Linda Piercy: I was just wondering about EVOC. Is EVOC going to still be out there
28

1 somewhere?

2

3 Mr. Larry Kelley: You know, again, I don't think that that's been decided yet. Initially, I
4 think one of the wetland areas we're discussing was where the EVOC was going to be. And my
5 understanding is that's been precluded in that particular location because of environmental
6 issues. You know, that's still to be evaluated. But I don't know any more than that at this time.

7

8 Mr. Rob Leonard: On that question, in regard to the future of the EVOC. The EVOC site is
9 currently operational on a temporary basis down at Mather Air Force Base, as you may be well
10 aware.

11

12 Ms. Linda Piercy: Right.

13

14 Mr. Rob Leonard: The Law Enforcement Coalition continues their examination of alternative
15 sites for the EVOC permanent sites. Actually, a single meeting has occurred, since this selection
16 of Stanford Ranch, with the Law Enforcement Coalition more or less just to talk about the whole
17 Public Safety Training Center concept at McClellan; that as you know includes more than just
18 the EVOC. There are administration uses, classroom uses, continued use of the small arms range,
19 the canine training, area for example. So, all of those things were discussed specifically related to
20 EVOC. The coalition wants to continue to examine alternative sites on McClellan, but then also
21 is examining sites elsewhere in the community, including Mather, including SMUD control
22 property, and a number of other sites located throughout the county.

23

24 Ms. Linda Piercy: The first section that was looked at is no longer — is that closed?

25

26 Mr. Rob Leonard: That's correct, as I understand it. I believe Mark Manoff from my office
27 may have reported to the RAB at a previous meeting that the Law Enforcement Coalition has

28

1 formally communicated to my office that they've withdrawn the west side from consideration.
2 But they've asked us to continue to assist them in examining other potential sites on McClellan.

3
4 Ms. Linda Piercy: I see. Thank you.

5
6 Mr. Paul Brunner: Any other questions? Mannard, did you have any questions for the group?
7 OK. We thank you very much for coming.

8
9 Mr. Larry Kelley: Thank you very much, I appreciate it. Look forward to working with you.

10
11 Mr. Paul Brunner: As they went through that, I want to give recognition to Sheila Guerra,
12 who did the actual invite for them to come. So, with that, you're welcome to stay for the rest of
13 the meeting and hear what we do, because I think, internally, since we had other people to come
14 in, Bill Gibson — I know, Mannard, you just came in and Chuck — what we originally
15 announced at the beginning for so few in attendance that we listen to the Stanford Ranch folks
16 and potentially adjourn with very few people here on it. So we talked and what we will end up
17 doing, if it's OK with the rest of the folks, is go through the agenda then, on that.

18
19 Any objection to that, since we made that one comment in the front, from the members?

20
21 Mr. Del Callaway: Sure, any other speakers?

22
23 Unknown Male: No.

24
25 Mr. Del Callaway: OK.

26
27 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Thank you very much.

1 Mr. Paul Brunner: Yes, thank you.
2
3 Mr. Del Callaway: Well, we'll get back on the agenda then.
4
5 Ms. Linda Piercy: Excuse me. Hello. I'm not going to be able to stay for a long time tonight.
6 So where are we? Are we on the agenda at all?
7
8 Mr. Paul Brunner: Actually, Linda, we pre-empted...
9
10 Ms. Linda Piercy: Starting from the beginning?
11
12 Mr. Paul Brunner: Yes, we pre-empted it because we were going to just listen to them and
13 then adjourn.
14
15 Ms. Linda Piercy: OK, we're starting from the beginning then?
16
17 Mr. Paul Brunner: Yes, if you're going to leave soon, maybe we should reconsider and go
18 back to the original plan.
19
20 Mr. Del Callaway: How much time do you have?
21
22 Ms. Linda Piercy: Probably an hour.
23
24 Mr. Del Callaway: We should be done in an hour.
25
26
27
28

1 **INTRODUCTION, WELCOME, AND ANNOUNCEMENTS**

2
3 Mr. Paul Brunner: We can really try to go through it and move right through the agenda and
4 do the presentation stuff. OK, why don't we give it a shot — people did come out.

5
6 OK. The first thing on the agenda is the Introduction and Welcome and Announcements. Del and
7 I announced ourselves, so why don't we have the other folks announce.

8
9 **Attendance and Sign-In**

10
11 Mr. Alex MacDonald: I'm Alex MacDonald. I'm with the Regional Water Quality
12 Control Board.

13
14 Mr. Bill Gibson: Bill Gibson, RAB member.

15
16 Mr. Mannard Gaines: Mannard Gaines, RAB member.

17
18 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Chuck Yarbrough, Restoration Advisory Board member.

19
20 Ms. Linda Piercy: Linda Piercy, RAB member and community member.

21
22 Mr. Joe Healy: Joe Healy, U.S. EPA.

23
24 Mr. Paul Brunner: OK. Del, did you want to go ahead and do the Purpose and Ground Rules?
25
26
27
28

1 **Purpose of the RAB and Ground Rules**

2
3 Mr. Del Callaway: I'm passing those out now. As you know, our purpose is to advise the Air
4 Force on methods and ways of cleanup and to view their documents and look for errors and this
5 and that. And how we do that is in our rules and bylaws. Chuck has gone over that several times,
6 so I just passed out to each of you another copy — if you will familiarize yourself with those.
7 Also along with that is Community Relations, Technical Report Review, and Relative Risk
8 committees. If your name is not on one of those committees, please put your name on there and
9 be part of one of those committees. The third thing is an e-mail with Stanford Ranch and the
10 other companies involved in the reuse, which is what the gentlemen just spoke of. Basically,
11 that's what I have.

12
13 **Air Force Statement**

14
15 Mr. Paul Brunner: OK. We do have listed on the screen various rules we try to apply to
16 during the course of the meetings. With that, why don't we go to our statement I'll read from the
17 Air Force? This is something I'd like to enter into the record each time as to why the Air Force is
18 here. I'll read this:

19
20 "McClellan Air Force Base is here tonight because our past industrial operations and disposal
21 action created pollution. We regret and apologize for those actions. Although no one here in this
22 room tonight is directly responsible for the contamination caused in the past, we are responsible
23 for fixing it. We know we have a problem and we're doing our best to solve it. We want your
24 opinions and your advice. That is why we're here."

25
26 Before we move to the next point, what I wanted to do during tonight was to pay honor to one of
27 our members who did come tonight, and that's Chuck Yarbrough. Chuck, if you can come
28

1 forward.

2
3 We'll take a picture and put it in our newsletter. One of the things we have worked through over
4 the years — Chuck and I have known each other for a long time. The first time I met Chuck was
5 in 1979, which was a long time ago. He has always been very, very active in community
6 relations, people out here in the community, working issues, and that.

7
8 We haven't always been on the same side working issues as far the issues are concerned, but I
9 know Chuck's heart and intentions and desires have always been there **inaudible**. I appreciate
10 that. And I know in the early days when McClellan started off and the Task Force was going into
11 the Technical Review Committee, you've been there, participated, and taken your own toll and
12 time to do that. You're here away from your family; you can be doing other things. We
13 appreciate that **inaudible** we went to the Technical Review Committee to the RAB when it first
14 formed, you were the first co-chair **inaudible** we've had multiple co-chairs from the DoD, from
15 my staff. Now I'm honored. But Chuck, he's always been there.

16
17 We do have this wonderful certificate at least wanted to recognize that. I know the other
18 members wanted to be here to say thank you too, but we sincerely say thank you for you efforts
19 and participation in the community and representing the RAB in your best efforts to do that.
20 Thank you very much, Chuck.

21
22 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Thank you.

23
24 **Approval of the April 21, 1999, Minutes**

25
26 Mr. Paul Brunner: OK. We go to the minutes.

1 Mr. Del Callaway: Let me back up one second. I overlooked the sign-in.

2

3 Mr. Paul Brunner: Oh yes.

4

5 Mr. Del Callaway: I would like all the RAB members to sign in, if you have an e-mail
6 address. please put it down. Alex, yours doesn't work; I tried it. Joe, yours works just fine, so I
7 got through to you. If you have a fax machine or an e-mail address, I'd appreciate it if you'd put
8 it on the sign-in sheet.

9

10 The next order of business is approval of April 21st minutes, and the one portion I'm looking at is
11 the Air Force statement, which I don't agree with. But I'll ask if there are any amendments,
12 additions, or deletions.

13

14 Ms. Merianne Briggs: Merianne Briggs. There is a correction, actually two corrections,
15 that need to be made on page 72. We've handed out copies of the corrections that we would like
16 made on that. On line number 15, the term "Club" was used. It was actually C-L-U-P. And on
17 line 16, a word "luciferous" was actually "vociferous," so we'd like to go ahead and make those
18 corrections on that.

19

20 Mr. Del Callaway: OK. Are there any other questions?

21

22 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Yes, I have a correction of my own. They're just small corrections.
23 On page 41, third paragraph down, the last line says like the "record of" and it should say "record
24 of decision." Then page 51, third paragraph down, the first sentence where it says "**of** city well
25 1019," it should be "come out **at** city well 1019." So instead of city well 19, it should say at city
26 well 1019.

27

28

1 Mr. Del Callaway: OK. Are there any other corrections, additions, or deletions? OK, then I
2 ask for a second that we accept the minutes with the changes.

3
4 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: I'll second.

5
6 Mr. Del Callaway: OK, all in favor signify by raising your right hand. OK motion is carried
7 unanimously. Current news.

8
9 **Current News**

10
11 Mr. Paul Brunner: On the Current News: this is where we talk about news releases and
12 different things. The Air Force did not have a news release since the last RAB meeting. There
13 was one public ad that did go out. It dealt with actually one of the facilities that you were
14 mentioning, Del, on Building 624-D. A PCB storage site we used at McClellan has now closed
15 or is being closed, taken out of operation. And part of the process that we have — for the plans
16 that we have, you have a closure plan and a public announcement that comes forth with that
17 process. There was an ad that announced that we have the plan; that's a requirement that we do
18 that. That was put into the paper as a public ad.

19
20 There was a question that came up from the RAB about that as to why didn't we pre-advance
21 notice the RAB about putting out the public ad on that, and what defines a restoration site and the
22 RAB's involvement on it. In this particular case the activity — that site that we're closing was an
23 operational unit until probably the late '80s, in that time period, and is controlled by Title 22,
24 which is state law, and also TSCA, which is the federal law for PCBs. The key point for that is
25 that it is a timing issue, not whether it's a restoration issue, per se. And from our vantage point
26 it's not restoration closure. We can mention it, talk about it, but it is not a restoration issue, per
27 se, for the RAB to work through.

1 We have brought it up in the past to talk about it — but the aspect of going ahead and coming
2 forward, like we do on other news releases and press releases, pre-advance notice on a procedure
3 for one of our facilities that we would have permitted to announce closure on it, we did not pre-
4 advance coordinate that with the RAB as we did that. And the rationale was that it wasn't a
5 restoration-type activity. It was just one of our regular permitted facilities that we were going
6 ahead to close and we were just following public law, that we had to do.

7
8 Mr. Del Callaway: Then the last sentence in your statement is not true?

9
10 Mr. Paul Brunner: Last statement in which statement?

11
12 Mr. Del Callaway: This one right here.

13
14 Mr. Paul Brunner: Well...

15
16 Mr. Del Callaway: That, "We want your opinion and advice."

17
18 Mr. Paul Brunner: Well, that is — on the comment where we went with the public ad, is
19 really going forward to ask for comments and advice from people as a member of the
20 community. The PCB storage site is very similar to the process we went through with the EE/CA
21 documentation for creeks, where it is not a cleanup issue on the restoration program. We did go
22 out and ask for public comments and community members' input. If the RAB chooses to provide
23 comments back on the closure plan as a RAB, you can do that. It is one of those areas where it is
24 not specifically a cleanup issue. If you have advice or comment, you can do that. But it is not part
25 of that restoration cleanup process that we would come and specifically ask for advice under the
26 restoration program.

1 Mr. Del Callaway: Well, it's an Air Force piece of property; it falls under your statement. It
2 was contaminated by the Air Force; it is your obligation to clean it up. And we have in place a
3 process where you provide the RAB with a worksheet requesting information or suggestions on
4 how to go about doing this. PCB — we discussed this in the past and on the DRMO site — in the
5 yard there — and the two releases did not follow a RAB worksheet or any coordination or any
6 advice or notification given to the RAB. So we kind of think that you kind of left us out of the
7 picture there. Even though you say it was some time ago, it would still fall under our desire to be
8 able to participate in cleanup and the advice of how to go about doing it and where to haul it, and
9 this and that and the other.

10
11 Mr. Paul Brunner: You're not pre-empted from following it. I think the issue from making
12 comments, I think the issue that surfaced, was did we have a public — we put out a public ad that
13 we have to do by law because we have a closure plan to do. And we did do that. We sent the
14 document out. We do a whole bunch of different activities for compliance-related things. We
15 have air permits; we do other issues on hazardous waste facilities, which do not clear through the
16 RAB. At one time, we had a compliance forum where we talked issues; in fact, we talked this
17 issue, too, Del. And we've shown the ability to come and discuss the issues, per se, if there was
18 interest on those items that are not directly cleanup on the restoration-type program that we have
19 — so we can talk those issues. But the idea of advance coordinating or going with worksheets for
20 non-CERCLA issues, which is what the RAB is on, that puts an extra onus of burden to come
21 and actually pre-coordinate all those activities. I think we do that through the regular public
22 notices we send out. That's a little bit of the difference.

23
24 Mr. Del Callaway: Regular public notices is a different forum than this. This forum is for
25 contamination. PCB is a contamination. Seems to me that would fall under our criteria. Maybe
26 some of the other RAB members would like to comment on it, Chuck.

1 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: I'd like to know or have a clarification of what closure you're
2 talking about. Are you just talking about closing this building for — to no longer be used? Is that
3 what you're talking about when you say closure here? Are you talking about ripping the building
4 out, ripping the concrete up? So, what are you talking about?

5
6 Mr. Paul Brunner: Well, today, Chuck, on 624-D, the building is gone. The floor of the
7 building has some PCB contamination on the concrete that is there. As we go through with the
8 Title 22 rules and regulations, there's a requirement for us to have the facility cleaned up and the
9 contamination removed there. So the closure plan would specify how the concrete is being torn
10 out and removed and disposed of.

11
12 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: So, you are taking the concrete out?

13
14 Mr. Paul Brunner: Yeah, the closure plan would take the concrete out and remove it.

15
16 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: So, I don't understand this and there's certainly a different criteria
17 here than Building 652, whereas we had mercury contamination, whereas we had what was left,
18 radiation contamination, and whereas it was considered restoration.

19
20 Mr. Paul Brunner: Well, the timing goes back to — it's 252 with the mercury.

21
22 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Right, I know where that one is, but I was referring to Building 6
23 — the one with mercury and the radiation.

24
25 Mr. Paul Brunner: Yes, it was 252

26
27 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Two-fifty-two?

1 Mr. Paul Brunner: The difference between the two is that the mercury contamination and that
2 transpired on a certain time period, which would fall within the CERCLA program. CERCLA is
3 a Superfund law, the statute that says the timing would fall into the criteria that falls into the
4 restoration program for cleanup to do, which is the past disposal sites. And this particular unit
5 that we're closing right now, the PCB unit was active and it's an active site as far as an
6 operational unit that we're having PCB restored on it. And it didn't fall into the CERCLA
7 process. It's outside; it was active beyond when we were doing cleanup. It stood outside so it
8 doesn't fit right into that picture of closure site or cleanup site that we're trying to work through.
9 Two-fifty-two fell into that role. We know of the contamination and where it is outside and we're
10 working through it. It fit into that mold to go ahead and start to do the cleanup with it. And we've
11 briefed that and talked to it.

12
13 Six-twenty-four-D is controlled by different statutes, different laws that we have to follow, such
14 as Title 22 and that. From your perspective I can see, well, one is contamination and that, but
15 there really are different statutes, different regulators, that we deal with under that procedure that
16 we would go forward with, and we're following those rules of closure for that particular facility
17 and removing the contamination.

18
19 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: The new storage garage that Frank Miller will refer to, I don't
20 know the number of that building, your hazardous waste storage facility. I understood that those
21 10 buildings were taken out of use when you moved into the new facility. So, that was about the
22 time you were studying 252.

23
24 Mr. Paul Brunner: The time that that was taken out is post-1980, 1981, 1982 time frame, I
25 mean, when we built the conformance storage facility. Is that what you're referencing, the new
26 hazardous waste storage facility?

1 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Exactly.

2

3 Mr. Del Callaway: No, that wasn't built then. That was built in the '90s.

4

5 Mr. Paul Brunner: That's even more my point is that when we — it was recently built and the
6 other site was operating as a PCB storage area, post the early-80s time period, when CERCLA
7 came forward and we signed their FFA and the other things that we're doing for the cleanup
8 program, that we're trying to do within the Restoration Advisory Board process in our cleanup
9 program. It is contamination. It is out there for public review, but it's not following the same
10 procedure.

11

12 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: You didn't follow my train of thinking.

13

14 Mr. Paul Brunner: I guess not. Try again.

15

16 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: What I was trying to say was that when we were studying the
17 mercury and the radioactive radium in Building 252. Is that 252, right?

18

19 Unknown Male: Correct.

20

21 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: OK. When we were studying that, you were already using the
22 hazardous waste storage facility, the new one. When the RAB was studying this right? OK, so
23 that means that those 10 buildings were no longer being used anymore.

24

25 Mr. Del Callaway: Yes, you are right.

26

27 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: So...

28

1 Mr. Paul Brunner: I don't see the connection.

2
3 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Well, you were saying that they were different because — I mean
4 I'm just saying that 252 fell into restoration back then when we were discussing that building,
5 and you knew about the contamination back then and those buildings weren't in use.

6
7 Mr. Alex MacDonald: I think the difference here, Chuck, is that the spillage and
8 everything that occurred at Building 252 occurred prior to CERCLA laws being initiated. So all
9 that waste is CERCLA waste. The contamination that's at Building 624 falls outside of CERCLA
10 since it occurred after that fact, after CERCLA laws came into being. It would have been more
11 like temporary leakage that occurred fairly recently. And so those regulations under the
12 Department of Toxic Substances Control, under Title 22, requires them to clean the PCBs up and
13 perform this closure plan and do the notification. So, basically, the person you know in that
14 section of DTSC that oversees that, is not the people here that look at the CERCLA program. It's
15 a completely different program.

16
17 That's why we're trying to get out two different regulatory bodies overseeing different
18 contamination at different sites, depending upon when it was used and when it was discharged.
19 Might not make a whole lot of sense logically. I mean, yes, we could treat these differently, but
20 that's the way the laws happen to be written.

21
22 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough; I just meant the spillage there not only has occurred recently, but
23 all the way back since way, way back.

24
25 Mr. Del Callaway: Before CERCLA.

26
27 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Right.

1 Mr. Alex MacDonald: Right, and Building 624, if you're considering it a permitted type
2 not really **inaudible** but permitted type PCB storage area, where it falls **inaudible** specific
3 regulations for that type of storage require a closure plan when you're done. Since there's
4 contamination there, your closure plan requires you to remediate that contamination. Whereas
5 Building 252, that was spillage and everything that occurred went into the storage: they handled
6 the materials, they discharged it into leaky lines, etc., so that was actually leakage that wasn't
7 designed to do any of that sort of thing. So, it's a CERCLA waste. So it just happens to fall under
8 a different regulation, so it's handled differently.

9
10 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Well, you know we see the spillage. You know there had to be
11 spillage there of PCBs or they wouldn't have gotten into the cracks.

12
13 Mr. Alex MacDonald: Correct, that's right.

14
15 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Concrete, right?

16
17 Mr. Alex MacDonald: They wouldn't have found the PCBs on the concrete itself.

18
19 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Right.

20
21 Mr. Alex MacDonald: The reason the PCBs spilled there so they had to under their quote-
22 unquote permit or the way the facility operates, under closure they had to sample. And they found
23 the contamination and that required them — it kicked them into doing a closure plan with actual
24 remediation. So that whole process and the closure plan is falling under the DTSC purview.

25
26 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: One of those thin lines.

27

28

1 Mr. Alex MacDonald: Yes.

2

3 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Well, the only other thing I have to say is along the lines of the
4 PCB storage there. Did we have any other chemicals stored there in that facility at any time along
5 with the PCBs?

6

7 Mr. Paul Brunner: From my memory, no, I don't think so, Chuck. The area was a PCB
8 storage area for waste and barrels and I don't know of any other chemicals.

9

10 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Cause that, to me, would be important, because if you mixed the
11 two it could drive the PCBs down farther than just the concrete.

12

13 Mr. Paul Brunner: That's true, and what we've looked for in the plan and the closure and that
14 — the plan does not address any other contaminates other than PCBs. And from our history, from
15 what we've searched and looked at the site, it did not have any other chemicals at the site.

16

17 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: So what happens if it gets into the — we didn't find any — I take it
18 that you didn't find any PCBs or chemicals or anything underneath the slab from that particular
19 facility.

20

21 Mr. Paul Brunner: Well, to date, we have not drilled through the slab to see what's right
22 underneath it. PCBs themselves are not highly mobile to penetrate the slab. What the plan does
23 call for is to go ahead and remove the slab, and when the slab is removed, then we would sample
24 the soil right below it to see if it was contaminated, and if it was contaminated, be removed at
25 that point. We do not anticipate that the PCB has gotten to the soil, but we would sample and
26 check, after we removed the slab, to see if there was anything there. And, if so, we would take
27 care of and remove it.

28

1 There was another question that was brought up as to where would the waste go? The waste is
2 anticipated that it would be disposed of through DRMO, through their contracts and go to
3 Kettleman. There is a hazardous waste site down at Kettleman Hills, down in Southern
4 California.

5
6 Ms. Linda Piercy: Excuse me, Linda Piercy. So what you're saying is, the laws are the
7 determining factor on what kind of contamination falls under restoration. Is that what you're
8 saying?

9
10 Mr. Paul Brunner: No.

11
12 Ms. Linda Piercy: I need clarification on that.

13
14 Mr. Paul Brunner: No, it's not what type of contamination, it's the timing as to when the
15 contamination occurred, as to whether or not it falls into the CERCLA program and into the
16 cleanup issues that we would deal with.

17
18 Ms. Linda Piercy: Because I heard laws mentioned, someone mentioned law, so?

19
20 Mr. Paul Brunner: The CERCLA law, the law that starts the whole Superfund process, came
21 out in the 1980 time period. And the funding and different things that we go to build for the sites
22 that get included in that program, typically deal with all those sites where the spillage occurred
23 before then. If something occurred after that time period, there's usually some other statute (state
24 or federal) that deals with that contamination outside the Superfund program.

25
26 Within that area, what we do is since they're already in place and these other laws and statutes
27 work with them to take care of those — there is not very many sites that fall in that category. But

1 there are some, and 624-D is one of those areas with PCB.

2
3 Ms. Linda Piercy: Thank you.

4
5 Mr. Paul Brunner: It's really a timing issue as to when the spillage occurred and I think Alex
6 defined it better than I did.

7
8 Mr. Del Callaway: My questions were not to put you on the spot and drag this out. It started
9 with page 72 to preclude, like, this contamination back in 1947 and the property was allowed to
10 fall into private hands and...

11
12 Mr. Paul Brunner: Are you reading from the minutes?

13
14 Mr. Del Callaway: Yes, it's one of the things that came up during that meeting. I wasn't here,
15 but I just happened to see that somebody brought that issue up. We would like to be in on things
16 ahead of time and whether CERCLA has anything to do with it or not. I don't know if that really
17 precludes us because if it's a hazard, it's a hazard. And if it moves, if it's going to be moved,
18 then we should be in on providing you with advice in accordance with your statement here, on
19 the Air Force statement. I'll let it drop at that.

20
21 Mr. Paul Brunner: OK

22
23 Mr. Del Callaway: OK.

24
25 **Review of Action Items**

26
27 Mr. Paul Brunner: What's next? The review of the Action Items. OK. You're handing out
28

1 copies of the Action Items? I'll pause for a second.

2
3 OK, the first Action Item that we have, and there are two pages of them, the first one is still open.
4 It was for Sheila to contact Erwin about his resignation. Yes or no in that regard, to get it in
5 writing? Sheila is not here, so I propose that we just leave it open.

6
7 Mr. Del Callaway: Yes. I looked at that in the bylaws and, evidently, you had some discussion
8 on it in the minutes also. I'll take care of it. I'll call him. In fact, I talked to him about a week
9 ago.

10
11 Mr. Paul Brunner: OK.

12
13 Mr. Del Callaway: I'll call him and talk to him again.

14
15 Mr. Paul Brunner: The next we believe is closed. It's, "Invite two perspective RAB members
16 to the next Community Relations meeting on June 16th to at least present and turn their
17 applications in." Letters were sent to them to invite them to the meeting, so we propose that be
18 closed. The letters were sent.

19
20 Mr. Del Callaway: OK.

21
22 Mr. Paul Brunner: The third one is still open. "RAB Community: RAB committees to
23 announce their chairs at the July RAB meeting." To all those RAB co-chairs, RAB committee
24 chairs, that's something that's coming up. That's still open.

25
26 The fourth one is still open, too. "RAB Community Members request briefing on north creeks
27 habitats." We did talk last RAB meeting about that. Elaine did that for me. I could not make the

1 last meeting. The status has not really changed on that. Negotiations between the Air Force,
2 LRA, and Fish and Wildlife continue on with that north area as to, does it fit in, what do we do
3 with the creeks on that? The fate of that area has not yet been determined as to exactly if it's
4 habitat or not. It's still airfield, it's still mowed, and what we take care out there — but Fish and
5 Wildlife believes there is habitat value out there. So we are working with the LRA and the future
6 landowners. What does that mean? So this will stay open, and we need to come back and give
7 you an update in the future on that.

8
9 The fifth one is, "Update the RAB on transition plans for EM to AFBCA at April RAB meeting."
10 That was done. The RAB decided to keep that open. We'll keep that open. Things have not
11 changed since the update and I read the minutes from the last time.

12
13 The next one is, "Invite representatives of U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to participate in RAB
14 training 1999, subject: Biological Opinion." The Biological Opinion has not yet been set for the
15 timing for when that'll happen. We have that, it stays open, and they will be invited to come.

16
17 The next page is, "Update RAB fact sheet on the Web site." We believe this has been done. We
18 turned in the sheet to the Community Relations group. And I believe on June 16th is when they'll
19 review that on that. So it has been turned in. That still stays open, I think, until that is done. Is
20 that what we wanted to do?

21
22 Ms. Merianne Briggs: Yes, we would like to go ahead and keep that open until we can
23 actually have the meeting on June 16th and go over that and put that on the Web.

24
25 Mr. Paul Brunner: OK, the next one is, "Discuss need for an alternate RAB membership
26 application as mentioned in the bylaws." That's still open and the notes would say that that's also
27 being discussed at the June 16th Community Relations meeting.

1 The next one deals with, "Assist Imogene Zander and the Piercys." Merianne Briggs was to
2 obtain base passes and that. There is a process in that, that's still open. We don't have too many
3 meetings on base today. But Linda and Imogene you all need to contact...

4

5 Ms. Linda Piercy: Sorry.

6

7 Mr. Paul Brunner: ...us to get the application so it stays open. The last time I asked, do we
8 really want to leave it open? You know that you're suppose to contact us and it just makes me
9 read it each time. Do we want to keep it open?

10

11 Mr. Del Callaway: What's wrong with them getting a pass to get on there?

12

13 Mr. Paul Brunner: They need to come in and sign.

14

15 Ms. Linda Piercy: We have to go to the base.

16

17 Mr. Del Callaway: You don't want to go to the base?

18

19 Ms. Linda Piercy: No, that's not it. I've just been really, really busy.

20

21 Mr. Del Callaway: Well, at your convenience go out there and do the paperwork and you'll
22 get your pass.

23

24 Mr. Paul Brunner: Yes, all I'm saying is that last time I asked, I'd kind of like to close it so I
25 don't have to keep putting the members on the spot as to where it is and move on, because I think
26 they all know.

27

28

1 Ms. Linda Piercy: We do.

2

3 Mr. Paul Brunner: Is that OK?

4

5 Ms. Linda Piercy: We do.

6

7 Mr. Del Callaway: The last one is closed.

8

9 Mr. Paul Brunner: Yes, and the last one is closed. We just carried it over to this meeting to let
10 standard protocol.

11

12 OK, and that's the Action Items. Then we go to Committee Reports.

13

14 **COMMITTEE REPORTS**

15

16 **Community Relations**

17

18 Mr. Del Callaway: Committee Reports, Community Relations and Sheila is sick so she won't
19 have a report tonight.

20

21 Ms. Merianne Briggs: Merianne Briggs. Del, if I could go ahead and say that we do have
22 a RAB training workshop coming up. That will be on July 7th at 6:30.

23

24 Mr. Del Callaway: Wasn't that changed to July 1st?

25

26 Ms. Merianne Briggs: That's July 7th with Joe Healy on Records of Decision. It's on a
27 Wednesday.

28

1 Ms. Roxanne Yonn: We gave a handout, but there's an error on it. It was a test. One person did
2 catch it. It's Wednesday, not Thursday, so if you just cross out Thursday and put Wednesday, it is
3 July 7th. And, Bill, you did pass the test, thank you.

4
5 Mr. Paul Brunner: I guess I'm confused then, we mentioned that there was a June 16th
6 training and then we went to a flier that talked July 7th. What's happening on June 16th?

7
8 Ms. Roxanne Yonn: June 16th is the Community Relations meeting, and then the training is
9 July 7th on Wednesday.

10
11 Mr. Paul Brunner: OK, all right.

12
13 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: You know, I got here for July 8th as being the Relative Risk
14 Ranking Committee, Reuse and Relative Risk Ranking Committee.

15
16 Ms. Merianne Briggs: That is correct.

17
18 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: So the training on the 7th and then the Relative Risk Ranking
19 Committee on the 8th.

20
21 Ms. Merianne Briggs: On the 8th that's correct.

22
23 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: So, basically, I'd like to just state that Joe Healy is going to be
24 giving the training on the 7th on Records of Decision. As you know, one of the big Records of
25 Decision coming up is the groundwater, so this should be a very important training session for all
26 RAB members to attend, if at all possible.

1 I don't know, I don't think Joe has necessarily come up with his training criteria yet, but maybe
2 you can give us a feeling of what you were thinking about presenting to us.

3
4 Mr. Joe Healy: I'm not sure if this microphone is on. I doubt it. OK, I think it's on now.
5 Well, I haven't put together training slides or things that I talk from yet. But I've written RODs
6 in the past and I know how involved a process it is in getting buy-in and approval from all the
7 various people involved in coming to a decision, part of which is the community. A big
8 important part for the ROD is the response to comments that are made on the Proposed Plan by
9 the community. And the ROD is a legal document that is very important in the CERCLA process.
10 So I'll try to explain that in more detail during the training and base it a lot on the experiences
11 I've gone through and I know many others have gone through who've actually been involved
12 writing and getting ROD approved for various CERCLA sites. I'll try to use examples that
13 pertain to what you can likely expect to see or be involved in with the upcoming RODs at
14 McClellan.

15
16 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: And the first one being the groundwater.

17
18 Mr. Joe Healy: The groundwater, the one that deals with solvents in the subsurface.

19
20 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: I don't know exactly where the schedule is right now. Can you give
21 us some kind of feeling when that will be supposedly coming out?

22
23 Mr. Del Callaway: Chuck, I think we can get into that later on.

24
25 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: I just like to get the feeling so they can see how important this
26 training is.

1 Mr. Del Callaway: We need to keep the meeting moving because she has to go.

2
3 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Yes, I know just one sentence from him and that'll be it. Do you
4 have any idea? Has that slipped?

5
6 Mr. Joe Healy: Proposed Plan, this fall a Draft Proposed Plan is very likely. And within
7 six months, if all goes well following that, hopefully a ROD would be signed or almost signed.

8
9 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: So this is an appropriate time for this training is what I'm getting
10 at.

11
12 Mr. Joe Healy: Oh, I think so because the Draft Final Feasibility Study is about to come
13 out some time later this month. And that's usually a good indicator of the direction of where the
14 Proposed Plan is going and that's a good time for you to start getting very involved.

15
16 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: So that's why it's important for each RAB person to be at the
17 training. That's what I'm trying to get over and thank you very much Del.

18
19 Mr. Del Callaway: You are welcome. You have anything else? OK, Rick?

20
21 **Base Reuse/Relative Risk Ranking**

22
23 **Reuse Efforts Status**

24
25 Mr. Rick Solander: I'm Rick Solander and I'd like to spend a few minutes to give you an
26 update on some of the reuse efforts that McClellan is engaged in, excuse me, some of the
27 environmental efforts that we're doing to support the reuse efforts.

1 This is timely because the Stanford Ranch folks came in and gave you a briefing at the beginning
2 here, so this will fit right into that. Having said all that, there are a few efforts outside the reuse
3 plan that we are engaged in working with the LRA to try to support.

4
5 The ones, twos, for single buildings and some of the areas, are being requested by certain entities
6 out there in the community that we're going ahead and doing the environmental documentation
7 on those to transfer those over to the County of Sacramento earlier than the Stanford Ranch folks
8 are working some of the other efforts.

9
10 Just to give you an update on the first one there, the North Area Transfer Station. By the way, the
11 handout you have coming around goes into a little more detail than the slides. It talks specifically
12 about those environmental documents that we are preparing, the Site-Specific Supplemental
13 Environmental Baseline Survey, what we commonly call the SSSEBS, and the finding of
14 suitability to lease, or the FOSL. Those are the two main documents we prepare that feed into
15 preparing a lease so that we can transfer the property to the County of Sacramento.

16
17 The first one on the list is the North Area Transfer Station. Since we met last, we have completed
18 that environmental documentation and the Air Force has actually signed the lease for that. It is
19 being coordinated for the county's signature at this time. Within the next 30 days, the county will
20 actually have possession of that piece of property. If you don't know where that is, I have a map
21 on the side of the room. When we get through here, at the end of the meeting, you can take a look
22 at where some of these areas are. That little piece of property to the east of the base that's kind of
23 a little a rectangle, that's the North Area Transfer Station. The County of Sacramento has been
24 operating out there since the '60s. It's where a lot of the municipal waste, solid waste in the
25 northern county gets taken. So they are actually going to get possession of that property to
26 continue those operations and do some modification of the facility.

1 The next effort is for an area we call the 1000 series. There are some facilities along the flightline
2 that are vacant. They used to be occupied by the 940th Division that has since moved to Beale Air
3 Force Base. So we're in the process of preparing the documentation to turn those over to the
4 County of Sacramento. There are some issues involved with that area. One of the buildings
5 stored radiation in the past, so we need to do the radiological surveys to clear that facility for
6 unrestricted use before we turn it over to the county.

7
8 The next item is Building 271, which has been requested by Boeing Service Corporation, Boeing
9 Service Company. That's the entity that the LRA has contracted with to do the base operations
10 on the base: the road maintenance, building maintenance, things like that. They want to use
11 Building 271 for an administration facility. So we're looking at completing that environmental
12 documentation in the summer of this year. The main issue of that building is that it is a historic
13 piece of property. And, I'm happy to report, that since we last met, the Air Force and the State
14 Historic Preservation and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation have signed what we
15 call a Programmatic Agreement that defines the requirements that the county is going to have to
16 adhere to to keep that building preserved to its historic nature. We have signed up to that and the
17 LRA will have to follow with that.

18
19 The next item on the list is the River Dock. That's an off-site piece of property that's located
20 along the Sacramento River near Garden Highway. Again, some of the same issues there. We're
21 due to complete the documentation this summer. That is also a historic piece of property. It also
22 happens to have some sensitive habitat out there, so we'll be working with Fish and Wildlife
23 Service to clear that area to get the restrictions laid out for the sensitive habitat before we can
24 transfer that.

25
26 Mr. Paul Brunner: This sensitive habitat, there's an elderberry shrub that's there.

1 Mr. Rick Solander: There's a lone elderberry bush out there and you all know what the
2 elderberry bush can do to us. So we'll be watching that one real closely. I was out there a couple
3 weeks ago to make sure that it was still there. And it is still there.

4
5 Ms. Linda Piercy: No truck plowed it down?

6
7 Mr. Rick Solander: No, but I can tell you it came real close. We had done some
8 clearing out there and they were warned ahead of time. We were out there in accordance to what
9 we said we would do before, and we watched them every step of the way to make sure they
10 didn't get that plowed a little bit too close to the elderberry bush. So it's still there.

11
12 Ms. Linda Piercy: Good deal.

13
14 Mr. Del Callaway: Is it a bush or a shrub?

15
16 Mr. Rick Solander: It's a shrub. I was told that today we're not suppose to call them
17 bushes, we're suppose to call them shrubs. So, it's an elderberry shrub.

18
19 The next item on the list is the nuclear reactor Building 258. UC Davis is very interested in
20 taking over that facility. There's some special legislation that's being worked through now to
21 allow us to do a direct transfer to the UC Regents. What's changed a little bit on that is we're
22 looking at not doing that through a lease, we're going to do that through what they call an early
23 transfer, actually, to transfer that property over to them by deed. We had a good conversation
24 with the regulators today and we believe we have a good plan to make that happen.

25
26 You may be hearing more about that in the near future. So that will actually go over to Davis.
27 They will have full ownership under a deed; this is our hope by the end of the year, in the fall of

1 1999. The special legislation is not suppose to be solidified until a September or October time
2 frame.

3
4 Mr. Paul Brunner: What transpires here is that the legislation that is before Congress — the
5 person who wrote the proposed language, put in there that we would transfer by deed. So as we
6 work through this, we are asking — it's different than what we've been doing, we've been doing
7 things by leases — is we may not be successful in getting the language changed before Congress
8 as they work the issues. I mean, the Air Force is giving that the try right now to change the
9 language. Failing that, as we want to make this happen, so we can transfer to UC Davis so they
10 can use it for medical research and use the facility for active purposes.

11
12 There is a process, early transfer that's allowed under CERCLA — you'll hear the term FOSET
13 being used, Finding of Suitability for Early Transfer. That will be conducted. What that calls for
14 us to do is to go through and do all the environmental documentation. We don't have the cleanup
15 levels established, so what that causes us to do is to define what it is. The Air Force would still
16 sign up to clean up the area, and in cases where there is very little risk involved with the
17 contamination at this particular site it provides a means under the FOSET for the EPA and the
18 state to allow it to be transferred by deed to this owner. We're talking about a small parcel of
19 property with the reactor itself, not the entire base, but just the reactor to be able to transfer by
20 deed under a FOSET.

21
22 Potentially, if we're successful we'll go back to the lease approach. Under the FOSET, what
23 happens is that the State of California needs to go all the way to the governor to get approval to
24 do this. We have other hoops that we have to go through to get it all done with a short time
25 frame. We can accomplish it better as a FOSET, quicker, but we may be told to go with the
26 transfer by deed. So you'll see that come up in the discussions.

1 Mr. Rick Solander: The next two items as well, the additional items in the second block of
2 items on the sheet that you have are directly related to what Stanford Ranch was talking about
3 today. We are going to be required to do environmental studies on the entire base and our due
4 diligence before we turn property over to the County of Sacramento.

5
6 Mr. Paul Brunner: Rick, let me interrupt for real quick: I won't take too long. I know I'll keep
7 within the hour, hopefully. But there's a point that came up. Del, you had mentioned about 624-D
8 and whether or not the building is going to be cleaned up in time for the Stanford Ranch and that.
9 The EBS process that we're talking about here, that Rick is really, like our termite reports, that
10 we go through to do if you're the landowner: disclosure acts. This is the process where we
11 combine all the environmental knowledge that we know about a site and capsulate it in this
12 report, and get clearances with the regulators, and have full disclosure with the people that'll be
13 taking over the property. And, also, for us to make sure we get the place cleaned up and ready to
14 be transferred over. This process should work and we should not actually be turning something
15 over to Stanford Ranch that is contaminated and not cleaned up. That's what this process is
16 trying to do, to make sure it's cleaned up.

17
18 Mr. Rich Solander: So, what we'll be doing is doing that due diligence and to aid in that effort
19 so it's not turned over contaminated, we have two years to turn over all the property. Our goal is
20 to turn over all the property to the County of Sacramento by July 13, 2001. Obviously, we can't
21 do all that in the next couple of months. So we've laid out a plan and a strategy to incrementally
22 do environmental baseline surveys for the whole base by that time.

23
24 The map you see on the side of the room here shows that we've broken the base up into eight
25 groupings. Systematically, we are going to work through those eight groupings to do the
26 environmental baseline surveys. And the first two groups' total consisting of about 160 facilities
27 are what we're currently working on. If you want to take the time afterward, using the hand notes

1 that I gave you and the color codes on the side of the room here on the map, you can see how
2 those eight groupings are going to be phased in over the next two years.

3
4 What we've tried to do is put in the areas that we think are going to be of most valuable use. And
5 when I say "we" I don't mean Environmental Management, I don't mean the Air Force. These
6 groupings were developed in conjunction with the County of Sacramento, the LRA, the Stanford
7 Ranch folks, the closure office, the Air Force Base Conversion Agency, as well as the Air Force
8 Environmental Management and Civil Engineering. It was a cooperative effort with all those
9 folks. It wasn't a unilateral decision from one party. We feel we have a consensus on the priority
10 and how we walk through that. And this shows that some of those facilities that are up front in
11 Groups 1, 2, and 3 are what some of those folks feel could be of most use for reuse potential.

12
13 If you look closely, most of those represent a lot of the industrial facilities on the west side — on
14 the east side of the base, and the housing units and what are not toward the latter part of the
15 groupings, if you look at that closer. So having said that, are there any questions or concerns?

16
17 Mr. Del Callaway: I guess there are none.

18
19 Mr. Rick Solander: OK, thank you.

20
21 **Technical Report Review**

22
23 **TAPP Update**

24
25 Mr. Del Callaway: Thank you very much, Rick. Mr. Yarbrough, Technical Report Review.

26
27 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: The only thing I have to say is we had a meeting last week on the
28

1 Technical Assistance Program (TAPP) and we have come up with a Statement of Work. We have
2 come up with a list of contractors that will be getting that Statement of Work (and we'll find out
3 if whether they're interested in participating in the TAPP. The next step is for them to respond to
4 us. We will go over their resumes and so forth if they send them in to us. We'll be making some
5 kind of determination as to how we want to proceed, and meet up with two or more companies to
6 compete on various tasks that we assign them.

7
8 What I want to do is, I'm going to be very short. I want to have the Technical Report Review
9 Committee meeting to go over some of the ideas on task that we'd like them to do. One would be
10 the Record of Decision. I'm thinking about the week after the Community Relations Steering
11 Committee meeting, Community Relations Community meeting on the 16th because I don't want
12 to go into July and there are a lot of meetings there anyhow. So I'm thinking of the 24th which is
13 a Thursday after the Community Relations meeting on the 16th. If there aren't any objections by
14 anybody here, I would like to call for a Technical Report Review committee meeting on the 24th
15 of June and, maybe if it's all right with Phil, you know of anything — can you be with us that
16 night on the 24th of June?

17
18 Mr. Phil Mook: Yes, I believe so, yes.

19
20 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Then we would go over the various reports that have come out.
21 And, also, maybe we can decide from that — get some ideas of what to assign a contractor for
22 our TAPP program.

23
24 Mr. Del Callaway: Are you going to call your members of your committee as well?

25
26 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Yes.

1 Mr. Del Callaway: Send out a letter?

2

3 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Yes, hopefully, Environmental Management, Merianne and
4 Roxanne will be able to send out a flier and also I'll phone them. There are some here tonight.

5

6 Mr. Del Callaway: I noticed my name is not on your committee, but I'll be there.

7

8 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: All right.

9

10 Mr. Del Callaway: Thank you, Chuck.

11

12 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Thank you.

13

14 Mr. Del Callaway: The next item is Mr. Brunner:

15

16 **RAB Advisory Worksheet Report**

17

18 Mr. Paul Brunner: We have none to report so we can go to the next one, The RAB Decision.

19

20 Mr. Del Callaway: We know that.

21

22 **RAB DECISION ITEMS AND NEW BUSINESS**

23

24 Mr. Paul Brunner: RAB Decision Items and New Business: I don't think we really have any.
25 We don't have a quorum either, necessarily ... so we go to the DoD Co-Chair comments and that
26 portion of the agenda. Before we get to Elaine's part, are you doing this? Phil's doing it.

27

28

1 Mr. Del Callaway: She passed the buck.
2

3 **DoD CO-CHAIR COMMENTS**
4

5 Mr. Paul Brunner: To Phil, a couple of comments. You did make really good progress on the
6 TAPP. I want to recognize that across the board on it. And so when we get to that point, when we
7 start to use it — I think that's good. So I wanted to recognize that effort on the progress you
8 made. The other item before I turn it over to Phil is, Elaine, as she comes, this may be her and
9 she will get a chance to speak about the eco stuff, I'll call her — but she is going to go and leave
10 us — be going back East to Washington, D.C., in the July time frame. And that so — this may be
11 your last RAB meeting.
12

13 Ms. Elaine Anderegg: I don't think there's a "may" option.
14

15 Mr. Paul Brunner: It will be your last RAB meeting.
16

17 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Very good, Elaine.
18

19 Mr. Paul Brunner: In that regard, I think she's represented us well, too, and within this forum
20 here, thank her for her efforts and what she's done.
21

22 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Thank you very much, Elaine.
23

24 Mr. Paul Brunner: OK, so with the Restoration Projects Update, Phil.
25
26
27
28

1 **Restoration Project Update**

2
3 Mr. Phil Mook: Good evening. My name is Phil Mook and I'll give a short update on our
4 cleanup status. The Groundwater Treatment Plant and the Groundwater Treatment at IC,
5 Industrial Cluster 29, which is by Magpie Creek in the Building 300 area. They are both off-line
6 right now. They are undergoing the start-up testing as part of the Groundwater Phase II Project.
7 They will come back online on 7 June. So a week from next Monday they'll come online and
8 they will start treating groundwater again. The capacity of the Groundwater Treatment Plant will
9 be increased. We will be treating more water at both IC-29 and the Groundwater Treatment
10 Plant.

11
12 We have some investigations ongoing on the industrial waste line laterals and industrial waste
13 trunk line inspections and also the petroleum oils and lubricants. We are nearing the end of these
14 projects; however, we do find new pipes, new lengths of pipes as we're doing our investigations.
15 So the amount of total footage that we're investigating is going up.

16
17 The integrity of these lines, in general, has been very good or above what we expected. The RI or
18 remedial investigation fieldwork, we had a large effort. It started actually in the fall and went
19 through the winter months, and that is completed. We now have all the samples and we will be
20 putting those into our reports.

21
22 We have a new SVE system, IC-35, that was operational on 1 June. I know we presented the
23 EE/CA and had poster-board sessions on that site at the RAB meetings in the past. So we have
24 another SVE system online. One SVE system is done for a few weeks, and that's the Site S
25 system in OU D. And it is down to replace the shroud around the fan that has to be manufactured.
26 It gets eroded over time and so that's being remanufactured. It will come back online 15 June, is
27 our estimate. That's my update on the cleanup status. Are there any questions?

1 I have the next item also, which is to rebrief, to address again, Monitoring Well 1019 and the
2 frequency, sampling frequency.

3
4 **Monitoring Well 1019 and Sampling Frequency**

5
6 Monitoring Well 1019 is approximately 4,000 feet west of the McClellan boundary. It is directly
7 adjacent to City Well 154. Sampling frequency has been quarterly prior to 1996. Sampling
8 frequency is now set biennially, every two years. We have RAB advice that we should sample
9 that well more frequently.

10
11 Mr. Del Callaway: So what's the answer?

12
13 Mr. Phil Mook: I'll get there.

14
15 Mr. Del Callaway: Oh.

16
17 Mr. Phil Mook: This is a map of the plume and the location of Monitoring Well 1019 and
18 City Well 154. I've also shown the groundwater flow direction in this area, which is actually
19 collapsing in on the OU D plume. What is affecting the groundwater flow direction there is our
20 extraction wells at OU D. So, as you can see, it collapses in or it goes centered into our extraction
21 well in the OU D area.

22
23 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Is that "X" suppose to be where the well is suppose to be?

24
25 Mr. Phil Mook: This is the approximate location of Building Well 1019. I can show it on
26 this map also over here. I have it on the larger map, this is...

1 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: It's not drawn to proportion though on that map.

2

3 Mr. Phil Mook: This map is to scale and this represents the 4,000 lineal feet from the
4 monitoring well to the base boundary.

5

6 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: It just looked a little bit too close on that one map.

7

8 Mr. Phil Mook: What caused the change in the sampling frequency from quarterly to every
9 two years, the OU D plume boundaries are now defined and they are a substantial distance over,
10 4,000 feet, from this monitoring well. Monitoring Well 1019 is now upstream. Because of the
11 capture, the flow is away or from 1019 toward the plume, not downstream of the contamination.

12

13 We have an approved Groundwater Monitoring Plan that bases the sampling on a statistical
14 process. And this looks at the stability of the sampling over the past events. We have over 40
15 sample results that all show below MCLs and within statistical tolerance. That means that they're
16 all within a narrow band of variance; therefore, we have one out of tolerance sample results.

17

18 Here are the over 40 samples which show all those samples that are all the same and this one
19 single sample that's out of tolerance.

20

21 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: I take it that the cumulative results of all the chemicals that were in
22 the well were taken into effect, into consideration.

23

24 Mr. Phil Mook: Correct, correct. This is the one, the only chemical of concern at that well
25 that has this one out-of-tolerance results.

26

27 Mr. Bill Gibson: You had no sign, cause, for that out of tolerance, Phil?

28

1 Mr. Phil Mook: I've gone over what could be the reasons for this — thank you, Bill, for
2 that question — out-of-tolerance sampling result. One reason is that it was a legitimate result.
3 And that this was what was truly representative of what was in that well at that time. Another
4 possible reason for it would be poor field equipment decontamination procedures. Before we had
5 this result, we would go around and maybe sample a high concentration well prior to a low
6 concentration well. And if you did not decontaminate your equipment effectively, you may have
7 residual contamination from that previous sampling event that could then get into the next well
8 sample. And the third possible reason for this out-of-tolerance result is a laboratory error.

9
10 We chose to treat this like it was a legitimate, or a truly representative, sample from that well. So
11 what did we do, what was our response? We went out immediately in the next available sampling
12 event and resampled that well. We did not wait the two years, or whatever. We did not throw it
13 out as an outlier. We said, we'd go right back and sample it again. We split the sample with the
14 Regional Water Quality Control Board. They were there; they took their sample to their
15 laboratory; we took our sample to our laboratory. Both of the samples came back with
16 approximately identical, I mean within the third digital .01, and the other one was .80 and a digit,
17 and the other one was .810. So they were within the third digits — within the thousandths.

18
19 Mr. Paul Brunner: They were close.

20
21 Mr. Phil Mook: They were very, very close. And it was back within the tolerance. It was
22 back within the previous 40 results. So we treated it as a legitimate sample, representative
23 sample, and we went right back out there.

24
25 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: I must have misunderstood Captain George Joyce. I thought he said
26 they were going out there in October. I didn't realize you had already tested it.

1 Mr. Phil Mook: Yes, when we got that sample that was very high or out of tolerance, we
2 went right back out there and got another sample and that's represented...

3
4 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: What he said to me was that the reason why we didn't go out there
5 immediately and retest it was because it wasn't a residential well. So I got the feeling that they
6 weren't testing.

7
8 Mr. Phil Mook: Yes, coincidentally we are going out this summer, August time frame, the
9 two-year period will have come up again and we will be out there again this August, too.

10
11 I would like to go over what our key monitoring well criteria is. Key monitoring wells are ones
12 that we sample, or can sample, more frequently than our statistical analysis, than the trend
13 analysis would say. If we have something that is stable, that normally would come out of our
14 analysis as being every two years, we would still sample selected monitoring wells more
15 frequently. The first category is downgradient wells. I have the map here that shows, where the
16 yellow Post-it notes are, these downgradient wells. These are wells that are located outside the
17 plume, but they're directly downgradient or they're downstream of the plume's movement.

18
19 A subset of downgradient wells are boundary wells. These are the wells, again that are located
20 outside the plume downgradient, but they're also located within 200 feet of the base boundary.
21 So you would see these at plumes that are right adjacent to the base boundary.

22
23 And the third one which is the one that most closely matches Monitoring Well 1019 is what we
24 call guard wells. And 1019 is located adjacent to a municipal well, so it meets the first criteria or
25 the first part of a guard well. Where it doesn't meet it, is the second one. It is not located in the
26 migration pathway of the plume; in fact, the water is going in the directly opposite direction
27 there, away from the city well toward our plume. So it does not meet our definition of a guard
28

1 well. That is why we have gone to the two-year sampling of this well.

2
3 Mr. Paul Brunner: Originally, when we first installed the well, talking to staff, the question
4 came up— and correct me if I'm wrong Phil or Elaine — is that we did install it as a guard well
5 because we didn't have the plumes all defined. But over time we have the information now and
6 we know where we're going with the sampling data, as it no longer meets that criteria as a guard
7 well.

8
9 Mr. Phil Mook: Yes, and that's represented here why it's changed. We now have the OU D
10 plume defined and we now know that it is upstream of the flow direction.

11
12 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: So what you're saying is your measurements of the groundwater
13 are actually higher there than they are on base.

14
15 Mr. Phil Mook: Correct. This well is about 75 feet below ground surface and it shows a
16 gradient in all the way down to OU D, which is in the 100 — you know deeper than 100 feet.

17
18 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Are you talking about the water level?

19
20 Mr. Phil Mook: Water level below ground surface, that's right, yes. So to answer your
21 question, Del. Two years. And the next sampling event will be this August of 1999. Now, based
22 on if that sample comes back within the tolerance, you know around .8 parts per billion, it will be
23 scheduled for another sampling event in two years. If it comes in out-of-tolerance we will go
24 back within the next six months and sample that well again. Thank you.

25
26 Mr. Del Callaway: OK. I guess you answered the question, along with the second sampling.
27 So that would have been part of it. Evidently, in the first briefing that wasn't related to some of
28

1 the RAB members that were present.

2

3 On your sheet here you have “west area establish fire break ongoing completion in July” the last
4 time. Last year did they run across a portion of the wetland area out there? Has that been taken
5 care of now?

6

7 Mr. Phil Mook: The firebreaks?

8

9 Mr. Del Callaway: Yes.

10

11 Mr. Phil Mook: The firebreaks do not go through vernal pools. We also marked off areas
12 where migratory birds are nesting and we do not mow those. The ammo storage area is being
13 firebrokeed around their fence, their perimeter fence, so it stays away from the vernal pools. We
14 have EM or natural resources people out there with them while they’re mowing. And so we
15 address the wetlands and vernal pools. Correct.

16

17 Mr. Del Callaway: OK, one other question. I noticed you’re referring to pipelines here and
18 other things. I notice that they’re taking the safety barrier down around tank — I’m not sure what
19 the number of it is now.

20

21 Unknown Male: Tank 10.

22

23 Mr. Del Callaway: Tank –?

24

25 Unknown Male: Tank 10.

26

27 Mr. Del Callaway: Is it 10?

28

1 Unknown Male: Yes.

2

3 Mr. Del Callaway: You have half of the burm down the one side. **Inaudible.**

4

5 Mr. Phil Mook: Oh yes. That tank has been empty for quite some time. It was an old tank
6 used to store diesel and we are in the process of removing that tank. So, that will be within a
7 couple of weeks — the big scissors machine, like they took out Tank Farm 8 across the street,
8 and that tank will be removed and close out sampling taken and any cleanup that's needed would
9 be done under our fuels program.

10

11 Mr. Del Callaway: All the slugs and sediments are already...

12

13 Mr. Phil Mook: Removed from the tank? Yes.

14

15 **West Area Update**

16

17 Mr. Paul Brunner: Any other questions for Phil? There's one other item under DoD
18 comments. It's the West Area Update and we had that one scheduled.

19

20 Mr. Del Callaway: Thanks, Phil.

21

22 Mr. Paul Brunner: On this — this is the update on restoring the creek damage that was done
23 on the West Area. We had various documents that were being prepared for the restoration of the
24 creek along with our environmental assessment that was prepared after comments. A few months
25 ago we ran into an issue with low-level contamination with the West Area and the creeks. And
26 we put everything on hold while we worked through an ecological issue on the west side to see if
27 there really is an ecological problem for that. We did work through various issues and, Elaine, if

28

1 you could give a quick update where we are and what happened with that.

2
3 Ms. Elaine Anderegg: Elaine Anderegg. We did have a meeting last Friday with the
4 ecological risk assessors. I thought it was a very good meeting, very cooperative group. They're
5 very interested in trying to make this project happen in terms of collecting the samples and
6 evaluating the risk so that we can get on with the restoration work that we want to do out there.

7
8 We came to agreement on sampling methods and locations, with the exception of one test
9 method for PCBs. And we're going to follow up this Monday with the same group of people to
10 resolve how we're going to do that PCB testing.

11
12 This Monday, we're also going to be looking at the risk management decision process, as well as
13 taking the actual samples and calculating the ecological risk. What we're going to do with that
14 information to make our decisions, we're going to go through some more diagrams and logic
15 flow of how that works to make sure we all are in agreement with what we're going to do with
16 this information after we have collected it.

17
18 We're also going to be looking at the timing on Monday. We didn't have a chance last Friday to
19 get to how this document review and the sample collection would take place to meet our goal. So
20 right now, it does look like there's a slight delay. We said in about six months we thought we'd
21 have that decision, which would have placed us around September. Right now it's looking more
22 like about November. And so — they were very open to the ecological risk assessors to try to
23 speed their review time up since they're spending a lot of time with us getting the sampling plans
24 developed. They thought it wouldn't take them as much time to review it. So we're going to visit
25 that and see what we can do to adjust that schedule, to try and see that we still can have the
26 information we need to make a decision this fall and, potentially, get out there and take some of
27 the actions that we wanted to for that project. One other piece of it that they brought up is that

1 they do have a desire to see us remove the side casting, that's the dirt that was pulled out of the
2 creeks and was put along the sides of the creek beds, to remove that soil before the next rainy
3 season, so that it could not fall back into the creek or go into the flood plain area. So we're also
4 going to discuss how we might be able to make that timing work and what that would take to do.

5
6 We expect right now to have our sampling plan to go out and collect that sample — those
7 samples that will help us evaluate the ecological risk 1-1 about the middle of this month. And
8 that's the date if you trigger from there on — it's looking like if we give them a 30-day review
9 cycle, it would take until about November. So we'll try to work on Monday to see what we can
10 do to bring that back up a little bit to give us some more time.

11
12 Mr. Paul Brunner: On the side casting, it really kind of presents a dilemma for us. There has
13 been significant regrowth along the banks and, as we work through this, if we do end up
14 removing the side castings, it means we have an impact then on that regrowth. So, (we're) kind
15 of in a "Catch 22" there, as I look at the process as to how we would proceed with that project.
16 So it does become a call as to how do we proceed with that which we need to work through at the
17 agencies as to what is the best approach for that area on it. The goal was to have the data back in
18 so if we were to remove the side castings, we could do it before it rains. But the issues going on
19 now with the — not coming back until November, it's going to probably rain by November and
20 it'll be mushy out there. So we're kind of caught in this "Catch 22" as to where we proceed. So,
21 what I've asked our folks to do is to start to lay out the plans as to how do we accomplish this.
22 That would most likely fall into some kind of CERCLA action. The removal of the site castings
23 at which time mostly likely you'd be asked for your comments. Which kind of goes back to an
24 earlier conversation, Del, as we work through — but, so more to come on that issue. The Air
25 Force is still working through to restore the area out there and to do it as quickly as possible.

26
27 There is one other point I want to bring up here. We did meet during the last few weeks with the
28

1 County and SAFCA, flood control people on the West Area? There is still the desire for us to try
2 to include some type of accommodation for them for flood control. That was part of the
3 comments on the NEPA documents that we sent out for the West Area. What we were asked to
4 do was, in the west side of the base, to accommodate their need by putting in the words of our
5 conservation easement, that we'd have for the west side working with Fish and Wildlife, some
6 accommodation where at least we would acknowledge some quarter width, and they were talking
7 about 200 feet, that would allow them to at least approach Fish and Wildlife to say that they want
8 to do this. They would not be actually proposing what they're going to do or how they would do
9 it at this time, but they wanted us to have at least the provision in the language in the
10 conservation easement which allows them the opportunity to start a process to do something and
11 to approach Fish and Wildlife to do that. It's easier for them, if they actually at least have an
12 acknowledgement in the easement that they can try versus a conservation easement that says they
13 can't do anything on that.

14
15 So they asked us to do that — the Air Force. I know my comment was that we would approach
16 Fish and Wildlife with the biological opinion and things that they are rendering to see if they
17 would accommodate that on the plans, and how that would be worded and could we do that. So
18 there was a discussion with that to try to accommodate them in that area.

19
20 The county, as they made that comment for us to do that, also acknowledged that they — if they
21 were to make a change out there that impacted anything on the west side, they would have to run
22 the full course. They would have to do all the CEQA documentation, approach Fish and Wildlife,
23 get their biological opinion, and also pay for any changes that they would make on the west side,
24 and that would not be the Air Force's job to do, as to where it was. So, within that that's where
25 we are on the west side. And there was a discussion with the flood people. And I know they came
26 and briefed here already. Any questions on the West Area?

1 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: With the side castings, I have one concern with flooding, too.
2 Regarding the side castings, did anybody think about going out there and doing some sampling of
3 that before you remove it and find out if there's any reason to remove the side casting?
4

5 Mr. Paul Brunner: We have looked at the possibility of doing — we have samples back from
6 actually quite a few of the piles that we show low levels of contamination in the piles in the side
7 castings. We don't have one for every side casting, as we define. But they do predominately
8 show some level of contamination. We don't know if that low level of contamination, Chuck,
9 presents a threat, but if its does its there. And what we're getting back from the eco assessors is
10 that that level that is shown even though they don't know if it's a threat, it is enough of a concern
11 from their part that they don't want it to slough back in.
12

13 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Aren't they the experts? Don't they know whether it proposes a
14 threat or not? I'd like to know, does it propose a threat?
15

16 Mr. Paul Brunner: Well, I think that's why we're doing the sampling.
17

18 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: I mean, why would you want to move it if it didn't propose a
19 threat?
20

21 Unknown Male: It didn't.
22

23 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Yes, if it didn't. Why would you want to remove it then? If you
24 have the results from the samples, shouldn't somebody come up with some kind of conclusion
25 saying there is a threat or there isn't a threat. I can understand you removing it if there is a threat,
26 but if there isn't a threat I can't understand. Make it logical.
27
28

1 Mr. Del Callaway: Who's driving the removing, LRA?

2

3 Mr. Paul Brunner: No, it's actually from the — as we had the meeting the other day with the
4 assessors with the low level of contamination there, I think it's a precautionary measure on their
5 part to not go through another rainy season where it will have a chance to slough back into the
6 creek. If they know about the low level of contamination, then they would prefer that we take the
7 action not to allow that to happen.

8

9 Chuck, as far as knowing the answer, I don't think they will know the answer until they do the
10 ecological assessment, those biological analysis that they're doing. They will not be able to
11 conclude as to what is that impact and what does it represent.

12

13 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Do your people have any ideas, Joe?

14

15 Mr. Joe Healy: They have to look at the specific conditions and soil types that exist at
16 McClellan. And they're going to do, I believe, some worm studies where they see the effect on
17 earthworm, simple organisms that they can readily test to see effects. They have to go through a
18 protocol that's been worked out for all these types of sites where they get some initial data and,
19 based on how that data looks, they proceed to more detail testd for some areas. I think that's what
20 they're entering now, is the more detailed phase of testing for some features. They're very
21 careful. They have some very detailed tests. They can't just go to a book on a shelf and pull it off
22 and say, lets see, here's the number at McClellan. I'll look it up in the table. Oh, it says it's good
23 or it's not good. It takes a lot more thought.

24

25 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Well, I just meant that apparently you would be doing more
26 ecological damage by removing the piles. Which way are you doing less damage? I don't know.

27

28

1 Mr. Joe Healy: That's something they are still discussing. They're looking at data, they're
2 looking at their options, and they're thinking about it.

3
4 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: So, it could still be that the piles won't be removed, or they are
5 going to be removed definitely?

6
7 Ms. Elaine Anderegg: Elaine Anderegg. That is something we were discussing today.
8 And I think that is something that we will come to, hopefully, an agreement on Monday as to
9 what data we need to make that decision. And I think — they were not opposed to be leaving
10 them if they were not contaminated. But the levels they have right now seen are enough that it
11 has caused them to want to go, as Joe was saying, to the next step and do these other biological
12 assays to make the determination. So, if they are not contaminated, I think there is a potential
13 they would either stay or be moved out of the way. Some of these physically may be in the way
14 of the restoration activity, and so we may be moving them for those reasons, too.

15
16 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: That would be good.

17
18 Mr. Del Callaway: Who is "they" now? Because I would like to know who's the driving force
19 on getting it removed or not getting it removed.

20
21 Ms. Elaine Anderegg: The "they" I am referring to are the ecological risk assessors,
22 which represent Fish and Wildlife, Fish and Game, representing the state and EPA.

23
24 Mr. Del Callaway: OK

25
26 Ms. Elaine Anderegg: I'm going to talk to them Monday about the concerns that the
27 RPMs, this group today, had and see if we can all understand why we're talking about doing that

1 and then what it would take to accomplish that. It's just that it came up at our meeting with them
2 last time that they said giving these levels and given another rainy season coming, you know we
3 think it would be a good idea to move that.

4
5 Mr. Del Callaway: OK.

6
7 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: OK concerning the flooding, I know it has been proposed in the
8 past to put a flood control canal through there — that area. I know part of their flood control
9 project was to leave a certain amount of water going down through the old channels in the
10 summertime. Did they give you any idea of what this flood easement would entail? Is it still a
11 flood control channel? They just don't know, or what?

12
13 Mr. Paul Brunner: Well, they were clear that they hadn't laid out their final plan. What they
14 did share with us, they asked for a 200-foot swath, or an area, to try to get it through the area with
15 as little impact as possible. Their exact corridor that they're talking about, Chuck, they didn't
16 have. But they did share that one of the ideas they're looking at is to have a small channel that
17 handles certain flows, like peak flows, that would go and they would use — their current thought
18 would be use the existing channels as much as possible — carry the flow for most rain water. But
19 for the really heavy peak flow to have some type of overflow channel. It wouldn't be a massive
20 size, but some way to try and take the surge. They didn't come up with a definite plan. But that's
21 what they were trying to talk about to do — to have as minimal impact as possible.

22
23 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: My main concern would be, I think you have the same concern,
24 just if there's enough water there to continue nurturing the plants that you're going to be
25 restoring.

26
27 Mr. Paul Brunner: Well, that's true. And we did talk about that. As to the aspect of
28

1 maintaining that balance on it, that was part of the equation that they need to satisfy.

2
3 It was clear from our vantage point, our documentation that the Air Force will produce for the
4 West Area will not be geared to answer the flood control issues. I made it very clear to them that
5 we will not try to answer the flood control problems. That full analysis on how that's going to
6 work is that we could go through and perhaps acknowledge in a conservation easement if Fish
7 and Wildlife would say OK, that they would consider that. But they would have to deal with that
8 and all of the various public notices, and how to deal with that on their own. Our documentation
9 would not try to deal with it in the future. But you're right, I do have some very similar concerns
10 that you have shared before about what's going on.

11
12 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Is that 200-foot swath including both creeks, or is that down both
13 channels?

14
15 Mr. Paul Brunner: No, for the Magpie Creek area they were talking the 200-foot area; for the
16 Don Julio area they were talking something less than that; I think it was a 100- or 150-foot in that
17 area. Don Julio, they did not necessarily see for the length of the area having to do anything,
18 really. They were just going to leave it natural with a little cross-connection upstream, perhaps to
19 connect the flows into the Magpie Creek channel, that they might propose. And that was the
20 extent that they had. They didn't really have any drawings; they just talked conceptually with us
21 with what they were proposing.

22
23 The basis of our meeting was to try to resolve their question to us from the environmental
24 assessment from last year where they asked us specifically to accommodate them on it. And our
25 Air Force response back to — well, you've got to tell us what to accommodate for us to
26 accommodate you. So they came to the table to ask for —really, the very minimal is, can you just
27 accommodate to let Fish and Wildlife acknowledge that they have the opportunity to come in to
28

1 talk — to have a future discussion? They didn't give us time frames, necessarily, when they
2 would do it. I would project, potentially after the Air Force left.

3
4 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: The other thing that I have along these lines is 200 feet, that's
5 approximately 66 yards right? That's like over half-a-football-field wide. Why do they need that
6 big a cut through there?

7
8 Mr. Paul Brunner: Well, I think what it is — not necessarily for the full channel to be that
9 way, it's the 200-foot swaths, somewhere, that they would be able to negotiate with Fish and
10 Wildlife to be able to carve in a smaller channel through and to weave it around to miss as many
11 of the areas as possible and not just be confined to a small area. It's bound to curve as they try to
12 miss the ecological areas.

13
14 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Vernal pools and so forth.

15
16 Mr. Paul Brunner: As much as possible.

17
18 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: That's why they're asking for a wider thing?

19
20 Mr. Paul Brunner: That's what they were explaining to me, yes.

21
22 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Yeah, I couldn't figure out why they wanted such a big section
23 there. OK.

24
25 Mr. Paul Brunner: OK. Good comment.

1 **NEXT RAB AGENDA TOPICS**

2
3 Mr. Del Callaway: My call, time is up. The next RAB agenda will establish at the Chair's
4 meeting. RAB topics, the training and the TAPP. Would like to see everybody attend the
5 training, if possible, and the TAPP meeting. Recap of Action Items.

6
7 Ms. Roxanne Yonn: Excuse me, Del, before we do that I think we need to ask if there's any
8 public comment.

9
10 Mr. Del Callaway: Well, yes, we can, but they all EM.

11
12 Ms. Roxanne Yonn: I think for the record, it would be wise to just say that we are having public
13 comment period.

14
15 **PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD**

16
17 Mr. Del Callaway: You want to ask your folks if they want to ask you anything?

18
19 Mr. Paul Brunner: Well, they're not all my folks. But close, but they're not all. Any public
20 comments?

21
22 Mr. Del Callaway: Any last words, Elaine, before you leave?

23
24 Mr. Paul Brunner: OK.

1 **RECAP OF ACTION ITEMS**

2
3 Ms. Roxanne Yonn: If there's no public comment, for the Action Items I have not recorded any
4 Action Items for this meeting. Are there any Action Items the RAB members wish to present?
5 Then we're good.

6
7 **CLOSING REMARKS**

8
9 Mr. Del Callaway: OK. Closing Remarks. Thank you very much ladies and gentlemen for
10 coming. We got off to a rough start, but second marriages always do. Hopefully, we'll do better
11 next time.

12
13 Mr. Paul Brunner: Thank you to all of the board members.

14
15 Mr. Chuck Yarbrough: Thank you.

RAB Public Meeting Action Items

STATUS	RESPONSE PREPARED	ACTION ITEM	CHAMPION	DATE ORIGINATED	TIMEFRAME	OTHER POC	NOTES
Open		Contact Erwin Hayer to obtain his resignation as a RAB member in writing.	Sheila Guerra	April 21, 1999 RAB Meeting	ASAP		
Open	X	Invite two prospective Rab members to the next Community Relations meeting on June 16.	Merianne Briggs	April 21, 1999 RAB Meeting	ASAP		Letters of invitation to June 16 CR meeting sent.
Open		RAB Committees to announce their chairs at the July RAB meeting.	RAB Community Members	April 21, 1999 RAB Meeting	July 21, 1999 RAB meeting.		
Open		RAB community members request briefing on North Creeks Habitat.	Elaine Anderegg	March 3, 1999 RAB Meeting	April 21, 1999 RAB meeting.		The Air Force does not consider the North Creeks area a high value habitat. This is an ongoing issue with negotiations continuing with the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service and the Sacramento County Local Reuse Authority.
Open	X	Update the RAB on transition plans from EM to AFBCA at April RAB meeting	Paul Brunner	February 10, 1999, Chair Meeting	April 21, 1999		Briefed at April 21, 1999 RAB meeting. Community members asked for action item to remain open for updates.
Open		Invite representative from U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to participate in RAB training 1999. Subject biological opinion.	Merianne Briggs	December 2, 1998	After biological opinion is published.		Training will occur when biological opinion is published. Timeframe yet to be determined.

RAB Public Meeting Action Items

STATUS	RESPONSE PREPARED	ACTION ITEM	CHAMPION	DATE ORIGINATED	TIMEFRAME	OTHER POC	NOTES
Open	X	Update RAB fact sheet on the Web site.	Merianne Briggs	September 2, 1994	ASAP		Rewrite was presented to Community Relations Committee on March 17 for comment. Committee requested until next CR meeting on June 16, 1999 to respond with comments.
Open		Discuss need for an Alternate RAB Membership Application, as mentioned in the bylaws.	Sheila Guerra		September 16, 1998 Community Relations Committee Meeting		Draft prepared by RAB members and will be presented at next Community Relations Committee meeting. Not available at March 17, 1999 CRC meeting. Committee requested this action be held over until June 16, 1999 CRC meeting.
Open	X	Assist Imogene Zander and the Piercy's obtain base passes.	Merianne Briggs	July 15, 1998	ASAP		Must make appointment with Ms. Briggs to obtain pass that is valid for one year. Since last meeting RAB members listed have not made appointment.
Closed		Set up a meeting with Rebecca Garrison on the Rideshare Program in the near future.	Sheila Guerra	June 3, 1998	Not specified		

CLEANUP STATUS

1. POLICIES: None

2. DOCUMENT STATUS REPORT: See attached

3. PROJECTS IN THE FIELD:

a) GW Phase II Project. GWTP and IC 29 pre-treatment systems are undergoing startup testing. Estimated startup date for both systems is **7 June 99**.

b) On going IWL lateral video assessment. Totals inspected to date are **36,900 feet** and **2,404 drains**. The total number of feet is estimated at **39,000**, and the total number of drains is estimated at **2772**. This project is approximately **91%** complete with an estimated completion date of **30 Jun 99**.

c) Industrial Wastewater trunk line inspection. **44,980 feet completed** to date. The estimated total for this project was originally **39,900 linear feet**. Additional lines have been found. Inspection and assessment is continuing. Estimated completion **1 Sep 99**.

d) On going petroleum, oils, and lubricants (POL) pipeline testing. Totals since the first of the year are **26,297 feet** pressure tested and **3,729 feet** removed. The estimated total for all POL lines is **32,000 ft**. An additional **1700'** of pipe was found and requires testing, and **4,492'** requires grouting. This project is **94%** complete. Estimated completion **30 Sep 99**.

e) RI Fieldwork (OU E-H Phase II, non-VOC, SVE, Radiation Background) started on **8 Sep 98**.

⇒ Data Gaps I (non-VOC and Radiation)

⇒ Trenching 100% complete (46 out of 46 trenches)

⇒ Radiation scans 100% complete (56 out of 56 scans)

⇒ Soil borings 100% complete (329 out of 329 borings)

⇒ Data Gaps II (non-VOC and SVE)

⇒ Soil borings 100% complete (699 out of 699 borings)

⇒ OU E-H Phase II (non-VOC and SVE)

⇒ Soil borings 100% complete (218 out of 218 borings)

⇒ SVE Well Installation

⇒ Soil borings 100% complete (62 out of 62 borings)

⇒ Data Gaps III (shallow soil gas)

⇒ Soil borings 100% complete (263 out of 263 borings)

f) GWTP and IC29 Dual Phase undergoing GWOU Phase II modifications. **Both systems scheduled to startup on 7 June**.

g) **9 of 10 SVE Systems (12 sites) operational. IC 35 operational 1 June. Site S is down for repair; estimated restart 15 June.**

4. REMEDIAL PROJECT MANAGERS (RPMs), DECISIONS/ISSUES/ITEMS TO BE RESOLVED:

⇒ Eco Risk Assessment

⇒ SVE EE/CA Technical Issues

⇒ MNRC Transfer

5. WEST AREA UPDATE

⇒ Establish firebreaks ongoing, estimated completion is **11 Jun**

⇒ Basewide wetland delineation ongoing, Report due **27 Aug**

⇒ Fire Training Area: demolition of old "hardbacks" last week

⇒ Camp Kohler vernal pool delineation signs completed **28 May**

6. PROGRAM EXECUTION:

Projects awarded from 15 Apr 99 - 31 May 99 (FY99 BRAC Program):

Project #	Title	Contractor
PRJY 98-7222	Mod to VOC FS	CH2M Hill
PRJY 99-7221	Mod to Data Gaps 3 (RI)	Radian
PRJY 99-7254	OU B1 O&M Services	URSG-OHM
Total Project Value (15 Apr 99 - 31 May 99)		\$293,860

STATUS, FY99 BRAC FUNDING PROGRAM:

Total Amount of Funds Obligated, 1 Oct 98 - 31 May 99

\$13,618,322

Projects to award, FY99 BRAC for 1 June 99 - 15 July 99

Project #	Title	Contractor
PRJY 99-6802	Radiological Closure D&D	
PRJY 99-6802	Radiological Closure Field Support	
PRJY 99-6902	Mod to SSSEBS	
PRJY 99-7107	TAPP	
PRJY 99-7221	Mod to Data gaps 3 (RI)	
PRJY 99-7221	Mod to Data Gaps RICS (RI)	
PRJY 99-7221	Mod to Draft Creeks (RI)	
PRJY 99-7246A	Non-VOC Treatability Study	
PRJY 99-7248	Mod to Non VOC EE/CA	
Various	Restoration Information System (RIS)	
Various	Technical Support	
Various	Field Support	
Total Project Value (1 June 99 - 15 July 99)		\$5,279,234

Document Deliverable Status Report

Next 45 Days

06/01/1999 - 07/15/1999

DSR Number	OU Code	Document Title	Cat	Document Version	Days	Deadline		Extension		Completion Date	DSR X-Ref
						Date	Type	Date	Reason		
Standard Documents											
1	68-5	A	IC35 SVE-EE/CA: Startup Memorandum	R	Final	0	02/01/1999	RPM Set	06/01/1999	F014, F059, F072, F090, F122	1272
2	239-1	C	CS-10/PRL 32 Action Memo	O	Draft	0	06/01/1999	RPM Set	9/1/1999		588
3	74-4	A	IC42 SVE-EE/CA: Site-Specific Document	R	Agency Rev DF	37	05/26/1999	RPM Set	06/02/1999	F130	1140
4	72-4	A	IC41 SVE-EE/CA: Site-Specific Document	R	Agency Rev DF	37	05/26/1999	RPM Set	06/02/1999	F129	1145
5	282-3	G	PRL T-44 SVE-EE/CA: Operations and M	O	Final	53	06/04/1999	RPM Set			1358
6	38-3	A	IC27 SVE-EE/CA: O & M Manual	O	Final	53	06/04/1999	RPM Set	06/04/1999	F119	1361
7	86-4	A	SSSEBS: Bldg. 271	B	Agency Rev DF	14	06/07/1999	BCT set			1367
8	179-1	BW	Microwave Regenerable GAC Tech Memo	O	Draft	0	06/07/1999	BCT set			951
9	185-5	BW	QAPP Update (1999)	P	Final	31	06/07/1999	RPM Set			1075
10	84-4	A	SFOSL: Bldg. 271	B	Agency Rev DF	14	06/07/1999	BCT set			1373
11	221-5	GW	WIP: Passive Diffusion Membrane Sampl	S	Final	20	06/07/1999	RPM Set			1394
12	188-2	BW	RI General Framework Update	P	Agency Rev D	77	05/24/1999	RPM Set	06/08/1999	F128	976
13	236-5	C	Bldgs. 788, 783 Rad Survey	O	Draft Final	223	06/09/1999	RPM Set	06/09/1999	F118	1165
14	60-5	A	IC32 SVE-EE/CA: Site-Specific Document	R	Final	23	06/11/1999	RPM Set			1156
15	62-5	A	IC34 SVE-EE/CA: Site-Specific Document	R	Final	23	06/11/1999	RPM Set			1151
16	70-5	A	IC37 SVE-EE/CA: Site Specific Document	R	Final	23	06/11/1999	RPM Set			686
17	369-1	H	SFOSL: Nuclear Reactor	B	Draft	0	06/14/1999	BCT set			
18	354-3	H	SSSEBS: Nuclear Reactor	B	Draft Final	18	06/14/1999	BCT set			
19	368-1	BWR	Background Radionuclide Study	S	Draft	0	06/16/1999	RPM Set			
20	72-5	A	IC41 SVE-EE/CA: Site-Specific Document	R	Final	16	06/18/1999	RPM Set			1146
21	86-5	A	SSSEBS: Bldg. 271	B	Final	11	06/18/1999	BCT set			1369
22	225-9	BWV	VOC FS	S	Draft Final 3	198	04/30/1999	RPM Set	06/18/1999	F110, F126	1309
23	226-1	BWV	VOC Proposed Plan	P	Draft	0	07/15/1998	RPM Set	06/20/1999	E103, E111, E142, E60, E68, F113, F123	547
24	287-3	G	SFOSL: 1016, 1025, 1026, 1046	B	Draft Final	108	06/21/1999	BCT set	06/21/1999	F076, F104	1344
25	288-3	G	SSSEBS:1016,1025,1026,1046	B	Draft Final	108	06/21/1999	BCT set	06/21/1999	F077, F103	1339
26	204-2	BWN	EE/CA Staging Pile Tech Memo for Non	O	Agency Rev D	60	06/22/1999	RPM Set			1317
27	64-3	A	IC35 SVE-EE/CA: O & Manual	O	Final	51	06/24/1999	RPM Set			1364
28	74-5	A	IC42 SVE-EE/CA: Site-Specific Document	R	Final	23	06/25/1999	RPM Set			1141
29	84-5	A	SFOSL: Bldg. 271	B	Final	18	06/25/1999	BCT set			1374

	DSR Number	OU Code	Document Title	Cat	Document Version	Days	Deadline		Extension		Completion Date	DSR X-Ref
							Date	Type	Date	Reason		
30	369-2	H	SFOSL: Nuclear Reactor	B	Agency Rev D	11	06/25/1999	BCT set				
31	354-4	H	SSSEBS: Nuclear Reactor	B	Agency Rev DF	11	06/25/1999	BCT set				
32	36-2	A	IC25 SVE-EE/CA: Site-Specific Document	R	Agency Rev D	60	06/25/1999	RPM Set	03/16/1999	E139		1123
33	352-1	N/A	SFOSL: River Dock	B	Draft	0	06/28/1999	BCT set	06/28/1999	F117		1380
34	353-1	N/A	SSSEBS: River Dock	B	Draft	0	06/28/1999	BCT set	06/28/1999	F078, F116		1375
35	76-2	A	IC43 SVE-EE/CA: Site-Specific Document	R	Agency Rev D	64	06/29/1999	RPM Set	06/29/1999	E141		1133
36	308-3	GW	RA - II O&M Manual	P	Final	30	06/29/1999	RPM Set				277
37	336-3	GW	Well Abandonment Summary Memorandum	P	Final	0	06/30/1999	IAG Set				773
38	160-5	BW	Five Year Review (First)	P	Final	147	03/05/1999	IAG Set	06/30/1999	F024, F084, F121, F132		474
39	40-5	A	IC27 SVE-EE/CA: Removal Action Report	R	Final	0	04/01/1999	RPM Set	07/01/1999	F056		1274
40	239-2	C	CS-10/PRL 32 Action Memo	O	Agency Rev D	30	07/01/1999	RPM Set	10/1/1999			589
41	283-3	G	PRL-T44 SVE-EE/CA: Removal Action R	R	Final	0	02/01/1999	RPM Set	07/01/1999	F025, F058		1273
42	198-3	BW	VZMS 4th Semi-Annual Progress Report	O	Final	0	07/01/1999	RPM Set				771
43	288-4	G	SSSEBS: 1016, 1025, 1026, 1046	B	Agency Review DF	11	07/02/1999	BCT set				1340
44	287-4	G	SFOSL: 1016, 1025, 1026, 1046	B	Agency Rev DF	11	07/02/1999	BCT set				1345
45	359-1	BW	SSSEBS: Group 1 Facilities	B	Draft	0	07/02/1999	BCT set				
46	240-5	C	CS-10/PRL-32 EE/CA	O	Draft Final	60	07/02/1999	RPM Set	07/02/1999	E109, F035		538
47	116-2	B	PRL S-13 SVE-EE/CA: Site-Specific Document	R	Agency Rev D	60	07/02/1999	RPM Set	04/28/1999	E127		1102
48	26-3	A	Dudley Loop/Northwest Taxiway EE/CA	O	Draft 2	0	04/01/1999	RPM Set	07/02/1999	E23, E35, E78, F089		744
49	362-1	BW	SFOSL: Group 1 Facilities	B	Draft	0	07/02/1999	BCT set				
50	119-2	B	SSA-2 SVE-EE/CA: Site-Specific Document	R	Agency Rev D	60	07/02/1999	RPM Set	04/28/1999	E126		1097
51	111-2	B	IC5 SVE-EE/CA: Site-Specific Document	R	Agency Rev D	60	07/02/1999	RPM Set	07/02/1999	E129		1112
52	179-2	BW	Microwave Regenerable GAC Tech Memo	O	Agency Rev D	30	07/07/1999	RPM Set				952
53	87-3	A/B	Bldgs. 623, 625, & 650 Rad Survey Report	O	Draft Final	45	07/08/1999	RPM Set				1387
54	236-6	C	Bldgs. 788, 783 Rad Survey	O	Agency Rev DF	29	07/08/1999	RPM Set				1166
55	354-5	H	SSSEBS: Nuclear Reactor	B	Final	14	07/09/1999	BCT set				
56	255-2	C	PRL 66 SVE-EE/CA: Site-Specific Document	R	Agency Rev D	61	07/10/1999	RPM Set				1352
57	369-3	H	SFOSL: Nuclear Reactor	B	Draft Final	17	07/12/1999	BCT set				
58	352-2	N/A	SFOSL: River Dock	B	Agency Rev D	14	07/12/1999	BCT set				1381
59	353-2	N/A	SSSEBS: River Dock	B	Agency Rev D	14	07/12/1999	BCT set				1376
60	325-1	GW	RD - II BW18 DeCom Rpt.	P	Draft	0	05/17/1996	IAG Set	07/15/1999	C03, C35, F060		267

Document Deliverable Status Report

Previous 45 Days

04/15/1999 - 05/31/1999

DSR Number	OU Code	Document Title	Cat	Document Version	Days	Deadline		Extension		Completion Date	DSR X-Ref
						Date	Type	Date	Reason		
Standard Documents											
85-5	A	SSSEBS NATS	O	Final	15	04/16/1999	BCT set			04/21/1999	1260
70-3	A	IC37 SVE-EE/CA: Site Specific Document	R	Draft Final	49	03/31/1999	RPM Set	04/19/1999	E138, F047, F091	04/19/1999	684
143-5	BW	Community Relations Plan (CRP) Update	P	Final	31	04/19/1999	RPM Set			04/19/1999	780
60-3	A	IC32 SVE-EE/CA: Site-Specific Document	R	Draft Final	80	03/01/1999	RPM Set	04/19/1999	F022, F045, F093	04/19/1999	1154
221-2	GW	WIP: Passive Diffusion Membrane Sampling	S	Agency Rev D	30	04/22/1999	RPM Set			04/27/1999	1391
356-2	BWN	Non-VOC Bench-Scale Soil Treatment Work	S	Agency Rev D	31	04/23/1999	RPM Set			04/27/1999	
204-1	BWN	EE/CA Staging Pile Tech Memo for Non	O	Draft	0	01/15/1999	RPM Set	04/23/1999	F005, F038, F088	04/23/1999	1316
74-3	A	IC42 SVE-EE/CA: Site-Specific Document	R	Draft Final	38	04/26/1999	RPM Set	04/26/1999	F075	04/26/1999	1139
76-1	A	IC43 SVE-EE/CA: Site-Specific Document	R	Draft	0	12/14/1998	RPM Set	04/26/1999	E146, E84, E85, F011, F020, F050	04/26/1999	1132
72-3	A	IC41 SVE-EE/CA: Site-Specific Document	R	Draft Final	66	03/22/1999	RPM Set	04/26/1999	F048, F101	04/26/1999	1144
86-2	A	SSSEBS: Bldg. 271	B	Agency Rev D	14	04/26/1999	BCT set			04/26/1999	1366
36-1	A	IC25 SVE-EE/CA: Site-Specific Document	R	Draft	0	12/21/1998	RPM Set	04/26/1999	E145, E82, F009, F027, F044	04/27/1999	1122
84-2	A	SFOSL: Bldg. 271	B	Agency Rev D	14	04/26/1999	BCT set			04/26/1999	1371
308-1	GW	RA - II O&M Manual	P	Draft	0	01/15/1999	IAG Set	04/30/1999	F003	04/30/1999	275
62-3	A	IC34 SVE-EE/CA: Site-Specific Document	R	Draft Final	30	04/30/1999	RPM Set	04/19/1999	F046, F092	04/19/1999	1149
116-1	B	PRL S-13 SVE-EE/CA: Site-Specific Document	R	Draft	0	01/25/1999	RPM Set	05/03/1999	E97, F029, F052	05/03/1999	1101
119-1	B	SSA-2 SVE-EE/CA: Site-Specific Document	R	Draft	0	02/01/1999	RPM Set	05/03/1999	E96, F015, F030, F053	05/03/1999	1096
111-1	B	IC5 SVE-EE/CA: Site-Specific Document	R	Draft	0	01/11/1999	RPM Set	05/03/1999	E160, E95, F021, F051	05/03/1999	1111
240-4	C	CS-10/PRL-32 EE/CA	O	Agency Rev D2	62	05/03/1999	RPM Set			05/03/1999	1211
221-3	GW	WIP: Passive Diffusion Membrane Sampling	S	Draft Final	12	04/29/1999	RPM Set	05/04/1999	F115	05/05/1999	1392
64-2	A	IC35 SVE-EE/CA: O & Manual	O	Agency Rev D	33	05/04/1999	RPM Set			05/04/1999	1363
354-1	H	SSSEBS: Nuclear Reactor	B	Draft	0	04/26/1999	BCT set	05/05/1999	F108	05/05/1999	
185-4	BW	QAPP Update (1999)	P	Agency Rev DF	30	05/07/1999	RPM Set			05/07/1999	1074
255-1	C	PRL 66 SVE-EE/CA: Site-Specific Document	R	Draft	0	03/10/1999	RPM Set	05/10/1999	F031, F054	05/10/1999	1351
221-4	GW	WIP: Passive Diffusion Membrane Sampling	S	Agency Rev DF	14	05/18/1999	RPM Set			05/18/1999	1393
49-5	A	IC30 SVE-EE/CA: Action Memorandum	R	Final	0	02/01/1999	RPM Set	05/18/1999	E149, F061	05/17/1999	1175
70-4	A	IC37 SVE-EE/CA: Site Specific Document	R	Agency Rev DF	30	05/19/1999	RPM Set			05/19/1999	685
62-4	A	IC34 SVE-EE/CA: Site-Specific Document	R	Agency Rev DF	19	05/19/1999	RPM Set			05/19/1999	1150
60-4	A	IC32 SVE-EE/CA: Site-Specific Document	R	Agency Rev DF	30	05/19/1999	RPM Set			05/19/1999	1155

DSR Number	OU Code	Document Title	Cat	Document Version	Days	Deadline		Extension		Completion Date	DSR X-Ref	
						Date	Type	Date	Reason			
30	84-3	A	SFOSL: Bldg. 271	B	Draft Final	28	05/24/1999	BCT set			5/24/99	1372
31	87-2	A/B	Bldgs. 623, 625, & 650 Rad Survey Report	O	Agency Rev D	60	05/24/1999	RPM Set				1386
32	86-3	A	SSSEBS: Bldg. 271	B	Draft Final	28	05/24/1999	BCT set			5/24/99	1368
33	354-2	H	SSSEBS: Nuclear Reactor	B	Agency Rev D	22	05/27/1999	BCT set			05/28/1999	
34	83-5	A	SFOSL NATS	B	Final	57	05/28/1999	BCT set			05/17/1999	1265
35	356-3	BWN	Non-VOC Bench-Scale Soil Treatment Wo	S	Final	35	05/28/1999	RPM Set			5/28/99	
36	224-3	BWR	USRADS Workplan	O	Final	326	02/12/1999	RPM Set	05/30/1999	F039, F081	05/21/1999	630
37	308-2	GW	RA - II O&M Manual	P	Agency Review D	30	05/30/1999	RPM Set				276

Prioritization of Reuse Efforts

Efforts Actively Being Worked by EM
Support Documents being Prepared

EFFORT	BLDG.	SSSEBS*	AF EIAP COMPLT	FOSL APPRVL	LEASE** COMPLT	CONVEY MECH.	NEED*** DATE	PROCESS POINT	SHOW**** STOPPER
NATS	North Area Transfer Station and Former Tank Farm 8	Complete	YES	Signed	AF Signed	EDC	Spring 99	Step 3.7.1	G
Vacated Facilities ready for LRA	1016, 1020, 1021, 1025, 1026, 1027, 1028, 1046, 1048, 1049, 1052	Spring 99	YES	Summer 99	Summer 99	EDC	Summer 99	Step 2.2.5	G
BSC	271	Spring 99	YES	Summer 99	Summer 99	EDC	Summer 99	Step 2.2.5	G
River Dock	River Dock	Summer 99	YES	Summer 99	Summer 99	EDC	Summer 99	Step 2.1.2	Y
McClellan Nuclear Radiation Center	258	Spring 99	YES	Summer 99	Fall 99	Special Legislation	Fall 99	Step 2.2.4	G
SSSEBS Package Group 1	Approx. 80 Facilities	Summer 99	YES	Fall 99	Fall 99	EDC	Fall 99	Step 2.1.2	Y
SSSEBS Package Group 2	Approx. 80 Facilities	Fall 99	YES	Winter 00	Winter 00	EDC	Winter 00	Step 2.1.2	Y

Future Efforts

EFFORT	BLDG.	SSSEBS*	AF EIAP COMPLT	FOSL APPRVL	LEASE** COMPLT	CONVEY MECH.	NEED*** DATE	PROCESS POINT	SHOW**** STOPPER
SSSEBS Package Group 3	Approx. 100 Facilities	Winter 00	YES	Spring 00	Spring 00	EDC	Spring 00	Step 2.2.1	
SSSEBS Package Group 4	Approx. 100 Facilities and Airfield	Winter 00	YES	Spring 00	Spring 00	EDC	Spring 00	Step 2.2.1	
SSSEBS Package Group 5	Approx. 80 Facilities	Spring 00	YES	Summer 00	Summer 00	EDC	Summer 00	Step 2.2.1	

EFFORT	BLDG.	SSSEBS*	AF EIAP COMPLT	FOSL APPRVL	LEASE** COMPLT	CONVEY MECH.	NEED*** DATE	PROCESS POINT	SHOW**** STOPPER
SSSEBS Package Group 6	Approx. 397 Facilities, Including Capehart	Summer 00	YES	Winter 01	Winter 01	EDC	Winter 01	Step 2.2.1	
SSSEBS Package Group 7	Approx. 171 Facilities	Fall 00	YES	Winter 01	Winter 01	EDC	Winter 01	Step 2.2.1	
SSSEBS Package Group 8	Approx. 61 Facilities	Fall 00	YES	Spring 01	Spring 01	EDC	Spring 01	Step 2.2.1	

* Site Specific Supplemental Environmental Baseline Surveys (SSSEBSs) will be prepared to document current environmental conditions. Supplemental FOSLs (Findings of Suitability to Lease) will be prepared to augment the SSSEBS and to identify environmental restrictions.

** May entertain Right of Entry (ROE) or License for some efforts to allow set up of operations before Lease.

*** Need date is for completion of lease.

**** G = No EM Issue, Y = EM Issue Required to be Worked, R = Unresolved EM Issue Impacting Schedule

Workload Acronyms: NATS – North Area Transfer Station, BSC – Boeing Service Company.