

**Mather Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Meeting
Draft Summary Meeting Minutes
Mather, California
11 March 2009**

Time: 6:00 PM

Place: Air Force Real Property Agency (AFRPA) Conference Room
10503 Armstrong Avenue
Mather, CA 95655

RAB Members

Name	Affiliation
Rick Solander	AFRPA Program Manager
Sandra Lunceford	RAB Community Co-Chair
Jerald Drobesh	RAB Member
Bob McGarvey	RAB member
Arne Sampe	RAB Member

Other Attendees Present

Name	Affiliation
Stanley Pehl	Air Force Center for Environmental Excellence
Todd Daniels	MWH
Brian Sytsma	CH2M Hill
Steve Hamilton	VA Hospital
Bill Hughes	AFRPA Contractor

1. WELCOME

Mr. Solander welcomed everyone to the meeting. Attendees introduced themselves. A sign-in sheet was circulated (Attachment 1). The meeting agenda was distributed (Attachment 2).

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Comments were requested on the March 2009 RAB meeting minutes. Ms. Lunceford only had an opportunity to review the minutes until two weeks ago. Other RAB members received the minutes previously but did not review the minutes. Ms. Lunceford made the point that it is important for the RAB members to receive minutes in a timely fashion. Ms. Lunceford also

pointed out the importance of reminder calls to the RAB members. Mr. McGarvey recommended approval of the minutes and Ms. Lunceford agreed, so the minutes were approved.

3. FIELD UPDATE

Mr. Solander provided an outline of the meeting and topics scheduled to be discussed.

Mr. Hughes provided a briefing using a PowerPoint presentation. Copies of the presentation slides are included as Attachment 3. Information directly included in the slides was not repeated in these minutes.

Mr. McGarvey asked that if excavated soil that is removed from Mather and shipped out of state, such as Nevada, if that is a concern due to lead. Mr. Hughes said the facility would have to be licensed for CERCLA waste. The recent soil that was excavated at 10C68 for shallow soil gas cleanup was shipping in state for disposal. Ms. Lunceford asked the cause of the lead at the site, if MMRP was a concern there. Mr. Hughes said it was most likely from lead-based paint and burning activities, not MMRP.

Ms. Lunceford asked what would happen if the small mammal survey indicated a concern. Mr. Hughes said that there is nothing specific outlined in the ROD, but the cleanup team of the Air Force and regulators would discuss options, which could include excavation if there is an elevated concern or further monitoring. The ROD requires a minimum of two years worth of sampling.

4. PROPERTY TRANSFER STATUS UPDATE

Mr. Solander stated that it is the Air Force's goal to transfer all remaining property by the end of 2010. To accomplish this, the Air Force is continuing to work with the LRA, which is Sacramento County, and requires working through Finding of Suitability to Transfer (FOST) documents.

For Parcel M, the FOST is basically ready and waiting on the shelf. However, the County is looking at something called reparcelization, which is changing the disposal mechanism for transfer of the property, changing to an Economic Development Conveyance (EDC) from a Public Benefit Conveyance (PBC). The County owes the Air Force an application for an EDC, which requires demonstration of the creation of jobs. This would be a good thing for the community if it happens. The Air Force is hopeful to receive that application from the County soon and transfer Parcel M by the end of the year.

Ms. Lunceford asked if the EDC application needs to show an improvement in the number of jobs created. Mr. Hughes said a key is to demonstrate jobs created on site, which helps local tax revenues and the local economy. Mr. McGarvey added that the Mather Community Campus on

this parcel has been very successful, but the recent economic recession and County budget deficit could have a negative impact on the program.

Mr. Solander and Mr. Hughes explained that the County would be able to develop the land they received under an EDC, whereas they would not be able to under a PBC. Ms. Lunceford asked who was the lead for the County in this application. Mr. Solander said Mr. Clark Whitten is the County's lead.

Mr. Solander explained the County is looking to find a partner to help with redevelopment efforts. Ms. Lunceford asked if McCuen Properties was still working at Mather. Mr. Hughes said their contract was up a few years ago. Mr. Solander said that the County believes having a master development working with them would be a good thing.

Mr. Solander said the "G" Parcels, which includes G1, G2, G3, currently are slated to be transferred through a PBC, but the County wants to change to an EDC for Parcel G3. Parcels G1 and G2 will remain as going to the County through the National Parks Service as a conservation conveyance due to sensitive habitat and vernal pools. Parcel G3 is an area the County would like to develop as a "University Village", as an EDC, with various universities being discussed for this parcel.

Mr. McGarvey added that there are plans to build four rugby areas, which would be a great addition to the community. Mr. Solander added that the Air Force is working with the County on this area since it is close to sensitive habitat, but this should be able to be worked through to minimize impact.

Mr. Solander explained that the "A" Parcels were originally slated to be transferred through the airport PBC, but the County has recognized it is no all airport use. Parcel A2 will become a conservation conveyance, likely with educational nature trails being built. Parcels A1 and A3 will remain part of the airport PBC. The most important document to facilitate the transfer of these parcels is the Biological Opinion with the US Dept of Fish and Wildlife. Mather is one of the prime areas left in Sacramento County that has significant areas of with sensitive habitat. Ms. Lunceford asked if other people or organizations can buy some of the land for habitat mitigation. Mr. Solander said this can be happen, only Sacramento County will be able to use this area as mitigation.

Mr. Drobesh asked if it would be possible to add trees to the nature trails. Mr. Solander said he would mention this to Mr. Whitten, and also encouraged him to also contact the County and Mr. Whitten about this.

Mr. McGarvey stated the City and County are working close together on the expansion of Zinfandel Road that goes through Mather, and these property transfer updates are important.

Ms. Lunceford asked for clarification about Parcel A1. Mr. Solander explained this will remain a PBC, with the federal sponsor being the FAA. This will be one of the last parcels transferred since it will have to be an "Early" transfer that needs to be approved by the Governor. Draft documents will be ready later this year.

5. GROUNDWATER CLEANUP UPDATE

Mr. Hughes provided an update using PowerPoint slides (Attachement 3).

Mr. Hughes said a pump test was conducted at Site 7 to see if the water was a inhibitor to the SVE cleanup. The perched water test data was not supportive of doing a longer-term dewatering effort. The water table will continue to be monitored to see if future action needs to be taken.

Mr. Hughes said AC&W is about 5 to 7 years away from being cleaned up. Ms. Lunceford asked what the original estimate was, and Mr. Hughes said originally it was estimated to be cleaned up in 15 years.

Mr. Drobesh asked if the Boeing/Aerojet perchlorate plume is mixing with any of the Air Force's plumes. Mr. Hughes said they have several extraction wells in the area, including on Mather. Most of the perchlorate contamination is much deeper (300-500 ft) than the Air Force's plumes and they do not co-mingle. There is a shallow arm that passes near the Air Force's Northeast plume, but they do not co-mingle either. Mr. Drobesh asked how often the water was tested for perchlorate near the housing area. Mr. Hughes said the County and Aerojet does routine testing on a quarterly basis.

Mr. Sampe asked if there barriers or impediments between the plumes that may help prevent them from co-mingling. Mr. Hughes said there are various layers of sands, silts, and clays that may help prevent this in some areas.

Ms. Lunceford asked how much more sampling and data is required before Operating Properly and Successfully (OPS) determination can be made. Mr. Hughes said the draft document is in regulator hands right now, which basically states the Air Force believes the treatment system is in place. Mr. Solander added that if the RAB would like to view this document, they are welcome to take a look at it. Mr. Hughes agreed to send the draft document to Ms. Lunceford.

6. MMRP

Mr. Solander provided an update on the MMRP program using the slides in Attachment 3. Only information not provided in the presentation is included in these minutes.

Mr. Solander pointed out that the survey at Mather Lake has confirmed there was likely a practice grenade range at Mather Lake, but if it was used, it was used sparingly and most of it is currently under water. Since the Air Force is not going to survey the bottom of the lake, language in the deed will indicate that there could be practice grenades at the bottom of the lake, as a notification. Mr. Drobesh asked what liability will be transferred to the County with the Lake related to the practice grenades. Mr. Solander said the Air Force will still be liable to

go back and clean something up if found later, that is the case for any property transferred, even if property is viewed as being pristine at the time of transfer.

7. KEY DOCUMENTS

The key document list is included in Mr. Hughes PowerPoint slides located in Attachment 3.

Ms. Lunceford if the Contingency Plan needed to be completely redone. Mr. Hughes said it would only be some minor adjustments required, mostly some figures being updated. Mr. Solander a few minor things that will be updated, but essentially it will state that if contamination exceeds MCLs the Air Force will go back and take care of it.

Ms. Lunceford asked how Mather compares to other California bases as it relates to the Contingency Plan. Mr. Hughes said that Mather is slightly less stringent than McClellan, but more stringent than Aerojet, for example. Mr. Solander said that each installation has its own discussions and agreements, but the Central Valley Water Board tends to be more stringent than others water boards in the State.

8. ACTION ITEMS

Mr. Hughes went over action items from previous RAB meetings. These are included in Attachment 3.

9. TOPICS FOR FUTURE RAB MEETING

Continuing potential topics for future meetings include:

- Cal-American response to termination of treatment
- OPS status
- OT-69
- Airport PBC and Early Transfer
- Capture Zone Analysis
- MMRP clearance update

10. FUTURE MEETING DATES

The next RAB meeting was tentatively scheduled for Wednesday, 10 June 2009. Mr. McGarvey appears to have a conflict on this date, but would double-check his calendar.

11. PUBLIC COMMENTS AND ROUND THE TABLE COMMENTS

Mr. Drobesh asked if there are requirements the Air Force must follow when they no longer need groundwater wells. Mr. Hughes explained Sacramento County has an ordinance that describes procedures that must be followed, but essentially they are filled with grout and then dug out five or six feet below surface and backfilled with native surface. Mr. Drobesh asked if we've done this yet at Mather. Mr. Hughes said the Air Force has done this about 60 times already.

Ms. Lunceford stated she received a letter on March 9 for a six-month notification of termination of treatment of a Cal-American supply well. Mr. Hughes explained this is a requirement to give the purveyor enough time to respond, and to make sure nothing changes. Ms. Lunceford asked if Cal-American has responded yet. Mr. Hughes said there has not been a response as of yet.

Ms. Lunceford asked if monitoring is reduced once OPS determination has been made. Mr. Hughes said monitoring is reduced as necessary. It was agreed this would be a topic at a future meeting.

11. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting was adjourned.