

**Mather Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Meeting  
Summary Meeting Minutes  
20 January 2010**

**Time:** 6:00 PM

**Place:** Days Inn, Mather Room  
3240 Mather Field Road  
Rancho Cordova, CA 95670

**RAB Members**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>
Doug Fortun	AFRPA Remedial Project Manager representing AF Co-Chair
Sandra Lunceford	RAB Community Co-Chair
Bob McGarvey	RAB Member
Arne Sampe	RAB Member
Jerry Drobesh	RAB Member

**Other Attendees Present**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>
Bill Hughes	ASE (AFRPA Contractor)
Linda Geissing	AFRPA Western Region Public Affairs Representative
George Waegell	Rancher south of Mather (Morrison Creek Inc)
Stanley Pehl	Air Force Center for Engineering and the Environment (AFCEE)
Brian Sytsma	AFRPA Contractor
Franklin Mark	Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC)
Conny Mitterhofer	Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley
Billie Barker	Community Member (residing on Mather)
Paul LeCheminant	TetraTech (AFRPA Contractor)
Viola Cooper	Community Involvement Coordinator for U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA)

**1. WELCOME**

Ms. Lunceford 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**

Mr. Fortun asked whether the meeting minutes for the last meeting could be approved. Ms. Lunceford did not think she had any comments. The meeting minutes for the 19 August 2009 meeting were adopted as final, with no changes necessary.

## **3. UPDATE ON REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS**

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 is not repeated in these minutes.

The Air Force has constructed a surface water outfall structure as an alternative means to discharge treated groundwater from the Groundwater Treatment Plant to the West Ditch. This new discharge alternative was tested in September. The West Ditch collects stormwater from the area and eventually discharges into Morrison Creek, which discharges into the Sacramento River. The volume of the discharge would start out low and eventually be at approximately 2,000 gallons per minute (gpm). Mr. Hughes stated that the most significant environmental concern with this discharge is that it could create or enhance a wet corridor to Elk Grove which could allow the Giant Garter Snake to migrate up the drainage channel, preventing or hindering development. The Morrison Creek channel upstream of Mather is mostly natural; on Mather, some of the channels are engineered; and the creek bed returns to natural channel conditions downstream of Mather where it crosses Jackson Highway near Bradshaw Road.

Ms. Lunceford asked Mr. Waegell if he knew of any individuals that would be concerned with this additional discharge into the creek. Mr. Waegell responded that the main concern are tules and a plugged creek. Mr. Hughes indicated that Sacramento Area Sewer District had been out inspecting the channels. Ms. Lunceford asked Ms. Barker to direct any concerned residents to Mr. Hughes or Mr. Fortun. Ms. Barker asked whether children are safe wading in Morrison Creek. Mr. Hughes assured here that discharge to the West Ditch would enter Morrison Creek downstream from the housing area and so would not affect the creek there. Mr. Hughes pointed out that treated water has been discharged to Mather Lake for the past 10 years, maintaining the seasonal nature to flows in the channel going through the housing area. The amount to be discharged in the future at the West Ditch (up to 2000 gallons per minute) sounds like a lot but is minimal when compared to flows from a typical storm (hundreds of thousands of gallons per minute).

During the discussion of the performance-based contract, Ms. Mitterhofer asked for clarification on the timing for the award of this new type of contract. Mr. Hughes indicated that proposals are due at the end of January, with the new contract being awarded in March – the transition to the new contractor would occur in the March/April timeframe, with some overlap of current and future contractor. Ms. Barker asked whether the most desirable thing was to close sites and Mr. Hughes responded that ‘to close sites’ means ‘to completely clean up sites’, but it is also possible to close sites with restrictions. He said that ideally, with the choice between restrictions and no restrictions, unencumbered land is preferred but this is also a question of balancing taxpayer

costs between the cost of more cleanup and the cost of implementing and monitoring land-use restrictions.

During the discussion of the groundwater cleanup, Ms. Lunceford asked what the trichloroethene (TCE) and tetrachloroethene (PCE) concentrations are at the Site 7 Plant. Mr. Hughes responded that the concentrations are about 20 parts per billion (ppb) TCE and 6-8 ppb PCE. The Aircraft Control and Warning (AC&W) plume is of similar size, started out at much higher concentrations but the treatment system has operated for about 15 years and is expected to operate for another 5 years. The Site 7 Plume has only operated for only about 4-5 years, so it is a little early to make accurate predictions.

During the discussion of the marsh area at Site 7, Ms. Lunceford asked whether the wells are safe and Mr. Hughes responded that they are. Only one well was impacted directly and was about 6 inches under water. However, the well has a rubber expansion cap and water should not get into the well. Mr. Hughes stated that potential infiltration of water from the marsh could slightly alter the groundwater flow by causing a mound at the water table which will cause flow away from the marsh in all directions as the mound tries to flatten out. This flow is expected to cause the plume margin to shift slightly to the east, which could help containment - the Air Force will continue to monitor the groundwater gradient and impacts on plume movement.

Ms. Lunceford stated that the extent of the Southwest Lobe of the Main Base/SAC Area Plume has not been defined. Mr. Hughes confirmed that the plume boundary had not been defined to the detection limit and that the nearest extraction well is located on-base. A portion of the plume is currently not under hydraulic control or captured. There is a concern for the series of private wells located downgradient of the plume, particularly the Muddex well which supplies the drinking water for the administrative building. All of these wells are being monitored for now. Mr. Hughes clarified that the depth to the plume is about 130 feet below ground surface.

Institutional Controls – Mr. Hughes clarified that if contamination is found after the transfer, the Air Force remains liable for the cleanup (if the contamination was caused by the Air Force). The first annual report of institutional control compliance will focus on the completed Records of Decision (RODs) and Explanation of Significant Difference documents (ESDs). Annual reports will be required as long as there are issues of concern. Once properties with institutional controls are transferred, the transferee will be required to certify annually that institutional controls are not being violated, and this information will be incorporated into the annual compliance reports.

The following represents a discussion on a number of questions posed by the RAB:

There was a question from Ms. Lunceford about the monitoring protocol for large off-base drinking water supply wells that are off line during scheduled sampling. Mr. Hughes stated that for the larger wells, these are just scheduled for sampling during the following quarter. However, if a well was of particular concern, the Air Force would collect a sample and not wait until the following quarter.

There was also a question whether there was breakthrough of trichloroethene (TCE) in the boundary wells for the Site 7 Plume– Mr. Hughes stated that the plume boundary is defined at the aquifer cleanup level but not at the detection level. Mr. Lunceford stated that there is also a concern because the extraction well is located so far away. Mr. Hughes stated that the contamination had not migrated far and mounding on the western side was controlling a portion of the plume. He admitted that there is some uncertainty for the Site 7 Plume capture boundary.

The Air Force operates a carbon treatment unit at two different well systems, one at the County Branch Center Complex, the other at a California American well, the Moonbeam Drive well. The systems were started up in 1997 during preparation of the water supply contingency plan. The criteria for terminating the Air Force’s responsibility for the system at the Moonbeam Drive well were met, i.e., the contamination fell below one half of the drinking water standard. The Air Force gave notification to CalAm in 2009 and wanted to terminate treatment. However, CalAm had the treatment system required as part of their permit and asked the Air Force to wait about 3 months, hoping the Air Force will remove the last used carbon at their expense. There have been on-going discussions between the attorneys for the Air Force and CalAm. Mr. Hughes was not sure what progress had been made. If concentrations were to rise again, the Air Force would want to make sure that treatment system is available to restart if needed. Mr. Hughes stated that once the carbon is removed, the water would only chlorinated and fluoridated. If contaminant concentrations go up again (detectable concentrations), CalAm might opt to start treatment up again. Mr. Hughes clarified that the State requires CalAm to measure carbon tetrachloride to 0.5 part per billion (ppb) which is the same as the drinking water standard. However, the Air Force looks lower than that level and makes the management decisions based on lower levels (0.25 parts per billion). Mr. Hughes was not sure what CalAm’s plans are for running the treatment system. The Moonbeam well operates at about 500 gallons per minute and supplies the off-base neighborhood between Mayhew and Branch Center, in the vicinity of the well. Ms. Lunceford stated she would like CalAm to come to a RAB meeting and present their side of the story.

Extension of Zinfandel Blvd. Ms. Barker asked how many landfill wells are present in the Zinfandel Extension. Mr. Hughes replied that there are 4 or 5 in the corridor of the road, one or two could be dispensed with as they are shallow and redundant, and some wells would need to be relocated.

Mr. Hughes discussed the presence of certain metals in groundwater monitoring wells, including chromium, nickel, vanadium and other trace elements. Initially the Air Force was not sure if these metals came from the landfills or were caused by degradation of the stainless steel screens in the monitoring wells. An evaluation at the Southern Landfill determined that the metals in groundwater originate from the degradation of the stainless steel screens in the monitoring wells and do not appear to be the result of contamination from the landfill. The same study was conducted at Landfill 4 and the chromium in groundwater was able to be removed through pumping, but nickel concentrations did not decrease during the test. There is no plan at this time to change any of the wells. Ms. Lunceford asked how many wells are impacted. Mr. Hughes replied that there are currently 6 wells total that are impacted, some consistent, some sporadic. Ms. Lunceford asked whether this problem could occur in all or some of the wells in time. Mr. Hughes responded that some of the wells have plastic screens; there are not that many stainless steel screens in the shallow wells (shallow stainless steel well screens may degrade through a

galvanic reaction). He also did not believe the metals concentrations would cause a significant environmental concern. The reason these wells were sampled for metals in the first place was to determine whether the landfills were releasing the metals. Monitoring wells at the landfills have been sampled since 1996. Based on the data, it does not appear there is a wide-spread release of metals from the landfills. If these concentrations did originate from the landfill, they are not expected to migrate far from the landfills and no one is being exposed to the metals. Ms. Lunceford asked that the Air Force keep an eye on this issue. Mr. Hughes stated that at this time, the Air Force would continue to monitor the groundwater. Someone asked whether methane is the culprit for the degradation of the screens. Mr. Hughes stated he did not think so but that he did not know much about the methane concentrations near the water table. It is possible there is some methane dissolving into the groundwater, creating a reducing environment. Mr. Sampe asked what chemicals the monitoring wells were being tested for to check for landfill releases. Mr. Hughes replied that the groundwater wells were being tested for volatile organic compounds (such as trichloroethene [TCE], tetrachloroethene [PCE], and carbon tetrachloride), commonly used to degrease/clean aircraft, petroleum-related chemicals like benzene and fuels, and metals. These are typically found in landfill areas. The Air Force also monitors air in shallow wells for landfill gases, methane foremost, and explosion hazard. The same chemicals tested for in groundwater are also being monitored for in landfill gases but not much is found in the landfill gas (other than carbon dioxide).

Ms. Lunceford inquired whether there are plans for any development at Site 29/71. Mr. Hughes replied there are no plans at this time but maybe in the future. No construction can take place until cleanup has progressed. Ms. Lunceford asked whether there are any workers out there, potentially exposed to any vapors in the soil. Mr. Hughes responded that contractors (MWH) are currently out there. PG&E is also out there, installing a new gas line. The biggest concern is that they do not dig anything up with gasoline contamination or dispose of it inappropriately. Mr. Drobesh asked whether it was possible to use bacteria to clean up the petroleum. Mr. Hughes said naturally or enhanced organisms could be used, but there are challenges to bring the organisms to the contamination. Within silts and clays, migration of takes a long time. The fact that gasoline was spilled over 30 years ago and has not degraded much either indicates there hasn't been much activity or the organisms can't get to the contamination. The clayey soils present a challenge.

At Site 23, a dry cleaning plant used to be located across from the Mather Heritage Credit Union. Some of the waste from the dry cleaning operations went to the sewer and caused groundwater and vapor contamination.

Ms. Geissinger introduced herself as the Air Force Public Affairs Representative for the Western Region of the Air Force Real Property Agency (AFRPA). AFRPA is the agency responsible for environmental cleanup and property transfer for all of the closed Air Force Bases in the United States. In this region, there are 7 major Air Force facilities that have been closed, with cleanup remaining. These are Norton, George, March, Castle, McClellan, Mather, and Williams. Ms. Geissinger has known and worked with Ms. Lunceford and some of the other individuals for 13 years or longer and stated that she really appreciated the community's participation in this meeting. Ms. Geissinger provided a briefing using PowerPoint presentation which is included as Attachment 3.

Ms. Barker asked how this meeting was publicized. Ms. Geissinger responded that a display advertisement was taken out in the Sacramento Bee. Additionally, a flyer was mailed to individuals on the mailing list, showing the meeting day/time and location map, as well as the agenda. Ms. Geissinger added that in 2004/2005, all Independence homes and businesses were added to the Mather mailing list since that was considered the most impacted community. So hypothetically, Ms. Barker should have received the flyer but if mail was returned (if the house was vacant), it is possible that her property was removed from the mailing list. Ms. Barker requested that the Air Force check into the status for her property as she thought her neighbors also did not know about this meeting. Ms. Lunceford added that several times she had walked the neighborhood. Ms. Geissinger added that the Air Force too had walked the neighborhood to hand out flyers to get the word out.

Ms. Geissinger stated that over the years, the RAB has been very instrumental in meeting its goals, not just in terms of taking information in but also sharing information. She mentioned tours, meetings with local elected officials, participation in Earth Day and 'thinking outside of the box'. RAB members have also been instrumental providing historical information to help with the investigation sites of concern.

Ms. Billy Barker asked whether the Air Force advertised in the Grapevine and Ms. Geissinger responded that the Air Force did advertise in the Grapevine. The Grapevine is a good avenue for running stories about Mather's progress in environmental cleanup.

Mr. Drobesh asked whether the McClellan RAB was still operating. Ms. Geissinger responded that the McClellan is still active and meeting on a quarterly basis. McClellan still has several important cleanup decisions to make, the major one regarding the landfills. The Air Force is actually actively recruiting (and training) new RAB members to fill vacant seats to represent the various sectors of the community. McClellan is still transforming itself. Mr. Drobesh inquired about the RABs in the U.S. Ms. Geissinger responded that in 2006, there were about 300 Department of Defense (DoD) RABs throughout the country, many of them at active-duty bases. As a whole, the birth of the Defense Environmental Restoration Program was in the 1980s, the decade for investigation and research; the 1990s was the decade for finding solution/technology; the 2000s was the decade for determining if the systems were operating as intended/holistic and if the regulators have concerns or ideas for optimizing the technologies. Mr. Drobesh asked whether other RABs have been closed down. Ms. Geissinger responded that Castle in Atwater, Norton in San Bernadino, and March in Riverside had all been adjourned. That leaves Williams in Arizona, Mather, and McClellan for this region. The environmental cleanup at Williams is almost complete, with all of the property transferred, with some groundwater contamination from the landfill.

Ms. Geissinger reminded the group that the purpose of tonight's meeting was not to make a decision about RAB adjournment, but rather share the process, obtain some input from the group, and reconvene in June. Ms. Geissinger said she would like to get input from around table, including the regulatory agencies.

Mr. McGarvey was not sure whether the aquifer problem at McClellan is as bad as at Mather. Mather's situation is unique since there are two Superfund Sites located in Rancho Cordova, Mather and Aerojet, and groundwater plumes remain under Mather. Given this situation, people might wonder why the RAB is being considered for adjournment. He would like to have discussions with as many people as possible. Ms. Geissinger indicated that at four bases where RAB was adjourned, groundwater contamination remained an issue. Initially, cleanup systems remove a lot of contamination but to remove the last portions, the systems will be running for quite some time longer, 30 to 50 years. Ms. Geissinger said it would come down to a comfort level, with a system in place to extract and treat the contamination and many (500) monitoring wells to monitor the progress. Ms. Lunceford interjected that maybe at the other bases, the groundwater contamination was actually contained but she stated this was not quite the case at Mather.

Mr. Sampe asked who takes charge after the RAB is adjourned and who pays for the cleanup. Ms. Geissinger responded that the Air Force is still the agency in charge of the cleanup. The Community Relations Plan would outline how the Air Force would communicate with the public. Ms. Geissinger also stated that at a minimum, annual meetings would be appropriate but the details would be decided later.

In reference to Slide 2 ('Have we accomplished our mission'), Ms. Barker inquired about the RAB's mission statement. Ms. Geissinger summarized the mission statement in Slide 3 ('Purpose and Function of the RAB'). Ms. Geissinger said the RAB is probably no longer needed in an advisory capacity for major cleanup decisions; however, the RAB is still viable if there is a perceived health risk, for example. Ms. Barker stated she did not understand the roles of the team after adjournment. Ms. Geissinger stated that Mr. Fortun would still be the Air Force representative, with the regulatory agencies overseeing the cleanup action. There would continue to be opportunities to communicate with the Air Force, even after adjournment.

Ms. Waegell stated that the use of acronyms turns the public off. He also mentioned the lack of maps with clear street names or coordinates, i.e., one that shows the plume boundaries, with street names and coordinates. Ms. Lunceford suggested that once plume boundaries are established, plume maps should be distributed to the public, i.e., individuals living near these plumes and potentially impacted. Mr. Sampe supported this idea. Ms. Lunceford proposed talking to the residents, once a map has been developed.

Ms. Barker asked for clarification about the RAB adjournment process and timing. Ms. Geissinger clarified that the Air Force would advertise to the community that RAB Adjournment would be discussed at the next meeting and that the Air Force would like to hear from the public. Ms. Barker was concerned that maybe the information was not getting to the public and therefore, there was no public participation. Ms. Geissinger responded that public participation and community outreach activities for Mather have been on-going for 16 years, including quarterly newsletters, participation Earth Day with booths, etc. As a good steward of taxpayers' money, however, it is the Air Force's obligation to match activities with the level of interest. If the level of interest is high, the Air Force needs to get the information to the concerned public, hold tours, or meetings. If the level of interest is low, it is the Air Force's duty not to spend

taxpayer money. The lack of participation is part of natural decline of interest as the major decisions have been made.

Ms. Cooper stated that she has been working with the Air Force for close to 14 years and has seen other bases go through the RAB adjournment process. It has been her experience that the Air Force will continue the community involvement and cleanup activities; the regulators will continue to be involved; and the public will still have the opportunity to attend annual or biannual meetings to get informed. Ms. Cooper also reminded the group that adjournment won't happen overnight, this was just an introduction to a process that the group might want to consider in the future, and a gauging of interest of the public.

Ms. Mitterhofer indicated that she had discussed the topic of RAB adjournment briefly with Mr. Marcus Pierce, the Central Valley Water Board's project manager for Mather. She stated that she has seen other RAB adjournment processes being successful. The Central Valley Water Board supports the Air Force in adjourning the RAB, or, if more appropriate, scaling back the meetings until adjournment is more feasible. At this point, the Air Force is simply gauging interest and concerns about adjournment in the future. Ms. Lunceford asked whether the Water Board had any specific concerns about Mather, CalAm, the Contingency Plan, chromium in the water, or the Southwest Lobe. Ms. Mitterhofer responded that Marcus Pierce, the project manager, should answer this question.

Ms. Barker suggested an article in Grapevine, about the current cleanup status at Mather and the pending issues presented. If the community was interested, they would attend the next meeting. The article could be informational, not necessarily about adjournment.

The topic of the webpage and on-line posting of information came up. Ms. Barker stated that she was unable to even find contact information on-line. Ms. Geissinger stated that the Air Force is currently in the process of migrating to a new web system. She admitted that not much has been posted in recent years but that is about to change. There will be significant information posted on the website, probably in the next 6 months.

Ms. Lunceford asked Mr. Mark if DTSC had any specific concerns with Mather. He said RAB adjournment would not necessarily mean that less information would be provided to the community. However, major decision documents have been completed and now different venues (other than the RAB) might work better to disseminate information to the public. This is also a matter of trying to use funds and efforts most wisely. Ms. Barker stated that the presentation and handouts were excellent but that she heard about 15 issues pending - where there were issues to disagree about? Mr. Mark stated that from regulatory standpoint, this is a dynamic system and the team works through the issues with the Air Force. Often there are separate all-day technical meetings with the agencies to address these types of concerns. The question for the RAB and tonight's meeting is whether there is a better way to do this. Ms. Lunceford asked whether there were any regulatory concerns specific to Mather. Mr. Mark responded that specific to Mather, the discussions are similar to what was discussed at tonight's meeting. From his perspective, nothing causes any significant concern. Mather has been in active remediation for some time; the team is in the process of getting documentation in place to transfer property. There are steps that have to be followed before that can be accomplished, for



example Explanations of Significant Differences (ESDs) or Institutional Controls. Ms. Lunceford stated that a lot of land still hasn't been transferred and that's why she was very excited Ms. Barker was able to attend the meeting tonight and represent the residents. Residents from on-base housing/Independence hardly ever attend these meetings, even though that is the community of foremost of concern to the group. Ms. Lunceford stated that she had been at the table for a long time, representing the community but the team really needed to hear from the residents themselves.

Ms. Barker stated that she wanted to hear from Mr. Doug Fortun what would happen if the RAB were to adjourn, what would be the mechanisms, what would happen after adjournment. How would the Air Force inform the public, what would be the Air Force's role, etc. Mr. Fortun said that if the RAB were adjourned, the group would decide what activities would be conducted to inform the public. Ms. Geissinger added that the Air Force could, for example, attend homeowners meetings on an annual basis. Ms. Barker indicated that her homeowners association does not publicize information and might not be the ideal tool. Mr. Hughes mentioned that Community Relations Plan would be updated, if appropriate (it is about 5 years old). The report of adjournment and the updated Community Relations Plan should identify the other opportunities for involvement. Ms. Geissinger will post the Community Relations Plan on the website. That is one of the requirements of the adjournment process, to make sure community involvement does not cease altogether but on-going community involvement opportunities are clearly identified. Ms. Barker added that it is important to know who to contact should there be a concern. Mr. Sytsma added that certain things would not change as they occur in parallel with the RAB. For example, you could still call the office and request a tour of the base, irrespective of the RAB. Ms. Barker reiterated that at this time, she does not know how to even contact the Air Force. She asked for local contact information and the team pointed out the phone and email contacts on the handouts.

Ms. Lunceford asked Mr. McGarvey if he had a suggestion on how to proceed. Mr. McGarvey responded that he hadn't given RAB adjournment any thoughts as his mind was still on aquifer issues but RAB Adjournment could certainly be discussed. He would like for information that is sent to the RAB community also sent to Homeowners' Associations, City Hall and local schools. If no one responded, that would show no interest. Ms. Geissinger stated that in the past, flyers were sent to schools, but this information could have gotten lost. Mr. McGarvey stated information dissemination could occur through distributing weblinks or contacting PTAs. He stressed the importance of updating the website, with current information, with current maps that show roads, homes, businesses, in relation to the groundwater plumes. Ms. Lunceford added that she thought this was a valid request since there are new residents living on the boundary. Ms. Barker also stated that there was a big turnover in the community at Mather's Independence. She voiced concern about not receiving the mailer announcing the tonight's meeting and Ms. Geissinger promised to check into that. Mr. Sampe said that his Homeowner's Association with delinquencies of 20% is not interested in water contamination.

Ms. Lunceford offered a suggestion for the RAB Adjournment. At the next meeting, the Air Force should propose a number of ways to disseminate the information so that the Air Force can build level of comfort with the community. After that, the group could develop plan of action and decide what community wants, e.g., biannual meetings, updated website, and/or community

meetings. She also suggested community visits might be appropriate to explain the current status of the cleanup, the pending issues, and the fact that drinking water is safe. Former Mayor Bob McGarvey suggested that information about the RAB be presented through an address to the Rancho Cordova City Hall, Cordova Council, and suggested RanchoCordovaPost.com, so that folks who didn't know about the RAB would have full disclosure before adjourning the RAB.

Mr. Drobesh stated that an updated website could solve a lot of these problems and take over the future of the RAB for disseminating information, but he questioned whether it could be run professionally. A good website should have up-to-date information and maps, and give the public an opportunity to search for information, as well as provide contact information. Most people would likely not come to meetings but meet once per year to discuss website improvements, etc. This might be a good idea for all the RABs around the country. Ms. Lunceford agreed that it might be worth the funding to get a good website going in lieu of some meetings.

Ms. Geissinger clarified that for the next meeting, the Air Force would have an agenda item about community outreach in general and options for other community involvement activities that would replace the RAB. The group would then discuss what we would do. This does not mean the RAB would be adjourned at that time. Ms. Lunceford stated that if people at Mather's Independence Housing are interested, they should attend the next meeting. Ms. Lunceford offered her contact information to talk to anyone interested. Ms. Barker stated she understood the cost and reasons to discontinue to the RAB. Also, other attendees might not be able to follow the presentation at these meetings as they are "bureaucratese", not to be taken as criticism. She said perhaps the group has accomplished its mission if she was the only resident attending tonight's meeting. However, it seemed to her that there are about 15 different issues pending that have a potential to affect her future, her family, and her residents. She would prefer if at the next meeting, the Air Force would present a draft article for the Grapevine or some other mechanism to inform the community about present-day cleanup status and information that can be disseminated. The Air Force should prepare a plan to inform the affected community, to bring the community into the present with current cleanup status at Mather (present-day materials and information). If after that, if people are not excited, upset, concerned, or interested, RAB Adjournment could be further discussed.

Mr. Waegell suggested that the County or State hold 'a day without water' to bring awareness to the public. Ms. Barker stated that she thought her neighbors were concerned about water but she did not think that they associated drinking water safety with the Mather RAB. Ms. Lunceford stated the water is fine to drink. Ms. Geissinger said that drinking water safety is an issue for the water supplier even though she understood that drinking water is the main concern. But systems monitoring wells are in place to monitor the safety. Mr. George stated that a lot of bottled water is being sold in Sacramento even though water was safe.

Ms. Lunceford summarized the Air Force action items for the next meeting as 1) present different methods for disseminating information to the public once the RAB adjourns and 2) prepare and present a plan to help the public learn about the current cleanup status at Mather using the suggestions of Former Mayor McGarvey (as stated above). She expressed a preference for a factual article illustrated with pictures. She also thought that the Air Force should attend

PTA Meetings, . Ms. Barker stated she did not think PTA presentations were necessary. A draft article for the Grapevine and Sacramento Bee 'How is Mather today – Mather is doing well and thriving' might be sufficient. Mr. Hughes suggested resurrecting a newsletter that was issued specifically for the Independence community, also a general article with the current news, the five-year review, the new contract, the program update, and contact information. Mr. McGarvey could take the same information to the Council Meetings. Ms. Barker said that the same information could be sent to the Homeowners Association - email might work best. Email contact is Viera Moore Property Management (Kathy). Mr. McGarvey reiterated the importance of current information as so much at Mather had changed. Ms. Lunceford stated RAB adjournment could be discussed, based on community interest the group would receive after these efforts. Ms. Geissinger promised that she would also show the updated website at the next meeting and the group could discuss future content, history, CERCLA process, short videos, current cleanup status, contact information. Mr. Waegell said the website should state where documents are located, have the ability to search for information, etc, and that a website might attract younger people to become more involved.

#### **4. KEY DOCUMENTS**

The key document list is included in the PowerPoint slides located in Attachment 3. Mr. Hughes stated that the next Five-Year Review would be coming out in the next few weeks. There is also a document that proposes to take Mather off a list that involves a different regulatory program, the Resources Conservation Recovery Act (RCRA), the Hazardous Waste Law. Mather used to handle hazardous waste when it was an active base. The facility had been closed some time ago but the Air Force just hadn't formally taken it off the list of candidate sites that require cleanup under this law. Ms. Barker asked what allowed a site to come off the list. Mr. Hughes clarified that the portions proposed to come off the list are the portions already cleaned up. This step will unencumber real estate development.

Mr. Hughes said he would expand the contact list to include the DTSC and EPA public participation specialists and any other additional regulatory representatives. The group mentioned that it is important to spell out the acronyms.

#### **5. ACTION ITEMS**

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

Mr. Hughes stated that the Air Force has a goal of transferring the remainder of the property this year, which might not happen. Ms. Barker asked whether all property transfers are to Sacramento County. Mr. Hughes replied that most (but not all) were to Sacramento County. Mather Community Campus will go to another recipient - Sacramento Office of Education, a conglomeration of school boards. The airport and parks will go to Sacramento County. Ms. Lunceford proposed further discussion of the transfers at the next meeting.

## **6. TOPICS FOR FUTURE RAB MEETING**

Potential topics identified for future meetings include:

- Different methods to distribute information to the public after RAB adjournment
- Draft article to Grapevine about Mather's cleanup progress
- Website layout and content
- Update – performance-based contract/contractor
- Five-Year Review
- Operating Properly and Successfully (OPS) Determination

## **7. FUTURE MEETING DATES**

The next RAB meeting was tentatively scheduled for 27 April 2010 but another possible date of 9 June 2010 was discussed. Mr. McGarvey will check his calendar to determine which dates would work best for him and pass that along to Sandra and Doug.

## **8. ADJOURNMENT**

Meeting was adjourned.