



**DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE**  
**AIR FORCE REAL PROPERTY AGENCY**

**MAY 24 2011**

**MEMORANDUM FOR SEE DISTRIBUTION**

**FROM: AFRPA Western Region Execution Center**  
3411 Olson Street  
McClellan CA 95652-1003

**SUBJECT: Restoration Advisory Board Meeting Minutes, 15 February 2011**

1. Attached please find the final minutes from the 15 February 2011 McClellan Restoration Advisory Board meeting held at the North Highlands Recreation Center as approved by the RAB members at the May 2011 meeting.
2. If you have any questions or comments, please contact Ms. Mary Hall, at (916) 643-1250, extension 232.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Steven K. Mayer".

**STEVEN K. MAYER, P.E.**  
**BRAC Environmental Coordinator**

**Attachments:**  
**Final Meeting Minutes, 15 February 2011**

**DISTRIBUTION LIST**  
**Final 15 February 2010 McClellan Restoration Advisory Board Meeting Minutes**

**Electronic Copies**

Robert Blanchard, RAB  
Dana Booth, RAB  
William Clements, RAB  
Paul Green, Jr., RAB  
Alan Hersh, RAB  
Glen Jorgensen, RAB  
Randy Orzalli, RAB  
Paul Plummer, RAB

**Hard Copy**

Gary Collier, RAB  
Carolyn Gardner, RAB  
Mars Pastor, community  
Frank Miller, community  
Tina Suarez-Murias, RAB  
McClellan Admin Record

Elizabeth Donnelly, Senior Field Representative, Congressman Dan Lundgren  
Trent Sunahara, Field Representative, Congresswoman Doris Matsui

Viola Cooper, US EPA  
Bob Fitzgerald, US EPA  
Barbara Maco, US EPA  
Yvonne Fong, US EPA

John Harris, DTSC  
Stephen Pay, DTSC  
Marcus Simpson, DTSC

James Taylor, Central Valley Regional Board

Phil Mook, AFRPA  
Steve Mayer, AFRPA  
Linda Geissinger, AFRPA  
Paul Bernheisel, AFCEE  
Joe Ebert, AFCEE

Brian Sytsma, Air Force contractor  
Mary Hall, Air Force contractor

John Saunders, community  
Buzz Link, community  
Warren Jung, Sacramento Suburban Water District  
Ben Malisow, TetraTech

McClellan Air Force Base (AFB)  
Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Meeting Minutes FINAL  
15 February 2011 -- McClellan, California

Time: 6:00 PM  
Place: North Highlands Recreation Center  
North Highlands, California

**RAB Member Attendees**

<u>NAME</u>	<u>AFFILIATION</u>
DANA BOOTH	LOCAL REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY (LRA), SACRAMENTO COUNTY
GARY COLLIER	WEST SIDE OF BASE, PARKER HOMES
YVONNE FONG	U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY (EPA)
CAROLYN GARDNER	MCCLELLAN PARK RESIDENT
PAUL GREEN	EDUCATION COMMUNITY; COMMUNITY CO-CHAIR
GLENN JORGENSEN	NORTH HIGHLANDS
ALAN HERSH	MCCLELLAN BUSINESS PARK
STEVE MAYER	AIR FORCE REAL PROPERTY AGENCY; CO-CHAIR
TINA SUAREZ-MURIAS	ENVIRONMENTAL COMMUNITY
JAMES TAYLOR	CENTRAL VALLEY REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD

**I. Welcome, Introductions and Agenda**

Brian Sytsma welcomed the group to the meeting and introduced himself as the meeting facilitator. Attendees signed the sign-in sheet (Attachment 1), and picked up available handouts.

Mr. Sytsma went over the agenda (Attachment 2) and the general format of the meeting, noting that this meeting is shorter than usual to allow time for the Public Meeting on the Ecological Sites Proposed Plan including how to be recognized as a speaker during the meeting and when to ask questions.

Mr. Sytsma invited the RAB members to introduce themselves and the stakeholder groups they represent. Mr. Sytsma invited everyone in the room, including community members, to introduce themselves.

## II. December Minutes and Response to Comments from December Meeting

He asked if there were any comments or changes to the December 2010 meeting minutes. There being no comments or changes, the minutes are considered approved. Mr. Sytsma then briefed the attendees on the agenda.

## III. Community Co-chair Update

Mr. Paul Green thanked his three guests, students visiting with him from China. Mr. Green said he is pleased to see the creek tailings project is now being moved forward with this upcoming Ecological Sites project. He has changed his mind and now sees the value in moving forward with the project. He explained he led the charge several years ago against taking the action to address the creek tailings, preferring to focus on projects with greater positive impact to the redevelopment of McClellan. Now that great progress has been made with redevelopment, he is comfortable with the project.

## IV. Air Force Cleanup Update

Mr. Mayer referred the RAB to the *BRAC Cleanup Team and Stakeholders Meeting Field Review* (Attachment 3) in their packet. He said he would not go over that during the meeting, but he would be happy to answer any questions after the meeting. He did review the *Current Key Documents and Events of Interest* (Attachment 4). Only information and comments not presented in the attachment is recorded in these minutes.

Mr. Collier asked if the fire training range and the small arms firing range are currently being used for that purpose and if so, how can we differentiate between the current use and the former use? He asked if we could pare those out and instead deal with the landfills.

Mr. Mayer responded by first addressing the small arms firing range. It is being reused by the police academy for public safety training, which are all indoor activities. The Air Force is going to clean up the lead in the dirt backstop associated with the Air Force's previous use of the outdoor range. The current operation and the past operation are separate in terms of activities. There is no continuing impact from that current training on what The Air Force is planning to clean up. When the Air Force cleans it up, the surface portion of soil will be removed, and taken to the CS 10 consolidation unit. As far as the fire training facility, there is on-going training that takes place there, but there is not any live fire-fighting at the site. The current training does not cause any issues with any contamination. The Air Force will be cleaning up contamination from past Air Force activities only.

## V. Privatized Cleanup Update

Ms. Fong updated the RAB and the community about the Parcel C6 privatization cleanup project. The treatment plant is in place and operational and members of the RAB had the opportunity to tour the site. It will be 30 to 40 days before the activities are completed. Ms. Fong introduced Barbara Macco, EPA remedial project manager, who will be working with her on the FOSET 1 privatization project. Ms. Macco will be conducting some public involvement activities over the next few months on the Initial Parcel 3 sites. Ms. Macco added that she will be working on 49 sites that are part of FOSET 1 and is proposing to have a public meeting on April 19. Ms. Fong added that the EPA is planning to conduct further community interviews this spring.

### *RAB discussion*

Mr. Jorgensen commented that the Parcel C6 tour guide Tom Naiman with TetraTech gave the best description of a low-temperature treatment plant that he has seen. The handouts were also very informative.

Mr. Collier thanked the EPA for the informative tour.

### *Community discussion*

Mr. Saunders asked what soil treatment is being produced at Parcel C6. Ms. Fong responded Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons and PCBs are primary targets of concern and those are the main containments that are being treated. Mr. Saunders asked if any soils were being removed and if dust was being created. Ms. Fong responded that there are dust suppression procedures in place and operations are shutdown if wind activity requires it. Mr. Saunders asked if any heavy metals were being excavated. Ms. Fong responded that metals were also part of the soils excavated. Arsenic and Vanadium were found in some of soil excavated. Mr. Mayer added that both arsenic and vanadium are naturally occurring metals.

Mr. Collier noted that the site is on the west side of the base near the Bell Ave. school. He said the soils have been removed and when he was there last week there didn't seem to be any problem with soils blowing around.

### **VI Public Comment**

*Frank Miller: The meeting started off with Paul Green mentioning that he was confused because years ago a project on the creeks was about \$3 million and now it's down to \$2.6 million. Often what happens is when it was \$3 million ten years ago the contractors, I'm just talking in general terms, I'm not making any accusations, but in general terms, the contractors will know how much money is in the budget of the polluter and they will tailor the project to extract the money from that budget and now they know there's less money in the program. They know that we've fallen on hard times and there is less money in the program and now naturally it has come down to how about \$2.6 million. It's not any more confusing than that. Regarding some comments Alan Hersh made about that he would like to see Building 252 demolished. I would say that would be fine if the developer would like to demolish Building 252, a building that he got for free, then he should pay for the demolition of that building. But to stick it on the tax payer that's going too far. You guys want to demolish a building, you guys pay for it. It's as simple as that. Regarding water on the base. Is it true that the base's water is coming from a nearby water district? Water is coming in from the adjacent water district. Is it true that McClellan is not*

*using any water from below the base? This creates the perception that if you're not using water from below your base and you're taking water from another water district, and are you even compensating that water district at fair market value for their water, and do the customers in that district even know that water is being removed from their system and being brought here. Well that's another issue. At the heart of the issue is the perception that if you're not using your own water and spending hundreds of millions of dollars to clean up and you swear that the water quality is super high and you're not using your own water, that creates the perception that you don't trust your own water and you won't drink your own water. And you don't have confidence in your own water. There's a public perception problem at that point. Ok, I'd better stop now.*

Mr. Sytsma said the Air Force would respond to Mr. Miller's at the next meeting (Attachment 5).

## XI. RAB Members' Questions, Advice, Comments, and Announcements

Ms. Fong thanked Mr. Jorgensen for suggesting the tours of Parcel C6. She noted there is one more tour scheduled for tomorrow morning.

Mr. Harris announced that he is being reassigned to different duties at the Department of Toxic Substances Control and this would be his last RAB meeting.

Ms. Suarez-Murias said she hopes the tours of Parcel C6 are being filmed, so they can be used as a teaching tool in the future.

Ms. Gardner said she did not get the message of the tour and asked Ms. Fong if, in the future, she could be called that would help.

Mr. Hersh suggested future RAB meetings include agenda items on the Small Volume Sites and the Focused Strategic Sites. Regarding Parcel C-6, Mr. Hersh noted that one of the reasons soil treatment was selected early on was to contain the risk early on when they were negotiating with the insurance company to provide insurance for this fixed price contract for the Air Force. They were concerned that if the contamination were discovered to go deeper than 6 feet, then excavating it and hauling it would exceed the negotiated cost. At the time the soil treatment unit seemed like a more cost-effective solution and it allowed McClellan Park to get the insurance.

In fact, the quantities of soil ended up just about where the records said they would be, which about 20,000 yards. Originally, they thought it would be around 11,000 yards. He said they didn't anticipate a layer of concrete debris, that they originally thought was a layer of hardpan, and when they got through the concrete, there was another layer of contamination below it. The thermal desorption started out as a way to get insurance, but in the end, it probably came out to be the same cost of just taking it to the landfill. However, when EPA selected the Record of Decision and considered the different alternatives, they felt that 20,000 yards of material doesn't go to a landfill, it gets treated, essentially becomes inert dust and goes back into the hole in which it came. He concluded by noting that McClellan Park is writing a report on lessons learned through the process.

Mr. Mayer said there's a lot going on around the base in the way of cleanup activities and a lot more soil removal and property being returned to clean, redevelopment opportunity.

Ms. Hall announced the next meeting is tentatively scheduled for May 17 at 6:30 and nominations and elections for community co-chair will be held.

The meeting adjourned at 6:50 p.m.



# McClellan Restoration Advisory Board Meeting

15 Feb 2011

Add to  
Mailing  
List?

Name/Organization

Email

BEN MALISOW / TETRA TECH
Stephen Fay / DTDC
JAMES Taylor
BOB FITZGERALD
FRANK MILLER
JOHN SAUNDERS
BREZZ LINK
John Harris
MARS PASTOR
Marcus Simpson
Andy James





# McClellan Restoration Advisory Board Meeting

15 Feb 2011

Add to  
Mailing  
List?

Name/Organization

Address

Email

Name/Organization	Address	Email
Vicki Cooper		
Tina Suarez-Murias		
Carolyn Gardner		
Barbara Maco		
WARREN JURY		
<del>WARREN JURY</del>		
DALE ANDERSON		
Ellis, Robert		
Karl Kurka		

Public Meeting

**McClellan Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Meeting  
North Highlands Recreation Center  
Tuesday, February 15, 2011, 6:00 – 6:50 pm**

**AGENDA – FINAL**

<u>TIME</u>	<u>TOPIC</u>	<u>LEAD</u>
6:00 – 6:05	Welcome & Introductions	Facilitator
6:05 – 6:10	Agenda & Comments on December Minutes	Facilitator
6:10 – 6:15	RAB Co-chair Update	Community Co-chair Paul Green Jr.
6:15 – 6:25	<b>Air Force Cleanup Update --</b> <i>Goal: Provide an update of current field activities and key documents.</i> <i>Process: Presentation and Q&amp;A</i>	Air Force Steve Mayer
6:25 – 6:30	<b>Privatized Cleanup Status</b> <i>Goal: Update the RAB and community about the Parcel C6 privatized cleanup project, and to discuss issues as necessary.</i> <i>Process: Presentation and Q&amp;A</i>	EPA Yvonne Fong
6:30 – 6:40	<b>Public Comment</b> <i>Goal: Provide opportunity for members of the public to comment.</i> <i>Process: Public members fill out a comment card indicating their desire to speak. The facilitator will call each person to the microphone.</i> <i>Speakers are asked to limit their comments to 3 minutes, however, more time may be allowed as necessary and available.</i>	Facilitator
6:40 – 6:50	<b>RAB Members Advice, Comments, &amp; Announcements</b> <i>Goal: Solicit advice from each RAB member for upcoming agendas, and provide an opportunity for RAB members to express brief comments and/or make announcements.</i> <i>Process: Around the table for each member to offer agenda suggestions, comments, and announcements; comments will be recorded and will form future agendas.</i>	RAB

## **MEETING GUIDELINES**

### **Ground Rules**

- *Be progress oriented*
- *Participate*
- *Speak one at a time*
- *Be concise*
- *Use "I" statements when expressing opinions*
- *Express concerns and interests (not positions)*
- *Focus on issues not personalities*
- *Focus on what CAN be changed (not on what can not be changed)*
- *Listen to understand (not to formulate your response for the win!)*
- *Draw on each others' experiences*
- *Discuss history only as it contributes to progress*

### **Facilitator Assumptions**

- *We are dealing with complex issues and no one person has all the answers*
- *Open discussions ensure informed decision making*
- *Managed conflict is good and stimulates creativity and innovation*
- *All the members of the group can contribute something to the process*
- *Everyone is doing the best they can with the knowledge they have now*
- *Blame is unproductive and dis-empowering*

**BRAC Cleanup Team and Stakeholders Meeting  
15 February, 2011**

**FIELD REVIEW:****Groundwater Program Activities****a) McClellan Ground Water Treatment System (GWTS)**

The GWTS is operating at approximately 1471 gpm with the following 8 wells shut down because VOC concentrations are less than the MCLs: OU B EW-364 (BC), OU D EW-86 (AB), OU A EW-435 (AB), EW-336 (A/B) OU C EW-137 (B), EW-446 (A), EW-456 (A/B), and OU H EW-454 (AB). These wells are being monitored for rebound. Wells EW-247, EW-308, and EW-383 were shutdown on 22 January 2009 to evaluate their effect on nearby well VOC concentrations in support of well field optimization for development of the C-6 Parcel. *Wells EW-63, EW-246, EW-310, and EW-415 were shut down on 27 January for the same field optimization. Replacement extraction wells for EW-63, EW-246, EW-310, and EW-308 were connected to the existing groundwater conveyance line system the week of 31 January and placed on-line to the GWTS on 4 February, with exception of the replacement wells for EW-308 and EW-310. These wells are scheduled to be completed and placed on-line to the system the week of 7 February. All extraction and monitoring wells within the C-6 Parcel will be abandoned and removed from the GWTS and GWMP. The CERCLA treatment system is operating. Batch discharges of 44,046 and 44,100 gallons were discharged to outfall number 1 on 19 January and 8 February respectively. The ion exchange system is operating normally.*

**b) Ground Water Monitoring Program (GWMP).** The 1Q11 event began on 3 January and was completed on 9 February.

**c) Davis GWTS -** Davis GWTS is shut down. Fall 2010 Semi-Annual Groundwater Monitoring Report including the Phase 3 Treatability Study post-injection groundwater sample data *will be submitted in February 2011.*

**d) Parcel C-6 Groundwater Well Replacement and Decommissioning (McClellan Business Park project) –** Replacement well drilling activities began on 3 November and are complete. All replacement wells have been constructed *and developed. Installation of pipelines and vaults for the new EWs is complete. The extraction wells are being tested and are expected to be in full operation by 14 February. The first sampling of the new wells is scheduled to be completed by 18 February. Abandonment efforts of the existing well field are scheduled to be completed on 10 February.*

**Soil Vapor Extraction (SVE) Program Activities****e) Soil Vapor Extraction (SVE) Systems**

(7 of 14 SVE systems are operating, removing vapors from 6 of 19 SVE sites). System uptime is calculated from 8 December 2010 through 10 February 2011.

- 1) IC 1 SVE is operating normally. (100% uptime)
- 2) IC 7 SVE is operating normally. (100% uptime)
- 3) IC 19/21 Flameless Thermal Oxidizer (FTO) is operating normally, treating vapors from IC 19 only. (100% uptime)
- 4) IC 19/21 VGAC is not operating. System was shut down for a rebound study on 21 April 2008.
- 5) IC 23 SVE system is not operating. System was shut down for a rebound study on 21 April 2008.
- 6) IC 25/29/30/31/32 SVE is not operating. The system was shut down for a rebound study on 11 January 2008. *An extraction well screened 8-40 feet bgs is scheduled to be installed*

NOTE: *Italicized text represent update changes*

BCT & RPM Field Activities Update 15 Feb 2011

*Margin or Underlined text represent corrective changes*

*the week of 14 February as a well field optimization. The electrical service was re-connected to a newer transformer on January 27<sup>th</sup> by SMUD.*

- 7) IC 34/35/37 FTO system is not operating. The system was shut down for a rebound study on 17 July 2008.
  - 8) IC 34/35/37 VGAC is not operating. The system was shut down for a rebound study on 27 May 2008.
  - 9) IC 42 SVE is not operating; the system was shut down for a rebound study on 11 July 2007.
  - 10) OU C1/PRL 66B FTO is operating normally, treating vapors from OU C1 only (100% uptime)
  - 11) OU C1/PRL 66B VGAC is not operating. The system was shut down for a rebound study on 17 July 2008.
  - 12) OU D VGAC is operating normally. (100% uptime)
  - 13) OU D Thermal Oxidizer is operating normally. *A deteriorating cross-over duct to the influent of the quench system was replaced on 3 and 4 February. (96% uptime)*
- B243 (PRL S-015 and PRL S-008)/PRLS-039 SVE is operating normally, treating vapors from PRL S-008 only. (100% uptime)

#### **Petroleum, Oil, and Lubricants (POL) Cleanup Activities**

##### **f) POL Program:**

- 1) System operating normally. The contractor has installed 1 new injection well and 1 VMW, along with necessary piping to connect to the blower). Field tests indicate satisfactory results with the delivery of air to the new injection well. Sampling results are in and indicate TPH contamination exceeding screening levels for GW protection at some 20' sample depths. *The Draft 3QCY10 report has been issued; also the Final PRL S-40 Biovent Expansion Work Plan detailing the Air Force's revised plan to further investigate TPHD contamination depth along Luce Ave.*
- 2) The Basewide Fuels Investigation – The Bldg 4 and Bldg 1036 systems are operating. *RWQCB has reviewed the Draft 3QCY10 reports and has no comments; the Final documents are pending.*

#### **Radiation Program Activities**

##### **g) Radiation Program.**

- 1) CS-10 – Site inspections are conducted weekly.
- 2) Building 252 Remedial Investigation –Final survey status (FSS) *completed on 9 February 2011. Waste disposal was performed on 26 January and shipped to US Ecology Idaho. The subcontractor SEC demobilized on 11 February 2011.*

#### **Soil Remediation, Investigation and Management Activities**

- h) OU B1 Drainage Ditch and OU D Cap O&M.** The Third Quarter CY10 *Cap Inspection and O&M report has been issued.*
- i) Sanitary Sewer System Replacement Project** Area B/C excavation and installation of new sanitary sewer pipeline is complete. Disposal of contaminated soil from the skeet range *has been completed.*
- j) Industrial Waste Collection System:** The Final Industrial Waste Line Pre-abandonment Survey and Cleaning Report was received on 03 January 2011.
- k) Small Volume Sites Investigation:** The Draft Final document was submitted on 2 July. *This A meeting to resolve the dispute on a site-by-site basis was held on 19 January 2011. EPA comments on the Draft Final RICS Addenda and FS have been received.*
- l) Follow-On Strategic Sites- Sampling.** The Regulatory agency comments have been received on the Draft RI/FS.

**m) Skeet Range Site Investigation** – *Pre-Final ROD issued 11 February 2011. Agency comments requested by 18 February 2011. Working Copy Remedial Action Working Copy is in preparation by Shaw E&I, Inc.*

**Wetlands/Habitats Management Maintenance and Miscellaneous Activities**

**n) Airfield mowing** has been discontinued for the winter season.

**o) Ecological Sites Proposed Plan** - Final Proposed Plan *was completed 27 January 2011.* Public meeting is planned for *15 February 2011.*

**Current Key Documents and Events of Interest to the RAB  
15 February 2011 RAB Meeting**

	<b>Document</b>	<b>Document Description</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>FOSET</b>
1	Engineering Evaluation/ Cost Analysis (EE/CA) for AOC 314 and PRL S-030A.	Characterizes sites. Establishes remedial action objectives (RAOs) for cleanup. Analyzes, compares, and recommends alternatives to achieve the RAOs. Takes the place of the FS and PP in the CERCLA process.	Draft in regulatory review. Field work planned for 2012.	FOSET #1
2	Small Volume Sites Remedial Investigation Characterization Summaries/Feasibility Study	Details investigation results and evaluates cleanup alternatives for 91 sites.	Informal dispute issues resolved. Addressing regulators' comments on draft final. Amended Draft Final to be issued February 2011. Final expected in April 2011.	FOSET #2
3	Action Memo – Non Time Critical Removal Action	Defines removal action plan in advance of ROD. Pulling the 6 Small Volume Sites with radium forward for removal action to move more efficiently through property transfer.	Expect to award contract in March 2011. Field work to be done in 2012 once work plans are approved.	FOSET #2
4	FOSET #2 (Finding of Suitability for Early Transfer)	Documents the environmental restrictions in support of an early transfer of property. Includes 120 sites (primarily from Small Volume Sites ROD, Building 252m and some Follow-on Strategic Sites).	Begin revising document to reflect Privatization approach in early 2011. Anticipate completion by end of 2011.	FOSET #2
5	Follow-On Strategic Sites Remedial Investigation Characterization Summary/Feasibility Study	Details investigation results and evaluates cleanup alternatives for additional landfill and soil sites (108 sites).	Agency comments on Draft received. Work is underway to address comments. Draft Final anticipated by end of 2011.	FOSET #3
6	Focused Strategic Sites ROD	Documents cleanup decision for 11 sites, including firing training area, small arms firing range, and large landfills	Agencies reviewing Draft Final. Final expected by May 2011.	FOSET #3
7	Ecological Sites Proposed Plan	Presents Air Force's preferred cleanup alternatives for ecological sites including creeks, vernal pools, and tailings piles.	Public Comment Period Feb. 4 through March 7, 2011.	FOSET #3
9	Skeet Range Record of Decision	Documents cleanup decision for Skeet Range.	Final in preparation for signature. Field work planned for Summer 2011.	FOSET #3

## **Air Force Response to Public Comments Received at the 15 February 2011 McClellan Restoration Advisory Board**

**Frank Miller:** *The meeting started off with Paul Green mentioning that he was confused because years ago a project on the creeks was about \$3 million and now it's down to \$2.6 million. Often what happens is when it was \$3 million ten years ago the contractors, I'm just talking in general terms, I'm not making any accusations, but in general terms, the contractors will know how much money is in the budget of the polluter and they will tailor the project to extract the money from that budget and now they know there's less money in the program. They know that we've fallen on hard times and there is less money in the program and now naturally it has come down to how about \$2.6 million. It's not any more confusing than that. Regarding some comments Alan Hersh made about that he would like to see Building 252 demolished. I would say that would be fine if the developer would like to demolish Building 252, a building that he got for free, then he should pay for the demolition of that building. But to stick it on the tax payer that's going too far. You guys want to demolish a building, you guys pay for it. It's as simple as that. Regarding water on the base. Is it true that the base's water is coming from a nearby water district? Water is coming in from the adjacent water district. Is it true that McClellan is not using any water from below the base? This creates the perception that if you're not using water from below your base and you're taking water from another water district, and are you even compensating that water district at fair market value for their water, and do the customers in that district even know that water is being removed from their system and being brought here. Well that's another issue. At the heart of the issue is the perception that if you're not using your own water and spending hundreds of millions of dollars to clean up and you swear that the water quality is super high and you're not using your own water, that creates the perception that you don't trust your own water and you won't drink your own water. And you don't have confidence in your own water. There's a public perception problem at that point. Ok, I'd better stop now.*

**Air Force Response:** Thank you for your comments on the creeks project and building 252. Regarding water on the base, yes, all businesses and entities at McClellan Park receive their water from Sacramento Suburban Water District as paying customers. The water below the base has not yet been completely cleaned and as such there are restrictions in place preventing its use. The clean water from the Groundwater Treatment Plant is discharged into Magpie Creek and therefore flows indirectly into the water supply system downstream from McClellan.

For more information on the drinking water supply and quality at McClellan, contact Sacramento Suburban Water District at [www.sswd.org](http://www.sswd.org), or call 916-972-7171.