From: Gilkey, Douglas E CIV OASN (I&E) BRAC PMO West
To: Duchnak, Laura S CIV OASN (I&E) BRAC PMO West
Subject: RE: HP Mtg
Date: Tuesday, February 27, 2007 3:06:45 PM

Bad, Michael had all the Lennar folks including counsel there and the regulators brought all their project managers. The discussion got into some technical areas. Some highlights:

1. Kathleen General Statement - early transfer may be a simpler way to go and the stadium use as better reuse.
2. DHS and RAD clearance issue - EPA and DTSC still dancing around but agree DHS has a role. I stated that the mindset needed to change and recognize that no state guideline exist. Need to define the DHS and clearance role.
3. City wants Navy to tackle groundwater issues through a TCRA. I stated that we don't feel a TCRA is warranted and the timeline would allow the ROD process to define and implement GW remedies.
4. EPA stated that in early transfer they would demand more conservative remedy and expect resources to back that up.
5. Parcel B - Lots of discussion about the City wanting to define what conditions must be met to be protective and not seek approval post ROD. Also how not having this violates the conveyance agreement. I pushed back and said that approvals would absolutely be required just like every other base in the country. DTSC backed this up but EPA was silent.
6. Soil Vapor Issue - same discussion about Lennar wanting more data to define exactly where soil gas is an issue. EPA said that in other cases the data didn't do any good and DTSC said it may be cheaper to just put in the barriers. Lennar and City continued to push.
7. City still avoiding E-2 and even said that it should be a wetland, meaning excavation. I held the line of cap and City taking the property.
8. City wants to be in front of the Board of Supervisors in a month with a general description on approach. They want to use Michaels letter for the approach with comments from us and the regulators.
9. City also wants a non-legally binding MOU with Navy and regulators defining the framework of the approach and reiterating commitments. Mostly to placate the 49ers that everyone is committed. I have a problem with this given we have no identified funding support.
10. EPA wants 2 additional FTE's starting this year to support this effort, one counsel and one to work AOC's
11. Action items include defining the roles on RAD clearance, discussion of GW remedies and approach (RI/FS vs TCRA), Parcel B AOC that the City will try to draft, more discussion on soil vapor, another more technical meeting in two weeks to better define the stadium boundaries and next steps.

I think we really need to get a read on what the Navy will say when Boxer/Feinstein/Pelosi push for this to be funded. Does Navy support this over other requirements or needs. I keep taking the line with Michael that more compromise and the better the deal for the Navy the more chance for support. I think he believes the political pressure will be enough regardless of whether or not it is a bad deal for the Navy. I will have a response to his letter for you to review in the next few days.

-----Original Message-----
From: Duchnak, Laura S CIV OASN (I&E) BRAC PMO West
Sent: Tuesday, February 27, 2007 14:22
To: Gilkey, Douglas E CIV OASN (I&E) BRAC PMO West
Subject: HP Mtg

How did it go?

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld