

**FORMER NAVAL AIR STATION MOFFETT FIELD  
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD  
BUILDING 943, WORLD ROOM  
MOFFETT FIELD, CALIFORNIA**

*NOTE: A glossary is provided on the last page of these minutes.*

**Subject: RAB MEETING MINUTES**

The Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) meeting for former Naval Air Station (NAS) Moffett Field was held on Thursday, 13 September 2007, at Building 943, World Room, Moffett Field, California. Mr. Bob Moss, RAB community co-chair, opened the meeting at 7:15 p.m.

**WELCOME**

Mr. Moss introduced himself, welcomed everyone in attendance, and asked for self-introductions of those present. The Moffett Field RAB meeting was attended by:

RAB Members	Regulators	Navy	Consultants & Navy Support	NASA	Public & Other
15	4	4	2	5	15

**APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES**

Mr. Moss asked for corrections to the 12 July 2007 meeting minutes. Ms. Alana Lee of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) provided a correction to the East-Side Aquifer Treatment System (EATS) Evaluation Report and Status presentation: the term "1,2-dichloroacetylene (DCA)" should be corrected to "1,2-dichloroethylene (DCE)." The 12 July 2007 meeting minutes have been corrected as follows:

- Page 3, East-Side Aquifer Treatment System Evaluation Report and Status presentation, Summary section, first bullet: 1,2- dichloroethylene (DCE) remained below the Record of Decision (ROD) cleanup goal of 0.5 micrograms per liter (µg/L), except at two wells.

The 12 July 2007 RAB meeting minutes were approved as corrected. Corrected meeting minutes are posted on the project website at [www.bracpmo.navy.mil/bracbases/california/moffett/](http://www.bracpmo.navy.mil/bracbases/california/moffett/).

**AGENDA REVIEW**

**U.S. Army Combat Support Training Center**

Mr. Moss reviewed the meeting agenda and provided a modification: Mr. Gary Houston, environmental chief for the U.S. Army Combat Support Training Center, will provide a brief update on the Army's proposed Combat Support Training Center on Orion Park. Mr. Moss said the public comment period for the Environmental Assessment closed about one month ago, and he gave examples of the types of public comments received. The Army will provide a formal presentation at the 08 November 2007 RAB meeting.

Mr. Houston said the project team is reviewing comments received for the Environmental Assessment and developing responses to comments, which will be an appendix to the final document. Comments will either be incorporated as a change to the document or will be addressed in the response to comments. Mr. Houston explained all comments will receive a response, and the response process will be completed in the next 30 days. He also provided a timeline of the review process. The following question followed the update:

- RAB member Mr. Steve Sprugas asked for clarification on Mr. Moss' mention of public comments received concerning the Army's position not to clean up the groundwater contamination at the site. A discussion about what laws would apply in determining whether the Army acquired liability of the plume followed. Mr. Houston said the Army will cooperate with cleanup that takes place.

Following the Orion Park update, Mr. Moss introduced Mr. Darren Newton, Navy Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Environmental Coordinator (BEC).

### **BEC Introduction**

Mr. Newton reviewed the remainder of the agenda. He provided project contact information for the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (Water Board), EPA, National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), and local planning commissions. Mr. Newton said a Hangar 1 update will be provided at each RAB meeting.

### **ANNOUNCEMENTS/REVIEW OF ACTION ITEMS**

Mr. Newton provided the following announcements and review of action items.

- U.S. Army Combat Support Training Center: The Army will make a presentation about the proposed Combat Support Training Center on Orion Park at the 08 November 2007 RAB meeting.
- MEW Companies Focused Feasibility Study: The Navy is participating in the regional groundwater plume Focused Feasibility Study with the Middlefield-Ellis-Whisman (MEW) companies.
- RAB Member Excused Absences: RAB members were reminded to call one of the RAB co-chairs for an excused absence if they are unable to attend a RAB meeting.
- Information Repository Update: At the previous RAB meeting, RAB member Mr. Arthur Schwartz expressed interest in establishing an information repository at the Sunnyvale Public Library. Mr. Newton asked Mr. Schwartz to provide an update. Mr. Schwartz said he contacted the Sunnyvale library and was told the library would need to contact the Mountain View Public Library because the Mountain View library is listed as the information repository location. He is currently waiting to hear back from the Sunnyvale library.
- Site 27 Property Lines Map: At the previous RAB meeting, RAB member Ms. Libby Lucas requested an illustration of the Site 27 property lines. Mr. Newton displayed two poster board maps showing the Site 27 property lines.
- Change in Navy Staff: Navy remedial project manager Ms. Elizabeth Barr will no longer be working on Moffett Field. She accepted a promotion and reassignment to Mare Island.
- 2008 RAB Meeting Schedule: Mr. Newton announced the proposed 2008 meeting schedule (included on page 8 of these minutes).
- Hangar 1 Progress Update: The Navy is working on the Hangar 1 revised Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis (EE/CA), which is not expected to be released before the next RAB meeting. As part of National Historic Preservation Act Section 106 consultation, the Navy met with the State Historic Preservation Office today and provided them with a tour of Hangar 1. Because of the potential risks inside the hangar, those attending the tour were required to attend safety training.

RAB member Mrs. Patricia Guerrieri expressed concern that the public comment period for the revised EE/CA may fall around the holiday season. Mr. Moss said a specific date on the EE/CA release has not been determined; however, the public comment period will be extended beyond mid-January 2008. Mr. Moss said holding a public meeting may depend on the Navy's recommended alternative. Mr. Newton assured the RAB the Navy will consider the holiday schedule when scheduling the EE/CA release and public comment period. RAB member Mr. Lenny Siegel said he shares Mrs. Guerrieri's concern and also suggested a large venue should be selected for the public meeting. Mr. Moss asked RAB member Mr. Kevin Woodhouse of the city of Mountain View if it is possible to book the Mountain View Center for the Performing Arts. Mr. Woodhouse said it could be explored as an option, but would probably require a fee and the facility is usually booked with performances. Mr. Newton said the Navy will look into venue options should a public meeting be scheduled.

Mr. Siegel reported that the Save Hangar One Committee recently endorsed the fabric covering technology [polytetrafluoroethylene (PTFE, commonly called Teflon) coated fiberglass] option presented by community member Ms. Linda Ellis at the May 2007 RAB meeting. Mr. Siegel also said the Save Hangar One Committee has collected about 1,600 signatures supporting a Save Hangar One Committee petition to re-side Hangar 1. Ms. Ellis presented a copy of the petition to Mr. Newton. Mr. Newton thanked Mr. Siegel and Ms. Ellis and accepted the petition. Mr. Newton said Mr. Wayne Donaldson is the officer for the State Historic Preservation Office, and he will be providing comments to the revised EE/CA. Mr. Newton will e-mail Mr. Donaldson's contact information to Mr. Siegel.

**DOCUMENTS FOR REVIEW**

Documents are available in CD-ROM format. Sign-up sheets for the documents listed below were circulated during the meeting:

#	DOCUMENT	APPROXIMATE SUBMITTAL DATE
1.	2006 Annual Groundwater Report for WATS and EATS	July 2007
2.	Draft Site 27 Remedial Action Report	September 2007
3.	Draft Work Plan for Site 14 South	October 2007
4.	Final Site 1 Landfill Five-Year Review Report	October 2007
5.	Draft Work Plan for Building 55 Sump Area	October 2007
6.	Draft Final 2006 Site 1 Landfill Annual Report	October 2007
7.	Final 2006 Site 22 Annual Report	October 2007
8.	Draft Site 22 First Five-Year Review Report	October 2007
9.	Final East-Side Aquifer Treatment System Evaluation Report	Fall 2007
10.	Final Former Building 88 Investigation Report	Fall 2007
11.	Site 29 (Hangar 1) Action Memorandum	TBA

**REGULATORY UPDATE**

Ms. Elizabeth Wells of the Water Board provided an update on recent Water Board activities:

- Site 1: Provided comments to the Navy on the draft Five-Year Review report.
- Site 22: Corresponded with the Navy regarding response to comments.
- Site 27: Met with EPA and California Department of Fish and Game regarding selenium at the site.
- EATS: Reviewed the draft evaluation report, provided comments to the Navy, and met with EPA.
- West-Side Aquifers Treatment System (WATS): Reviewed the monitoring report and provided comments to the Navy.
- Building 88: Reviewed the monitoring report and provided comments to the Navy.
- Focused Feasibility Study: The Water Board is participating in the MEW companies Focused Feasibility Study.
- Building 27 fuel components and select underground storage tanks (USTs): Reviewed and finalized the Work Plan to conduct an investigation of Building 27 fuel components and pipelines. The Water Board is working on closing USTs in the area.
- Environmental Assessment for the Combat Support Training Center - Army: Reviewed the Environmental Assessment and corresponded with the Army.

- Area of Investigation (AOI) 14 - NASA: Met with NASA and reviewed the report of findings.

The following questions followed the Water Board update:

- Mr. Siegel said he has read comments provided by NASA, EPA, and the Water Board on the EATS evaluation report and asked how the differences between the Navy and regulatory agencies will be resolved. To provide background information, Ms. Wells said the regulatory agencies reviewed the evaluation report and determined the Navy's recommendations were not supported by information presented in the report. Specifically, the regulatory agencies asked the Navy to provide more evaluation of the extraction system itself; to provide more information as to why the system is not cost effective or if there are other ways to optimize the system that would be cost effective; to provide information on what would need to be done if the system were turned back on; and to provide a fuller evaluation of enhanced natural attenuation. Ms. Wells said the regulatory agencies also requested the Navy to look into other technologies in addition to the existing system. The regulatory agencies also asked the Navy to turn the groundwater extraction system back on. The Water Board and EPA met with the Navy on 29 August 2007, and the Navy will conduct additional evaluations. Mr. Newton said the Navy will be meeting with the regulatory agencies on 04 October 2007 to discuss the plan forward.

Ms. Alana Lee of EPA said the Navy's pilot study worked to a certain point, so EPA is requesting further evaluation of why the Navy is not pursuing the technique. Ms. Lee said the regulatory agencies were not in agreement with the Navy's proposal that monitoring natural attenuation was effective in meeting cleanup goals. Mr. Siegel referenced a similar case at Intel, and said he would like the Navy to fully evaluate and explore several options rather than considering only monitoring. Mr. Newton said the Navy is conducting a broader evaluation and is working with the regulatory agencies to develop a solution that will work for the groundwater treatment system.

Mr. Peter Strauss asked why in-situ chemical oxidation was not considered. Mr. Newton said in-situ chemical oxidation would be part of the expanded evaluation. The Navy is currently evaluating additional options. Ms. Wells said the Navy followed the work plan and is now responding to regulatory agency and RAB comments.

- Mr. Strauss asked Ms. Lee why the system has remained off for a long period. Ms. Lee said the work plan indicates that the system should be turned back on after completion and evaluation of the pilot test. Typically this is also regulatory agency policy, but in this case the system remained off. Ms. Lee commented the Navy has demonstrated, and the agencies agree, that the plume is stable. Although the cleanup levels are not being met, the objective of a stable plume has been achieved. RAB member Mr. Richard Eckert said that as long as the contamination is still there, it should be removed.
- Mr. Moss asked whether the Water Board agrees with EPA's position on vapor intrusion barriers and testing of vapor barriers for the Army's proposed project on Orion Park. Ms. Wells replied they do agree.

Ms. Wells concluded the Water Board update.

Ms. Alana Lee of EPA provided an update on recent EPA activities:

- EPA's Technical Assistance Grant (TAG) will be awarded on 01 October 2007 to the Pacific Study Center.
- EPA is participating in the MEW Focused Feasibility Study being conducted for the MEW site-wide regional plume, which includes portions at Buildings 88 and 28, and portions on NASA property. A draft Feasibility Study in collaboration with MEW companies, Navy, NASA, Water Board, and EPA to address the regional plume will be available in winter 2008.
- EPA is reviewing the Five-Year Review report for Operable Unit 1 (OU1) and will be done by the end of September.

Deleted: Institute

- EPA provided comments on the Building 88 report, and the Navy had been asked to address the source at the site. The regulatory agencies and Navy have since agreed that Building 88 will be included in the site-wide regional plume Focused Feasibility Study.
- EPA is preparing comments on the Army's Environmental Assessment for the proposed facilities at Orion Park. The EPA is commenting only on sections pertaining to Superfund.
- EPA currently has no funds to continue offsite groundwater investigations, but is hoping to receive more funding. The EPA would like to continue discussions with the Water Board and Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) to help determine where the contamination is originating.
- The Navy and EPA have not yet reached agreement on Orion Park contamination. There will be a meeting with the agencies' senior leadership to discuss the issues. Mr. Siegel asked whether the disagreement has been elevated to a formal dispute resolution process as specified in the Federal Facility Agreement (FFA). Ms. Lee said it has not. Mr. Siegel asked if Orion Park is still covered under the FFA. Ms. Lee explained this is where the disagreement is; EPA believes Orion Park is part of the FFA while the Navy does not. EPA and Navy senior leadership are discussing the issue. Mr. Siegel stated he would like Orion Park to be cleaned up and would like revisions to the Superfund law and to the FFA agreed to by the time there may be a potential dispute over Hangar 1. Mr. Newton said he will relay the message to Navy senior leadership.

Mr. Moss said that if a contamination source cannot be identified, then the site owner should be responsible for remediation of the site. Ms. Lee said it is EPA policy that the site owner is not responsible for remediation if the contamination is coming from an offsite source and the site owner did not cause the contamination. Ms. Lee said EPA and Navy agree that there is an offsite source of contamination coming onto Orion Park, but do not agree that there is also an onsite source. EPA believes there is an onsite source while the Navy does not. Ms. Lee said that EPA would not hold the Army or Navy responsible for the cleanup if the source of contamination is offsite and not caused by the Army or Navy. Mr. Strauss said there has been a change in EPA policy about liability of site owners. Mr. Moss and Mr. Siegel cited legal examples of offsite contamination requiring clean up by current site owners, and additional discussion with Ms. Lee followed.

Mr. Strauss asked about the kind of information given by stable isotope analyses and asked for further explanation of EPA and the Navy's disagreement. Mr. Newton said it is his understanding that stable isotope analyses are a form of fingerprinting, and it is the Navy's position that the fingerprints show the contamination originating offsite (not an onsite source). However, the Water Board, EPA, and NASA do not agree with the Navy's conclusion; the issue has been elevated to senior management.

- RAB member Councilmember Jac Siegel asked for an explanation of EPA's authority in the Moffett Field remediation. Ms. Lee said EPA is a regulatory agency overseeing remediation activities. The Navy and EPA have a Federal Facility Agreement governed under the Superfund process. Mr. Newton said EPA's and Water Board's roles are a concurrence process, not an approval process. EPA has final dispute resolution authority. Mr. Newton provided some examples of the concurrence process.

Ms. Lee concluded the EPA update.

#### **SITE 1 LANDFILL – FIVE-YEAR REVIEW REPORT**

Mr. Wilson Doctor, Navy remedial project manager, presented an overview of the Operable Unit 1 second Five-Year Review report. Mr. Doctor explained the purpose of a Five-Year Review report, including elements included in a report, components of the review process based on EPA guidance, and explained when a Five-Year Review is required.

A Five-Year Review report is an evaluation of an in-place remedy to verify that the remedy remains protective of human health and the environment. Five-Year Review reports are required under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA). The first Five-Year Review of OU1 was completed in 2002.

Mr. Doctor provided background information on OU1. In 1997, approximately 23,000 cubic yards of refuse from Site 2 were excavated and consolidated with Site 1. Site 1 and the former Site 2 landfill collectively make up Operable Unit 1. As specified in the Record of Decision, the former Site 2 landfill underwent three years of groundwater monitoring and evaluation of results. The results indicated there were no contamination levels of concern in the groundwater. The Navy, EPA, and Water Board achieved concurrence to list the former Site 2 landfill as a "No Further Action" site.

Major components of the Site 1 remedy include:

- 12 acre, two-foot thick, multi-layer, engineered cap;
- Groundwater/surface water monitoring (12 wells, two piezometers, two trench wells);
- Landfill gas monitoring (four wells, 19 gas vents, 21 perimeter locations);
- Institutional controls, including fencing and cap disturbance restrictions; and
- Inspection/maintenance of vegetative cover, cap, monitoring components, pump appurtenances, and institutional controls. Santa Clara County officials inspect the landfill regularly.

Current Status: The draft Operable Unit 1 2007 Five-Year Review report was completed on 30 July 2007. The Navy has received EPA and Water Board comments, and is currently incorporating them. The Navy and EPA are expecting to achieve concurrence by 30 September 2007. The Five-Year Review report concludes that the OU1 remedy remains effective and protective of human health and the environment.

The following question followed the presentation.

- Mr. Schwartz asked if the concentration of methane is sufficient for recovery. Mr. Doctor said the concentrations of methane are relatively low and there is no collection system. Mr. Don Chuck, with the NASA Ames Research Center environmental department, added that when he was with the Navy, they found that methane is not produced in concentrations sufficient for recovery.

Mr. Doctor concluded the presentation.

#### **AREA OF INVESTIGATION 14 – REPORT OF FINDINGS**

Mr. Don Chuck of NASA presented the Area of Investigation 14 report of findings for the Northern Soil Fill Areas. AOI 14 is located on the northern portion of NASA Ames Research Center and consists of the Former Soil Fill Area (also called the "peninsula"), Building N217 Fill Area, and Building N217A Fill Area.

Field work at AOI 14 was carried out 20 June 2006 through 23 June 2006. A total of 207 samples were collected for 38 sampling locations. Samples were collected every two feet, and borings were completed in natural soil. Mr. Chuck said sampling cannot always be done in a proper line because the contractor may run into an obstacle or blockage, such as a concrete slab, that prevents sampling.

Mr. Chuck described the compounds and the analytical method used for each compound. The chemicals of concern (COCs) are polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), dichlorodiphenyltrichloroethane (DDT), lead, and zinc. He displayed cross sections of AOI 14 and the concentrations of the COCs. In addition to PCBs, DDT, and lead; cadmium and chromium were found above either Site 25 or Water Board screening levels. Mr. Chuck also displayed maps depicting the distribution of pesticide and metals sampling results. The N217 and N217A Fill Areas were found to have concentrations of PCBs ranging from 0.022 milligrams per kilogram (mg/kg) to 0.450 mg/kg; chromium from 20 mg/kg to 61 mg/kg, and lead from 14 mg/kg to 280 mg/kg. Contamination is mostly in the upper four to five feet of the peninsula. Mr. Chuck said the distributions of other compounds (DDT, lead, cadmium, chromium) are described in the report. He added that usually when PCBs are remediated, so are most of the other COCs.

Mr. Chuck said that as part of the report of findings and the sampling analysis plan, there is a provision to conduct additional sampling at N217 and N217A if contaminants are detected. This would be done so that NASA could delineate the site. NASA is drafting a sampling analysis plan which will be added as an addendum

to the report of findings. The next step in the process is to complete the internal draft review of the removal action work plan and to prepare the remedial design. Possible environmental restoration alternatives include excavation of contaminated soil and offsite disposal, excavation of contaminated soil and onsite treatment, or capping AOI 14.

The following questions were answered at the conclusion of the presentation:

- Mr. Siegel asked if all of the cleanup-goal exceedances were for PCBs. Mr. Chuck said the main concern is PCBs (Aroclor-1268 and 1260). Mr. Chuck later clarified that the Aroclor-1268 and 1260 did not originate from Hangar 1. Mr. Siegel asked where Aroclor-1268 would have come from. Mr. Chuck said it is unknown.
- Community member Mr. Steve Williams asked when NASA was considering building a conference center and moved soil. Ms. Sandy Olliges of NASA replied she believes it was the late 1970s or early 1980s. Mr. Chuck said the PCBs were transported with the soil, but the source of the soil is unknown. There were several instances over time of dumping soil, so it is difficult to determine the source of contamination.
- Mr. Siegel asked when NASA will be proposing a remedy. Mr. Chuck said in mid 2008.
- Mr. Siegel also asked who the regulatory agency is. Mr. Chuck said NASA is conducting the work as a voluntary cleanup, and Ms. Olliges said the voluntary work is being conducted with EPA and Water Board oversight. Mr. Chuck said NASA is conducting the cleanup to eliminate the site as a source of PCBs to Site 25, and to eliminate any problems for neighbors of the Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District (MROSD).
- Mr. Siegel then asked if the cleanup is part of Superfund. Mr. Chuck said NASA is not part of Superfund, and explained there are three different oversight agencies, DTSC, EPA, and Water Board. The EPA is involved because of Site 25. Mr. Williams asked what determines who the oversight agency is. Mr. Chuck said that if the area is over the regional plume, EPA is the oversight agency, otherwise DTSC is the regulatory agency.
- In response to a community member's question, Mr. Chuck said the site is approximately one acre in size.

Mr. Chuck concluded the presentation.

#### **SITE 25 UPDATE**

Mr. Scott Gromko, Navy remedial project manager, provided a brief update on Site 25 activities in response to questions received.

Mr. Gromko said the Navy's preferred alternative is focused treatment, to stabilize zinc and lead concentrations, excavation, and offsite disposal. Cleanup of Site 25 is on hold until contamination at Hangar 1 is addressed. He explained approximately 76,000 cubic yards of sediment will be hauled off and disposed of at an approved facility, which could include either Kettleman City, California; or Altamont, California, depending on the level of contamination in the soil.

Ms. Lucas asked Mr. Gromko if he feels that Mr. Chuck's presentation on AOI 14 answers concerns expressed by MROSD about Site 25. Mr. Gromko said he is not familiar with the MROSD's comments she is referring to, but it appears NASA is investigating the extent of the contamination for the peninsula of soil that MROSD has expressed concern with in the past. Mr. Chuck said he does not recall having received comments from MROSD.

#### **RAB BUSINESS**

##### **Other**

- Mr. Woodhouse asked about the status of the letter of appreciation for Mr. Rick Weissenborn, former BEC for Moffett Field. Mr. Moss replied that the RAB hasn't always presented letters of appreciation to Navy staff, but he will draft a letter on behalf of the RAB if that is the pleasure of the group. RAB members indicated they would like to present Mr. Weissenborn a letter of appreciation.

- Mr. Moss announced a newspaper article about a German company that makes blimps and plans to house them in Moffett Field's Hangar Two and provide blimp tours over San Francisco Bay.
- Mr. Moss announced a news item about Google aircraft flying out of Moffett Field and noted there was a report about this on Channel 5 today.

**Future RAB Topics** - Mr. Newton asked for topic suggestions for future meetings. The following topics were identified as potential agenda items:

- The U.S. Army is scheduled to present on the proposed Combat Support Training Center on Orion Park at the 08 November 2007 RAB meeting;
- Presentation by the regulatory agencies about what would be required before construction of the proposed Army project on Orion Park; and
- Presentation on the groundwater plume in relation to EATS/WATS and the MEW companies Focused Feasibility Study.

**RAB Schedule** - The next meeting is scheduled for Thursday, 08 November 2007, from 7 to 9:30 p.m., at Building 943, World Room, Moffett Field, California.

The proposed RAB meeting schedule for 2008 is as follows:

- 10 January 2008
- 13 March 2008
- 15 May 2008
- 10 July 2008
- 11 September 2008
- 13 November 2008

**Adjourn** - The meeting was adjourned at 9 p.m., and Mr. Newton thanked everyone for attending.

Mr. Newton can be contacted with any comments or questions:

**Mr. Darren Newton**

BRAC Environmental Coordinator, Former NAS Moffett Field

BRAC Program Management Office West

1455 Frazee Road, Suite 900, San Diego, CA 92108

**Phone:** 619-532-0963 **Fax:** 619-532-0940 **E-mail:** darren.newton@navy.mil

## **GLOSSARY OF TERMS USED IN THESE MINUTES**

AOI – Area of Investigation  
BEC – Base Realignment and Closure Environmental Coordinator  
BRAC – Base Realignment and Closure  
COC – Contaminant of concern  
DDT – Dichlorodiphenyltrichloroethane  
DTSC – Department of Toxic Substances Control  
EATS – East-Side Aquifer Treatment System  
EE/CA – Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis  
EPA – U.S. Environmental Protection Agency  
FFA – Federal Facility Agreement  
MEW – Middlefield-Ellis-Whisman  
Mg/kg – Milligram per kilogram  
MROSD – Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District  
NAS – Naval Air Station  
NASA – National Aeronautics and Space Administration  
OU1 – Operable Unit 1  
PCB – Polychlorinated biphenyl  
RAB – Restoration Advisory Board  
TAG – Technical Assistance Grant  
TBD – To be determined  
UST – Underground Storage Tank  
Water Board – San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board  
WATS – West-Side Aquifers Treatment System

*RAB meeting minutes are posted on the Navy's Environmental webpage at:  
<http://www.bracpmo.navy.mil/bracbases/california/moffett/>*