

FINAL

**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, 08 November 2007, at Building 943, World Room, Moffett Field, California. Mr. Darren Newton, U.S. Navy Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Environmental Coordinator (BEC) and RAB co-chair, opened the meeting at 7:10 p.m.

WELCOME

Mr. Newton introduced himself, welcomed everyone in attendance, and provided a brief agenda overview. He distributed a project contact information sheet with point-of-contact information for local, state, and federal agency representatives of Moffett Field. The point-of-contacts listed should be contacted for any questions related to redevelopment at Moffett Field. Mr. Newton introduced Ms. Julie Crosby, a new Navy remedial project manager, and welcomed Mr. Bob Moss, RAB community co-chair, to lead the subsequent agenda topics.

Mr. Moss 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
13	3	3	3	2	24

AGENDA REVIEW

Mr. Moss said there is an increase in current and proposed Moffett Field activities and redevelopment projects, which could impact Moffett Field and cleanup activities in the coming years. Mr. Newton referenced the project contact information sheet he distributed that lists who to contact about redevelopment at Moffett Field. Questions outside the Navy's installation restoration program should be directed to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's (NASA's) public affairs officer Michael Mewhinney (michael.mewhinney@nasa.gov; 650-604-3937). Mr. Newton also listed project contact information for city and county planning commissions as well as U.S. Army, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (Water Board), and other NASA contacts.

APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

Mr. Moss asked for corrections to the 13 September 2007 meeting minutes. Mr. Peter Strauss, Technical Assistance Grant (TAG) consultant to the Center for Public Environmental Oversight (CPEO) provided a correction to the meeting minutes: the reference to "Pacific Institute" should be corrected to "Pacific Study Center." The 13 September 2007 meeting minutes were corrected as follows:

- Page 4, EPA Regulatory Update, first bullet: EPA's Technical Assistance Grant (TAG) will be awarded on 01 October 2007 to the Pacific Study Center.

The 13 September 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/.

FINAL ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Newton reviewed the remainder of the agenda and the proposed 2008 RAB meeting schedule. The 2008 meeting schedule was approved by the RAB members and can be found on Page 9 of these minutes.

Mr. Newton provided the following announcements.

- Site 22: The 2007 Draft First Five-Year Review Report is in preparation. The document will be finalized in January 2008.
- Site 1: The 2007 Operable Unit 1 Second Five-Year Review Report was finalized on 30 September 2007.
- Orion Park: Community comments on the redevelopment of Orion Park should be directed to the Army:
 - Mr. Gary Houston, Installation Environmental Chief, Fort Hunter Liggett, 831-386-2763.
 - Ms. Amy Phillips, Public Affairs Officer, Combat Support Training Center, 925-875-4298.
 - Mr. John Love, Executive Environmental Manager, Army Reserve Installations Directorate, 703-601-2537; lovejb@hqda.army.mil.
- Google/Moffett Reuse: Community comments on Moffett Field reuse should be directed to Mr. Michael Mewhinney, NASA Public Affairs Officer, 650-604-3937; michael.mewhinney@nasa.gov.
- RAB Member Excused Absences: RAB members were reminded to call one of the RAB co-chairs for an excused absence if unable to attend a RAB meeting.
- Site 29 (Hangar 1): The Hangar 1 Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis (EE/CA) has been added to the document sign-up sheet list. The EE/CA is expected to be available for public review and comment in early December 2007. Community members will be notified by mail and newspaper advertisements. A public meeting to receive oral and written comments on the EE/CA is currently scheduled for 09 January 2008. The Navy is currently searching for a large-capacity venue to hold the public meeting. Public comments on the document also can be submitted via e-mail, fax, and postal mail. All comments on the EE/CA will be responded to in a Responsiveness Summary, which will be an appendix to the Action Memorandum. The Action Memorandum also is listed on the document sign-up sheet.

The following questions followed Mr. Newton's announcements.

- RAB member Councilmember Jac Siegel of the city of Mountain View asked which federal entity is in charge of Moffett Field. Mr. Newton said Moffett Field was transferred to NASA in 1994 through a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). The Navy, under a separate MOU, transferred the family housing (Orion Park, Shenandoah Housing, and Wescoat Housing) to the Air Force in 1994. The Air Force later transferred the family housing to the Army. Councilmember Siegel asked if the Army is responsible for cleanup at Orion Park. Mr. Newton said the topic is currently under discussion within the Department of Defense (DOD) Senior Leadership.
- A community member asked why the Army wants to use Moffett Field for its activities. Mr. Newton said that through 2005 BRAC law, several reserve centers were approved for closure and a new reserve center is to be constructed on Moffett Field. Mr. John Love, Executive Environmental Manager, Army Reserve Installations Directorate will be discussing this topic further during tonight's presentation.
- A community member said he has been trying to research the Hangar 1 contamination and has been unsuccessful in receiving responses from the Navy, NASA, and elected officials. He also contacted RAB member Mr. Lenny Siegel for information. In response to the community member, Mr. Strauss handed the community member a document of information. Also, Mr. Newton said he could meet with the community member after the meeting to get clarification on what type of information he is seeking.

FINAL

DOCUMENTS FOR REVIEW

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

<u>#</u>	<u>DOCUMENT</u>	<u>APPROXIMATE SUBMITTAL DATE</u>
1.	2006 Annual Groundwater Report for WATS and EATS	July 2007
2.	Final East-Side Aquifer Treatment System Evaluation Report	Fall 2007
3.	Final Former Building 88 Investigation Report	Fall 2007
4.	Draft Site 22 First Five-Year Review Report	November 2007
5.	Final Work Plan for Site 14 South	December 2007
6.	Final Work Plan for Building 55 Sump Area	December 2007
7.	Draft Site 27 Remedial Action Report	December 2007
8.	Final Phase III Petroleum Sites Report	December 2007
9.	Final Investigation and Closure Report for Building 29 and 55 Petroleum Pipelines	December 2007
10.	Final Site 22 Landfill Operations and Maintenance Plan Addendum	December 2007
11.	Site 29 (Hangar 1) EE/CA	TBA
12.	Site 29 (Hangar 1) Action Memorandum	TBA

REGULATORY UPDATE

Ms. Elizabeth Wells of the Water Board provided an overview of “The Pulse of the Estuary: Monitoring and Managing Water Quality in the San Francisco Estuary,” a report published by the San Francisco Estuary Institute and the Regional Monitoring Program for Water Quality in the San Francisco Estuary. Ms. Wells distributed copies of the report and provided contact information for obtaining a copy (San Francisco Estuary Institute, 510-746-SFEI; www.sfei.org).

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

- The Water Board has participated in conference calls, meetings, and/or document reviews for the following sites:
 - Operable Unit 1 (Sites 1 and 2).
 - Site 22 – The Water Board reviewed the annual report.
 - EATS.
 - WATS/Building 88.
 - Focused Feasibility Study (includes Middlefield-Ellis-Whisman (MEW) parties).
 - Building 29/55 pipeline, Site 14 and select underground storage tanks (USTs) – The Water Board is working with the Navy to address and close the petroleum sites.

Ms. Wells concluded the Water Board update. There were no other regulatory agency updates.

U.S. ARMY ARMED FORCES RESERVE CENTER COMPLEX AT ORION PARK

Mr. Love provided an overview of the Army’s plans for an armed forces reserve center complex at Orion Park. Mr. Love said there are two issues related to Orion Park: (1) the source of the groundwater contamination and

FINAL

(2) future development of the site and protection of property users. To address protection of future occupants from the onsite groundwater contamination, the Army is working with the EPA and Water Board. Mr. Newton clarified that the Navy does not believe there are onsite sources of contamination, however if the EPA determined that there were onsite sources at Orion Park, the responsible party for cleanup would be within the DOD. Mr. Newton reiterated that the topic is currently under discussion within Senior Leadership. Mr. Love said tonight's presentation will focus on redevelopment of the site.

Mr. Love noted the following documents were distributed to RAB members via e-mail prior to the RAB meeting:

- The Final Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impacts for the Orion Park redevelopment.
- Appendix Q, item 14.a. and item 56.a.
- Construction Project Description.
- Conceptual Site Plan.
- Soil and Groundwater Management Plan.

Mr. Love said the 2005 BRAC included a robust transformation and realignment of the Army Reserve. There are two main projects from the 2005 BRAC: (1) relocation of the 63rd Regional Readiness Command Headquarters to a new facility at Orion Park and (2) relocation of the Armed Forces Reserve Center to Orion Park. The two relocation projects have been combined into one project for fiscal year 2008. Overall, the Army is downsizing from 10 regional readiness commands to four regional readiness commands. (The other three command facilities are under construction with occupancy expected next fall.)

The Army is advertising a full and open design-build contract for the first quarter of 2008. The Army will provide design requirements to the design-build contractor to develop the northern 30 acres of Orion Park. Currently, the Army has a conceptual site plan, but the contractor will determine the number of buildings on the site. There will be no residential use on the property. The remaining 40 acres of Orion Park is reserved for other federal agencies that have expressed interest in developing the property. However, these federal agencies must still submit requests and receive funding.

The Army is planning to demolish and remove all buildings on the northern 30 acres. The redevelopment will include the 63rd Regional Readiness Command Headquarters, the Armed Forces Reserve Center, maintenance shop(s), fitness center(s), storage building(s), and guard gate(s). Mr. Love described the two alternatives for this project: (1) redevelop on Moffett Field as enacted by elected representatives or (2) do not redevelop.

To build safe buildings and protect users, the Army is conducting a detailed health risk assessment for industrial use. This assessment has been provided to the EPA. The EPA has investigated the site and said there is potential for vapor intrusion and noted that contamination concentrations have been above levels for residential use. Furthermore, the EPA believes that existing conditions may have the potential to exceed commercial standards as well. The Army will take steps to mitigate to below the commercial standard of 2.7 micrograms/liter³ of trichloroethylene (TCE).

Mr. Love said existing buildings will be demolished and new buildings will be constructed with vapor intrusion barriers and active ventilation systems, as well as other mitigation for the health risk assessment. The Army also conducted soil and groundwater analysis in the areas to be redeveloped. The analysis found potential to encounter contaminated groundwater in future development. The Army has identified what the soil and groundwater management requirements will be and the protective measures to be taken for the site developers and construction workers. The U.S. Army Center for Health Promotion and Preventative Medicine will assist the Army project team to develop an industrial hygiene surveillance program, indoor air quality program, and preoccupancy testing program. Long-term monitoring will be part of the operations and maintenance costs. Mr.

FINAL

Love said the Army is taking the extra steps to provide protection for the facility users and is working with the EPA to fine tune its approach. Mr. Love stated the Army is committed to building safe buildings.

To address the concern over traffic, Mr. Love said the Army anticipates that personnel relocating to the new facility will already be living in the Mountain View area or will come from Southern California. Mr. Love read sections 14.a and 56.a of Appendix Q to the Text of 2005 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission Final and Approved Recommendations. Sections 14.a and 56.a explain the redevelopment and relocation to Moffett Field. The realignment comes from executive orders from the president of the United States.

The following questions followed the presentation:

- Councilmember Siegel asked how many personnel are expected. Mr. Love said approximately 400 full-time personnel are expected; approximately 1,500 reserve personnel will be training on weekends.
- A community member asked if there are any historic structures that will be demolished. Mr. Love replied there are none.
- A community member asked where residents would be housed during the construction. Mr. Love replied that Orion Park housing is currently unoccupied. Mr. Love added that there will be no housing in the redevelopment; there are other Army residential housing projects, and most personnel will be traveling from the area on the weekends.
- Mr. Siegel said he does not believe that the 2005 BRAC Commission's recommendations were specific to development of the northern 30 acres of Orion Park, as such, the redevelopment of the other parts of the property should have been evaluated under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). In addition, housing for workers should have been evaluated under NEPA. Mr. Siegel said that although he supports the project, it appears to him the Army is not in compliance with the law because it is not evaluating all the options. Furthermore, the analysis does not adequately address all the comments made on the draft Environmental Assessment, and the document is lacking the acknowledgement that cleanup is needed. Mr. Siegel said the Army potentially could become a responsible party if they do anything that would constitute a "release" under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA). Mr. Siegel said he wants someone to take responsibility of the plume. Other issues of concern include housing and transportation. Mr. Siegel would like the Army to construct housing, recognizing that cleanup is required first. He said he urges the Army to work with NASA and the city to solve transportation and housing issues, and said he is pleased with the Army's mitigation plans, but it is not enough.
 - In response to Mr. Siegel's comments, Mr. Love said that under BRAC public law, the legal community indicated that there is some latitude in NEPA that the alternatives could be either to build or to not build. Under BRAC public law, the Army is in compliance to address those two alternatives at a minimum. The Army has to develop the top 30 acres because other agencies are interested in the rest of the property.
 - Mr. Love also said the Army is going above and beyond requirements to protect future users of the property, such as building away from saturated zones and groundwater, and installing vapor intrusion barriers, active ventilation systems, monitoring systems, and direct reading instrumentation. The Army is doing all it can to use state of the art technology to protect future users. Data show there is risk for residential use and potential risk for other types of uses, so the Army is taking a proactive approach by installing the protective measures.
 - Regarding housing and transportation, Mr. Love said the Army is doing what it can with the residential communities. The Army has built at Shenandoah Square and Wescoat Housing. Military personnel will have the first priority for this housing. The Army also is working with NASA to provide an easement on the Orion Park property for the possible future improvement of R.T. Jones Road.

FINAL

- A community member asked if the Army could include a bike path from Steven's Creek to NASA Ames in the Army's master plan. Mr. Love said this comment would need to be directed to Ms. Phillips, Army Reserve Public Affairs Officer.
- RAB member Mr. Arthur Schwartz asked if the housing allowance was adjusted for higher rental rates in the Bay Area. Mr. Love said the higher rental rates are a concern for some personnel that may be relocating; however, the Army will be providing higher housing allowances.
- To address Mr. Siegel's earlier comment, Mr. Moss said mitigation for vapor intrusion in the Final Environmental Assessment does address comments made on the draft document.
- Mr. Moss also said the existing groundwater contamination would need to be addressed. He said the location of the new building(s) may negatively impact groundwater cleanup.
- Mr. Moss recommended the Army examine what other cities require regarding traffic. For example, other cities may require the developer to pay for traffic and transportation mitigation, such as providing free bus or light-rail passes.
- Mr. Moss said the number of Army personnel would affect Mountain View housing and there is currently a shortage of housing there. It was Mr. Moss' opinion that building housing to serve relocated personnel is a legitimate mitigation.

Mr. Love introduced Lieutenant Colonel (LT COL) Cushman of the Army. LT COL Cushman commented that the meeting has presented good concerns regarding housing. The Army does not anticipate the approximate 400 personnel being new to the area. The Army is anticipating that members of the local community will get many of the jobs offered. In general, the personnel already live in or commute to the Mountain View area. Mr. Moss asked for quantification of the number of personnel that already reside in the Mountain View area and the number of personnel that will be relocated. LT COL Cushman replied that the number of personnel relocating could not be quantified because the Army does not have letters of commitment. However, LT COL Cushman said the weekend traffic will be similar to what is already occurring at NASA and the commissary. He said the increase in traffic is not anticipated to reach levels that some are anticipating.

- Community member Mr. Steve Williams said there would still be more than 400 personnel, which is a significant impact to traffic congestion and should be addressed in the documents. In response to the comment about the bike path being an enhancement, Mr. Williams said the bike path is part of the transportation infrastructure to bring people in without impacting the roads; it is not an enhancement. Regarding housing, Mr. Williams said it is important to remember that the Army development is adjacent to an airport and it is not ideal to put housing on the property itself since it is too close to the runways.
- Mr. Schwartz said that although employees will be given a transportation allowance, it does not mean they will use the allowance towards transportation. Mr. Love said transportation allowances would be issued in the form of bus or train tickets, for example.
- Mr. Moss said the city of Mountain View and NASA are beginning to use recycled water from the Palo Alto Water Treatment Plant and asked whether there are plans to use the recycled water on Orion Park. Mr. Love said the Louisville District of the Army Corps of Engineers will be looking at all possibilities for utilities during the design process.

Mr. Love concluded the presentation.

MIDDLEFIELD-ELLIS-WHISMAN COMPANIES FOCUSED FEASIBILITY STUDY

Ms. Maile Smith, PG, of Northgate Environmental Management Inc., representing the MEW companies, presented the MEW companies Focused Feasibility Study (FFS). The presentation covered the purpose of the FFS, premise, process, participants, evaluations, and schedule. Ms. Smith displayed a site map and said solvents

FINAL

stored under ground (south of Moffett Field) had leaked into the groundwater. The groundwater plume emanating from the MEW companies migrated onto Moffett Field and comingled with groundwater contamination from former Navy sources on Moffett Field.

The purpose of the FFS is to evaluate the current remedy, evaluate and compare alternatives to support the development of an updated site-wide groundwater cleanup plan, and to propose cleanup standards and Remedial Action Objectives that are achievable and technically practicable. The FFS also will evaluate whether the current remedy conserves resources and maximizes land use, remains cost effective, remains protective of human health and the environment, and optimizes overall remediation effectiveness.

The current remedy is groundwater extraction and treatment. The remedy has been in place for approximately 25 years. The first investigation of the contamination was conducted in 1981 and cleanup started in 1982. Soil cleanup at the MEW site was completed in 2001. Ms. Smith said the pump and treat remedy continues to remove mass, but it is less efficient over time. The FFS will examine more efficient technologies and remedies.

Ms. Smith described the FFS document process. (1) The draft and final study will be distributed for review and comment, which will be a more than six-month process. (2) The EPA will concur with the updated groundwater cleanup plan and will issue a plan amending the current remedy. (3) There will be a public comment period and public meeting on the new cleanup plan. (4) The EPA will make the final cleanup remedy decision. (5) The EPA will document the remedy decision in an amendment to the 1989 MEW Record of Decision (ROD).

Ms. Smith then provided a list of the project team for the FFS, which includes the EPA, Schlumberger (Northgate), NASA, Water Board, Raytheon (Locus), and the Navy. Ms. Smith also provided a list of the extended stakeholder team and other interested parties. Ms. Smith said the project team meets frequently to discuss progress and evaluations.

The FFS will update the conceptual site model, which includes an update of the groundwater flow model to evaluate subsurface flow, an evaluation of chemicals of concern, a volatile organic compound (VOC) source evaluation, and a VOC fate and transport evaluation. The FFS also will evaluate potential exposure pathways and receptors, and will evaluate the existing pump and treat remedy for restoration potential, as well as evaluate its efficiency. Furthermore, the FFS will evaluate existing Remedial Action Objectives and cleanup standards to protect human health and the environment, and comply with applicable or relevant and appropriate requirements (ARARs); identify and screen remedial action options; evaluate retained options against nine CERCLA criteria (plus sustainability); evaluate technical impracticability; and recommend selected options. The project team will work with the EPA to develop the Proposed Plan. The project team also is following EPA guidance for a CERCLA feasibility study.

Ms. Smith explained the remedy selection criteria, which includes overall protection of human health and the environment; compliance with ARARs; long-term effectiveness and permanence; short-term effectiveness; reduction in toxicity, mobility, or volume through treatment; implementability; cost; state acceptance; and community acceptance.

Ms. Smith then reviewed the project schedule. The FFS Work Plan was completed on 31 July 2007, and the EPA approved the work plan on 27 September 2007. Copies of the work plan can be obtained by contacting the EPA or Ms. Smith, or by visiting the information repository. A draft FFS report is expected to be completed by 30 January 2008. EPA comments on the draft document will be received 60 days after submittal, and a final report will be completed 30 days following receipt of comments on the draft document. The Final FFS is expected for approval 30 days following the submittal of the final document. The Proposed Plan and ROD amendment are scheduled for 2008-2009.

The following questions followed the presentation:

- Mr. Siegel said he is looking forward to the FFS process, which shows that the responsible parties do want to look for opportunities to introduce an innovative and cost-effective cleanup remedy. He said Mr. Strauss, TAG consultant, will be reviewing the documentation.

FINAL

- Mr. Siegel also said he read correspondence regarding the Navy's participation in the FFS and asked what the status is. Mr. Newton said the issues have been resolved and the Navy is participating in the FFS. The Navy wants a path forward and an alignment of common goals. Ms. Smith said the FFS is a collaborative effort among the project team and the Navy is an active participant in the project team meetings.
- Mr. Strauss asked if the soil cleanup standard will be revisited in the FFS. Ms. Smith said the FFS is not revisiting the soil cleanup standard. Rather, it is evaluating the soil data and the cleanup process itself to ensure the soil cleanup was addressed adequately to meet the standards.
- A community member asked whether the bulk of the contamination has moved and as a result left a trace behind its path (plug flow). Ms. Smith said there is no evidence of this. The study is underway; however, the evolution of the plume has been analyzed in the past. By the time the initial investigation was done, the plume had already comingled with the Navy plume to the extent seen now. The evolution of the plume has been mainly dissipation in the core of the plume, and there has been no evidence of plug flow.

Ms. Smith concluded the presentation.

RAB BUSINESS

Other

- Mr. Strauss suggested the Army and MEW companies revisit the water reuse study that was done for the MEW and Navy sites in the early 1990s. Mr. Strauss said there is a mandate to reuse the discharged water from Navy and MEW sites, however, the agencies couldn't find a way to use the discharged water. Perhaps the Army and NASA could look into using the Mountain View/Palo Alto system. Ms. Smith said groundwater reuse is assessed annually as part of the regional annual report for the MEW site. Ms. Alana Lee of the EPA said NASA reuses some of the discharge for the wind tunnel. Mr. Newton said they will continue to discuss reusing discharged water in team meetings for the FFS.
- Regarding the Hangar 1 EE/CA, Mr. Siegel suggested that a detailed discussion on the EE/CA be held at the next RAB meeting. Mr. Siegel also requested that the structural engineer working with Ms. Linda Ellis (local architect) be given access to Hangar 1 so that the community can better respond to Navy documents. Mr. Newton replied that the Navy has heard this concern at previous RAB meetings. He said the hangar is a CERCLA site and the Navy is currently in the process of evaluating what mitigation measures they have. Only the State Historic Preservation Officer and federal and state agencies have been allowed access to the building. Mr. Siegel asked what is stated in CERCLA that would prevent someone from entering the building to evaluate the hangar on behalf of the community. Mr. Schwartz said the Navy would benefit from a pro bono structural engineer. Mr. Williams said he has heard that people have been allowed to enter the hangar for educational purposes. He said it appears that these people have been allowed access to the hangar if they are willing to undergo the training and if they know the right people. Mr. Williams said the structural engineer should be allowed to get the training and access the building. He said that time is critical since the revised EE/CA is coming out soon and said community members should be allowed access. Mr. Newton said he has noted the concern and will discuss it with the Navy.
- A community member asked if the German company proposing to house a dirigible(s) at Moffett Field will be housing them in Hangar 1. RAB member Mrs. Patricia Guerrieri said she believes the dirigibles are proposed for operation in Alameda and will only be using Hangars 2 and 3 if there is bad weather or for mechanical maintenance.
- A community member said he has heard there are planes flying onto Moffett Field twice per week.
- RAB member Mr. Jack Gale asked if there is a charter for the RAB that states what is within the scope of topics for meetings. Mr. Newton said there is a charter, available at the welcome table or on the Navy's website: www.bracpmo.navy.mil/bracbases/california/moffett/documents/RAB_charter.pdf. Mr. Newton

FINAL

reminded everyone that the RAB's focus is to talk about installation restoration/environmental programs at Moffett Field.

- Regarding the Army documents for Orion Park, Mr. Newton said he will find out whether the Army documents can be posted on the Navy's website.
- A community member asked whether the housing project discussed earlier is part of Google or Moffett Field's master plan. Mr. Moss talked about the potential Google and NASA housing plans and other redevelopment news.
- Mr. Siegel said the Navy should make it clear that they only will be receiving public comments at the public meeting and not responding to comments. Navy remedial project manager Mr. Scott Gromko said comments will be responded to in a Responsiveness Summary, which is an appendix to the Action Memorandum. At the public meeting, there will be a stenographer to record oral comments.

Future RAB Topics - Mr. Newton asked for topic suggestions for future meetings. The following topic was identified as a potential agenda item:

- Hangar 1 EE/CA.

RAB Schedule - The next meeting is scheduled for Thursday, 10 January 2008, from 7 to 9:30 p.m., at Building 943, Moffett Field, California.

The 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 9:15 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

FINAL

GLOSSARY OF TERMS USED IN THESE MINUTES

ARAR – Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirements
BEC – Base Realignment and Closure Environmental Coordinator
BRAC – Base Realignment and Closure
CERCLA – Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act
CPEO – Center for Public Environmental Oversight
DOD – Department of Defense
EE/CA – Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis
EPA – U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
FFS – Focused Feasibility Study
LT COL – Lieutenant Colonel
MEW – Middlefield-Ellis-Whisman
MOU – Memorandum of Understanding
NAS – Naval Air Station
NASA – National Aeronautics and Space Administration
NEPA – National Environmental Policy Act
PG – Professional Geologist
RAB – Restoration Advisory Board
ROD – Record of Decision
TAG – Technical Assistance Grant
TBA – To Be Announced
TCE – Trichloroethylene
UST – Underground Storage Tank
VOC – Volatile Organic Compound
Water Board – San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board

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