

These meeting minutes have been approved as corrected. Please see corrections on pages 5 and 8.

**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, 10 May 2007, at Building 943, World Room, Moffett Field, California. Mr. Bob Moss, RAB community co-chair, opened the meeting at 7:10 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
12	5	7	2	2	16

AGENDA REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Moss reviewed the meeting agenda, which had been revised from the initial version mailed in the RAB meeting mailer packet. The revised meeting agenda was mailed to those on the mailing database prior to the meeting. Mr. Lenny Siegel, RAB member, asked why the agenda had been revised to remove the Hangar 1 siding option presentation by Ms. Linda Ellis of DGA Architects. Mr. L. Siegel suggested the presentation be added back to the agenda with the understanding that it would serve an educational purpose, not an endorsement by the Navy. Mr. Moss said the agenda topic was postponed because there was a misunderstanding to what the presentation would discuss. Mr. Moss said that if the RAB would like to hear a presentation about how the fabric covering siding option would apply to Hangar 1, the presentation should be postponed until more analysis is done. However, if the RAB would like to hear a general presentation on the basic function of the fabric covering, Ms. Ellis could make a 10-minute presentation at tonight's meeting. Mr. Rick Weissenborn, Navy Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Environmental Coordinator and RAB co-chair, recommended postponement of the presentation until more information about the siding option is known. A colleague of Ms. Ellis' said the presentation would cover an introduction to the fabric covering, its capabilities and past use, and how it could apply to Hangar 1. Mr. Kevin Woodhouse, RAB member, agreed hearing the presentation would be useful. Mr. Arthur Schwartz, RAB member, moved to add the presentation to the agenda with the understanding that it is for educational purposes, not an endorsement; Mr. L. Siegel seconded the motion. The presentation was added to the agenda before the regulatory update.

Mr. Moss turned the meeting over to Mr. Weissenborn who asked for corrections to the 08 March 2007 meeting minutes. A community member's question about the minutes was resolved and the minutes were approved as written.

Meeting minutes are posted on the project website at www.bracpmo.navy.mil/bracbases/california/moffett/rab_mm.aspx.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Weissenborn announced Dr. Jim McClure's resignation from the RAB. The RAB will make arrangements to recognize him for his service on the RAB at the next meeting.

These meeting minutes have been approved as corrected. Please see corrections on pages 5 and 8.

Mr. Weissenborn also announced he has been reassigned and will no longer serve as BRAC Environmental Coordinator and RAB co-chair for Moffett Field; he then introduced his relief, Mr. Darren Newton. Mr. Weissenborn has been reassigned to the El Toro, Tustin, and Naval Training Center projects.

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.	Draft East-Side Aquifer Treatment System Evaluation Report	May 2007
2.	Draft Phase III Basewide Tank Closure Further Assessment Sites Report	May 2007
3.	Draft 2006 Site 1 Landfill Annual Report	May 2007
4.	Final Groundwater Monitoring Well Installation and Sampling Report Orion Park Housing Area	June 2007
5.	Final Work Plan for Additional Fuel System Components at Building 29	June 2007
6.	Draft Work Plan for Site 14 South	June 2007
7.	Final Former Building 88 Investigation Report	June 2007
8.	Draft Site 27 Remedial Action Report	July 2007
9.	Draft 2006 Annual Groundwater Report for WATS and EATS	July 2007
10.	Site 29 (Hangar 1) Action Memorandum	TBA

COMMUNITY CO-CHAIR ELECTION

The attending RAB members made written nominations for RAB community co-chair; Mr. Moss was re-elected and will continue his service as community co-chair.

HANGAR 1 – FABRIC COVERING TECHNOLOGY

Ms. Ellis, a local architect, presented an overview of fabric covering technology and its possible application toward Hangar 1. Ms. Ellis’ suggested approach to use this technology as a siding option for Hangar 1 is to remove the existing cladding and cover the existing frame structure with the architectural fabric. The fabric is composed of polytetrafluoroethylene (PTFE)-, (commonly called Teflon), coated fiberglass. Ms. Ellis described the general benefits of using this fabric technology and described its characteristics. She presented current building and aviation applications, such as the Denver Airport, San Diego Convention Center, and Shoreline Amphitheatre in Mountain View. Ms. Ellis also reviewed the Hangar’s structure and dimensions. She described the fabric’s benefits as applicable to Hangar 1 and that she thought it would reflect the Hangar’s historical appearance. Ms. Ellis said the Hangar’s color was originally all-white (without the black roof) and the fabric covering could also be all-white.

Following are questions and comments about the presentation:

- Mr. Moss asked for clarification on how Ms. Ellis envisions the fabric covering would work: would the Hangar’s siding be removed and then the fabric would be put over the Hangar’s structure? Ms. Ellis said using the fabric without the siding will allow for translucency. Mr. Moss observed that placing the fabric over the structure without siding would eliminate the concern of there being contamination underneath the fabric and Ms. Ellis agreed.

These meeting minutes have been approved as corrected. Please see corrections on pages 5 and 8.

- Mountain View Councilmember Jac Siegel, RAB member, asked if Ms. Ellis has been able to analyze whether the steel would provide enough support to the structure. Ms. Ellis explained a structural engineer had conducted a preliminary review from looking at photos. Based on the type of existing frame, the cross bracing, and the three-dimensional frames that were built in a pattern when the Hangar was constructed, it appears the steel could provide enough support. However, Ms. Ellis said she would be happy to look at that in more detail on behalf of the RAB.

Ms. Ellis concluded the presentation.

REGULATORY UPDATE

Ms. Elizabeth Wells of the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (Water Board) introduced herself. She explained that since she began work at the Water Board in March 2007, she has been reading documents and visiting sites to get acquainted with Moffett Field. Ms. Wells then provided an update on recent Water Board activities:

- Reviewed the Draft 2006 Site 22 Landfill Annual Report and provided comments.
- Reviewed the Draft Former Building 88 Investigation Report and met with the Navy, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), and National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) to discuss comments. The Water Board also will provide an addendum to their comments.
- Reviewed the Draft Groundwater Monitoring Well Installation and Sampling Report for Orion Park Housing Area and met with the Navy, NASA, and EPA to discuss the report. The Water Board is conducting an additional review of the report.
- Reviewed the quarterly East-Side Aquifer Treatment System (EATS) and West-Side Aquifers Treatment System (WATS) National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) reports. The Water Board participated in a telephone conference with the Navy.
- Reviewed the Site 25 Draft Final Addendum to the Revised Final Station-Wide Feasibility Study and provided comments to the Navy. The Water Board is in concurrence with the Navy's selected alternative.
- Currently reviewing the Draft Work Plan for the fuel components pipeline near Building 29. The Water Board also is reviewing the entire petroleum sites program and working with the Navy to ensure all data is up to date.

There were no questions following the Water Board update.

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

- The EPA met with the Navy and Water Board about the Draft Groundwater Monitoring Well Installation and Sampling Report for Orion Park Housing Area. Ms. Lee said groundwater contamination is coming onto Orion Park, so EPA is trying to identify the potentially responsible parties and has sent letters requesting additional information to each of them. A letter has been sent to Caltrans regarding the interchange area where EPA has detected elevated levels of trichloroethylene (TCE). Another area is the County of Santa Clara's vector control yard, and the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) is now overseeing the work. DTSC and the County of Santa Clara have met to discuss additional investigations on the property. The EPA also sent letters requesting additional information to other facilities along Leong Drive and Fairchild Drive.
- The EPA hopes to conduct an additional investigation to further the groundwater investigation on Orion Park. Because of EPA's other competing priorities and resources this fiscal year, the EPA's Moffett Field project team is hoping to obtain funds to do additional work. In the meantime, EPA will continue to look for potentially responsible parties as well as work with the Water Board and Navy to address groundwater contamination.

These meeting minutes have been approved as corrected. Please see corrections on pages 5 and 8.

There were no questions following the EPA update.

Per Mr. L. Siegel's request, Ms. Viola Cooper, community involvement coordinator for EPA, provided an update on EPA's Technical Assistance Grants (TAGs) for Moffett Field and Middlefield-Ellis-Whisman (MEW) sites.

- EPA received a letter of intent for the Moffett Field TAG from the Pacific Institute, Mr. L. Siegel's group. EPA is advertising receipt of the letter of intent and the opportunity to apply for the Moffett Field RAB TAG in the San Jose Mercury News and Mountain View Voice on 10 May 2007. The TAG awards \$50,000 for the RAB to hire a technical advisor to interpret technical documents to the community.
- Ms. Cooper said the MEW TAG was awarded to Mr. L. Siegel's group.
- Mr. L. Siegel said an advisory group has been established to oversee the selection of the technical advisor for the Moffett Field and MEW TAGs. If anyone is interested in being a part of the advisory group, they should contact him.

There were no further questions following the update on the EPA TAGs.

HANGAR 1 REVISED EE/CA PROGRESS

Mr. Weissenborn provided an update on the Hangar 1 revised Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis (EE/CA) progress. The revised EE/CA is anticipated to become available to the public in late fall or early winter 2007/2008. As part of the BRAC Cleanup Team (BCT) process, the regulatory agencies will have an opportunity to review the revised EE/CA before it is made available to the public. The revised EE/CA studies a couple of new alternatives. Mr. Weissenborn said the Navy is reviewing the use of a fabric covering option (presented by Ms. Ellis) as a historic mitigation option.

Following are questions and comments about the presentation:

- Mr. Schwartz said Ms. Ellis' presentation showed that the Hangar's color was originally completely white. He said the reasons for putting a black roof on the Hangar, such as condensation, are not apparent today because of the warming trends. He would like to see the original white color restored.
- Mr. L. Siegel asked if the Navy has been researching the historic coloration of the Hangar. Mr. Weissenborn replied yes.
- Mr. Moss said sealing the Hangar with the silicone epoxy coating that he has mentioned at previous meetings can be done in an all-white material to look like the Hangar's original color.
- A community member asked if it has been determined how the Navy will be collecting public comments on the revised EE/CA. Mr. Weissenborn said that comments may be made by letter, fax and, e-mail. He added that the Navy will determine the need for a public meeting and the public will be notified through various methods, such as mailed notices and advertisements in local newspapers.
- Councilmember Siegel asked if the timing for releasing the revised EE/CA was because of Navy review or contractor work. Mr. Weissenborn said the timing is due to Navy and regulatory agency review.
- Mr. Woodhouse asked if congressional representatives would have the opportunity to review the revised EE/CA before it was made available to the public. Mr. Weissenborn replied that no advance copies of the EE/CA would be distributed, however the document would be available to all members of the public, including congressional representatives.
- Mr. Moss asked if there was a firm date when a remedial action would need to be taken. Mr. Weissenborn said there is no firm date; however, the Navy anticipates remedial action would occur in 2008.

Mr. Weissenborn concluded the presentation.

SITE 25 STATUS UPDATE

Mr. Scott Gromko, Navy Remedial Project Manager, presented an update on Site 25. Site 25 collects storm water from the west side of the runways. Past activities at the facility produced contaminants which were carried by storm water and deposited in the sediment at the site. NASA and the Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District (MROSD) are the property owners, with NASA owning the majority of the property. Mr. Gromko described the current and planned land uses of the site: seasonal wetland (current use), tidal marsh (planned use by MROSD), and managed pond (planned use by NASA). The different land uses determine the habitats. The most recent document released for the site is the Site 25 Draft Final Feasibility Study Addendum which was issued on 06 April 2007. Currently, the Navy is reviewing minor comments from the regulatory agencies. A Final Feasibility Study Addendum will then be issued.

Within the Feasibility Study four cleanup alternatives were evaluated. These alternatives were compared against seven of the nine National Contingency Plan (NCP) Criteria. Mr. Gromko listed the alternatives evaluated and explained the basis of the NCP evaluation criteria. Alternative 3 (focused in situ/ex situ treatment, excavation, off-site disposal, restoration, and ecological monitoring) is the Navy's recommended alternative, and it satisfies cleanup goals to establish tidal marsh habitat, which is the most conservative approach (allowing for all habitats and land uses). The next steps in the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) process are to: issue a final feasibility study, prepare a proposed plan and hold a public meeting, and prepare a record of decision, remedial design, and remedial action.

Following are questions and comments about the presentation:

- Councilmember Siegel asked if the remaining steps to complete the remedial action are funded and asked how the Navy knows how much the costs would be. Mr. Gromko said the remedial action is funded. The budget is evaluated in the feasibility study, which analyzes costs for each alternative within a -30/+50 range. The cost of remediation estimated for each alternative is a "balancing criteria" in determining the recommended alternative.
- In response to RAB member Ms. Libby Lucas' question, Mr. Gromko said that the Navy is not the property owner and would not turn the site into a tidal marsh (the site would not act as a tidal marsh after cleanup). If the property owners choose, they would have the responsibility of converting the site to tidal marsh. The Navy is planning to clean up the site to a safe level that is suitable for a tidal marsh ecosystem.
- Mr. Moss asked who would pay for preventing intermixing of the water from the two sites if MROSD converted the site to tidal marsh and the Navy still wanted to have the site retained as a wetland or other water source. Mr. Gromko replied this would be the responsibility of the property owners (NASA or MROSD).
- Mr. Don Chuck, NASA, said the Army Corps of Engineers and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service are looking at constructing a levy to separate the two properties for tidal restoration.
- Mr. L. Siegel asked if it would be possible to clean up Site 25 before the Hangar was remediated if it were determined that NASA's settling basin was trapping contamination migrating from Hangar 1. Mr. Gromko responded this would not be possible even if there is some kind of mitigation measure in place. He said the Navy, under guidance, does not remediate contaminated sediment sites if there are known upstream sources. (The contamination of Hangar 1 is a known upstream source.) Mr. Weissenborn added that this is a Navy policy and he believes it is an EPA policy as well. Mr. Weissenborn said that even if the settling basin were to capture all the contamination, there is still the possibility of migration. Mr. L. Siegel asked that any decision to halt remediation of Site 25 because of Hangar 1 remediation be fairly justified since NASA's settling basin is working and Site 25 is not becoming re-contaminated. Mr. Chuck explained the settling basin works most of the time, but can overflow with heavy rain. There have been past incidences where overflow cleanups were done.

Deleted: stopping

Deleted: various site uses chosen by the property owners.

Deleted: protect Moffett Field from the Bay

These meeting minutes have been approved as corrected. Please see corrections on pages 5 and 8.

- Mr. Moss said it seems reasonable that with regular monitoring and settling basins, contamination could be detected before it reached Site 25. He observed it seems excessive that no action will be taken until Hangar 1 is remediated. Mr. Moss requested that regular monitoring be conducted.
- In response to Mr. Moss' statement about the settling basins and the increased amount of PCBs found closer to the Hangar, Mr. Chuck said the basins do not stop water from escaping. Polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) could still migrate, and PCBs are being found in the settling basin during the basin clean out.
- A community member asked if there are other upland sources of contamination to Site 25. Mr. Gromko said there were a few sources where PCB transformers were formerly located, owned by both the Navy and NASA. NASA has remediated the known sources from their past operations and the Navy plans to address theirs during the Site 25 Remedial Action. However, Hangar 1 is the biggest known upland source of contamination to Site 25.

Mr. Gromko concluded the presentation.

MOFFETT FIELD REMEDIATION ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Mr. Weissenborn reviewed the status of Moffett Field sites, providing an overview of remediation accomplishments for petroleum sites, CERCLA sites, and No Further Action sites; including current status, regulator involvement, community involvement, and benefits. Mr. Weissenborn emphasized the community has had the opportunity to comment on Navy plans during the environmental restoration process. All environmental documents have been made available to the public and there have been open houses, public meetings, and discussions at RAB meetings.

- Of the 161 petroleum sites, 47 percent are closed and 32 percent are "closure-in-progress" sites. The Navy is currently working with the Water Board to close the closure-in-progress sites.
- Mr. Weissenborn said there are approximately 8,500 feet of fuel piping that have not been used for 60 years. The Navy is in the process of evaluating the pipeline for the presence or absence of contamination. The Navy, in coordination with Water Board and Santa Clara County Department of Environmental Health is finalizing the Work Plan.
- The Navy is preparing a work plan for Site 14 South. The Navy is also pressure testing the pipelines and tanks for leaks at this site. This will allow the Navy to address any contamination that is present. They will continue to coordinate with the Water Board to determine the next steps.
- CERCLA sites include Site 1 Landfill, Site 22 Golf Course Landfill, Site 25 Storm Water Retention, Site 26 EATS, Site 27 Northern Channel, Site 28 WATS, and Site 29 Hangar 1. While Moffett Community Housing and Basewide Groundwater Monitoring have CERCLA contaminants, these two programs are not considered Navy Installation Restoration sites. Of the CERCLA sites, 81 percent (17 of 21) are closed or closure-in-progress.
 - Site 1: Site 1 is undergoing long-term monitoring and maintenance; reports are prepared annually. The Navy strives to achieve concurrence with regulatory agencies on all documents prepared. Through work at the site, squirrel impacts to the landfill have been minimized and raptor perches have been installed.
 - Site 22: The golf course landfill is undergoing monitoring and maintenance; reports are composed annually. The Navy is resolving regulator comments on the long-term operations and maintenance plan. Work on this site has led to squirrel impacts being minimized. The Navy has planted native California trees at the site.
 - Site 26 EATS: While groundwater monitoring is still being conducted, EATS has been turned off to evaluate cleanup options. Monitoring conducted since December 2003 shows that the plume is stable. The Interim EATS Evaluation Report was submitted in August 2006; and the Navy is

preparing the Draft EATS Evaluation Report. In summary, operation of EATS has removed 24 pounds of contaminants prior to its shutdown in July 2003, and Site 26 is included in the annual groundwater monitoring program at Moffett Field.

- Site 27: The Navy is preparing a draft remedial action report. It is scheduled to be available in July 2007. Collaboration with regulatory agencies resulted in remediation being completed in January 2007. The Navy has removed 65,000 cubic yards of contaminated sediment. As a result of remediation, there is now habitat for the western pond turtle and other species. The project also increased storm water capacity and improved accessibility of the northern berm. The Navy is planning to replant vegetation along the channel. The first hydro-seeding did not germinate in all areas as a result of the cold weather, so the Navy will re-hydro-seed and is evaluating watering options.
- Site 28 WATS: The Navy submitted the Draft Building 88 Investigation Report in July and is currently resolving regulatory comments. WATS has removed 3,700 pounds of contaminants through March 2007. Site 28 is included in the annual groundwater monitoring program for Moffett Field.
- Site 29 Hangar 1: The EE/CA for Hangar 1 is being revised, and comments received for the original EE/CA will be considered in this version. There have been a lot of community involvement opportunities, including one public meeting, a workshop, and three open houses. There have also been numerous discussions at RAB meetings, and three informational updates have been prepared and distributed. The Navy has been in discussions with the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) and plans to meet with the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO).
- Moffett Community Housing: Although not a CERCLA site, Moffett Community Housing has CERCLA contaminants in the groundwater. The Navy is revising the Draft Groundwater Monitoring Well Installation and Sampling Report based on regulatory agency comments received. Orion Park is vacant.
- Basewide groundwater monitoring: The Navy collects water-level measurements of over 400 wells semi-annually, and samples over 150 wells annually to monitor the groundwater. In addition, MEW, NASA, and the Navy conduct annual sampling of 1,200 wells simultaneously in one day. These data are presented in the Annual Groundwater Report for WATS and EATS.
- No Further Action sites include Site 23 (Golf Course Fill Area), weapon storage bunkers, upland soils, and Stationwide Remedial Investigation Human Health Risk Assessment Exposure Areas 4090 and 4158. The Navy received concurrence from the regulatory agencies on No Further Action sites. There is continued land use on these sites.
- Throughout Moffett Field remediation activities, the Navy interacts with regulatory agencies, the Army, NASA, and the public. In the last 18 years, the Navy has spent \$155 million on cleanup of Moffett Field.
- Mr. Weissenborn also showed a map of the remaining sites to be closed.

Following are questions and comments about the presentation:

- A community member asked about the fuel pits that Mr. Weissenborn mentioned when talking about the petroleum sites. Mr. Weissenborn said they are at the eastern side of Hangar 1 and were used for fueling aircraft. The fuel pits are part of the characterization work.
- Mr. L. Siegel asked if the large fuel tanks are in operation. Mr. Weissenborn said they are no longer in operation and are currently undergoing characterization. Mr. Weissenborn said there are some old munitions bunkers just north of the site where the Navy has been able to trace biological contamination. The site

contains a lot of permeable material surrounded by mostly clays. The Navy plans to install monitoring wells in that area this summer.

- Mr. L. Siegel asked when the recommendation report for EATS will be available. Ms. Elizabeth Barr, Navy Remedial Project Manager, said the Draft EATS Evaluation Report is scheduled to be available at the end of May or in early June. In response to Mr. L. Siegel's request, Ms. Barr said a presentation on Site 26 can be given at the upcoming RAB meeting.
- Mr. L. Siegel asked if there was a scheduled date for construction for Moffett Community Housing. Mr. Weissenborn said he did not know; the Navy has requested the Army present an update to the RAB.
- A community member asked if the Army's plans for Orion Park Housing Area have changed. Mr. Weissenborn said that to his knowledge the Army's plans have not changed.
- Mr. Woodhouse said he recalled from a couple of years ago that the amount spent on cleanup of Moffett Field was about \$100 million. Mr. Weissenborn said the figure is probably true for a couple of years ago, but the current amount of \$155 million is through fiscal year 2006. Mr. Weissenborn said the projected additional cost for completion (CTC) is \$78 million. This figure is revised every six months as more accurate cost estimates are obtained through feasibility studies and project status. Mr. Woodhouse asked if the \$78 million includes remediation of Hangar 1. Mr. Weissenborn replied yes, however, the CTC will be revised once the revised EE/CA is completed. The \$78 million also includes 25 years of groundwater monitoring for sites 1, 22, 26, and 28.
- Mr. Gabriel Diaconescu, RAB member, asked how many years were left to clean up Moffett Field. Mr. Weissenborn replied there is a lot of groundwater contamination, inclusive of the MEW plume. Remediation of the groundwater through a pump and treat system could take more than 200 years.
- Mr. L. Siegel asked about the major excavation near the commissary that was done in the 1990s. Mr. Chuck said 10 tanks were removed from the commissary area; the large storage tanks were part of Site 5. The excavation involved about 75,000 cubic yards of soil, which is now foundation material for Site 1.
- Mr. Diaconescu said the Moffett Field Remediation Accomplishments presentation is impressive. He said this type of comprehensive presentation is needed once in a while to help the community understand the big picture. Mr. Weissenborn suggested an overview presentation be done every November to review site accomplishments and status.

Mr. Weissenborn concluded the presentation.

RAB BUSINESS

RAB Related Announcements

Announcements can be found on page 1 of these meeting minutes.

To honor Dr. McClure's and Mr. Weissenborn's service on the RAB, Mr. L. Siegel moved to commend Dr. McClure and Mr. Weissenborn for their service and present a certificate of appreciation at the next RAB meeting. Mr. Schwartz seconded the motion. A certificate of appreciation will be presented to Dr. McClure and Mr. Weissenborn; Mr. Moss will email the text for the certificate.

Deleted: his

RAB Schedule - The next meeting is scheduled for Thursday, 12 July 2007, from 7 to 9:30 p.m., at Building 943, World Room, Moffett Field, Calif.

The RAB meeting schedule for the remainder of 2007 is as follows:

- 12 July 2007
- 13 Sept 2007
- 8 Nov 2007

These meeting minutes have been approved as corrected. Please see corrections on pages 5 and 8.

Future RAB Topics – The following topics were identified as potential agenda items:

- Army presentation on Orion Park
- EATS Evaluation Report and status
- Hangar 1 revised EE/CA progress
- Recognition for Dr. McClure's service as a RAB member

Adjourn – The meeting was adjourned at 9:05 p.m., and Mr. Weissenborn thanked everyone for attending.

Mr. Weissenborn's position has been reassigned to Mr. Darren Newton. 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

ACHP – Advisory Council on Historic Preservation

BRAC – Base Realignment and Closure

CERCLA – Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act

CTC – Cost for completion

DTSC – Department of Toxic Substances Control

EATS – East-Side Aquifer Treatment System

EE/CA – Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis

EPA – U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

MEW – Middlefield-Ellis-Whisman

MROSD – Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District

NAS – Naval Air Station

NASA – National Aeronautics and Space Administration

NCP – National Contingency Plan

PCBs – Polychlorinated biphenyls

PTFE – Polytetrafluoroethylene

RAB – Restoration Advisory Board

SHPO – State Historic Preservation Office

TAG – Technical Assistance Grant

TCE – Trichloroethylene

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/>