

**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 March 2008, 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. He introduced RAB community co-chair Mr. Bob Moss.

WELCOME/AGENDA REVIEW

Mr. Moss welcomed everyone in attendance, asked for self-introductions of those present, and provided a brief agenda overview. On behalf of the Navy, Mr. Moss presented a letter of appreciation to Ms. Tania Fragomeno of Katz & Associates for her role in Moffett Field community relations support.

The Moffett Field RAB meeting was attended by:

RAB Members	Regulators	Navy	Consultants & Navy Support	NASA	Public & Other
9	2	3	3	4	17

APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

Mr. Moss asked for corrections to the 10 January 2008 meeting minutes. No corrections were suggested. The 10 January 2008 RAB meeting minutes were approved.

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.	Final East-Side Aquifer Treatment System Evaluation Report	February 2008
2.	Draft Site 27 Remedial Action Report	February 2008
3.	Final Former Building 88 Investigation Report	February 2008
4.	Draft Site 26 Alternative Remediation Technical Memorandum	March 2008
5.	Final Phase III Petroleum Sites Report	April 2008
6.	Final Investigation and Closure Report for Building 29 and 55 Petroleum Pipelines	April 2008

7.	Draft 2007 Site 1 Landfill Annual Report	April 2008
8.	Draft Building 29 Petroleum Pipeline Investigation Report	April 2008
9.	Final Site 14 South Petroleum Progress Report	April 2008
10.	Site 29 (Hangar 1) EE/CA	TBA
11.	Site 29 (Hangar 1) Action Memorandum	TBA

ANNOUNCEMENTS

- Mr. Newton reviewed Moffett Field points-of-contact information, including the information repository and administrative record locations, and reviewed the 2008 RAB meeting schedule. It was noted that representatives from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) may not be able to attend the July RAB meeting because of a scheduling conflict with USEPA’s National Association of Remedial Project Managers annual training conference.
- Mr. Newton said Ms. Alana Lee of the USEPA is unable to attend tonight’s meeting, so the groundwater topic has been postponed.
- RAB co-chair election: Mr. Newton said the co-chair election will be held at the May RAB meeting. Anyone interested in being a candidate for the position would need to receive a nomination.
- Western pond turtles, Site 27: Mr. Newton provided an update on the western pond turtles at Site 27.
 - Per an e-mail from Mr. Kran Kilpatrick of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), the majority of turtles were captured prior to environmental restoration activities at Site 27 and were relocated to a pond near Marriage Road. Since completion of site activities, the fence surrounding the pond has been removed, and the turtles have been making their way back to Marriage Road Ditch where they have direct access to the Northern Channel. There have been turtle sightings at both the Marriage Road Ditch and Northern Channel.
 - RAB member Ms. Libby Lucas asked how many turtles have been sighted. Mr. Kilpatrick said there were 52 turtles originally captured and there have been about 15 sightings. However, because the turtles have not been marked, it is unknown whether a particular turtle is being sighted multiple times.
 - Ms. Lucas asked if the turtles are able to use the woody debris. Mr. Kilpatrick said the woody debris is usable on the south bank of the Northern Channel, but not yet usable on the north bank. She asked whether the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service or California Department of Fish and Game have taken a look at the turtle habitat. Mr. Kilpatrick said they were present during several NASA tours.
 - Ms. Lucas said she heard there has been a problem with re-vegetation of the Channel. Navy remedial project manager Mr. Scott Gromko said there have been a number of experts visiting the site. After construction activities were completed at the site, the Navy planted California native species. However, germination has been slow because the seeds need a full cycle of rain and warm weather to germinate. The Navy is still monitoring the site and more hydro-seed has been added. Invasive plants have begun to grow back, but weeding activities to remove the invasive species are not part of the plan. Ms. Lucas asked if the Navy would be interested in a volunteer group to remove the invasive species. Mr. Gromko replied that the property is owned by Cargill Salt and Lockheed Martin, so the possibility of volunteers would need to be coordinated through the property owners.

APPROVED AS CORRECTED ON 15 MAY 2008

- Moffett reuse: Mr. Newton provided the contact information for local, state, federal and regulatory agencies and reminded the attendees that all of this contact information can be found on the points-of-contact sheet located at the sign-in table. Per request from a community member, the contact sheet was updated to include e-mail addresses for the Army contacts. Mr. Newton reminded everyone that questions related to 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 Mr. Moss or Mr. Newton for an excused absence if they are unable to attend a RAB meeting.
- Navy Exchange: Mr. Newton provided contact information for the Navy Exchange gas station, which is not part of the Navy's environmental restoration program: Navy Exchange Customer Service, 800-628-3924; www.navy-nex.com.

REGULATORY AGENCY UPDATE

San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board

Ms. Elizabeth Wells of the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (Water Board) provided an update on recent Water Board activities at Moffett Field and an overview of the structure of the Water Board. Monthly meetings of the Water Board are open to the public. For more information contact Ms. Wells.

- Petroleum program: The Water Board is the lead oversight agency for the petroleum program at Moffett Field. The USEPA is not involved in the petroleum program. The Navy and Water Board are meeting frequently to move the petroleum program forward. The goal is to close more petroleum sites by the end of 2008 and establish a path forward for those sites that cannot be closed this year.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

Ms. Sarah Kloss of the USEPA provided an update on recent USEPA activities at Moffett Field.

- Site 22: The Navy and USEPA achieved concurrence on the Site 22 Five-Year Review report.
- Focused feasibility study: The draft Middlefield-Ellis-Whisman (MEW) regional plume focused feasibility study is expected to be available to the public in April 2008.

HANGAR 1 PROGRESS REVIEW

Mr. Gromko outlined the topics of tonight's presentation: Hangar 1 background, structural analysis update and next steps.

Background

Mr. Gromko provided information on the background of Hangar 1, including the historical use of the hangar, how the exterior cladding of the hangar was discovered as a source of contamination, and subsequent Navy actions to remediate the site. Mr. Gromko explained the composition of the hangar's siding and said the siding is made up of many layers surrounding sheet metal. The contaminant, polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), is embedded in the layers of the siding. Any technology used to remove the contamination would need to penetrate through the low-permeable layers of the siding. Analyses completed thus far for the Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis (EE/CA) have shown this to be technically infeasible for many of the alternatives.

Structural analysis update

Mr. Gromko provided background and qualifications information about Exceltech Consulting, the structural engineering firm selected to conduct the structural analysis of the hangar. He then explained that some steps in the structural analysis process include inspecting and summarizing site conditions, building a computer model, calculating input parameters for the model, identifying areas of unacceptable structural integrity, and presenting options and costs for areas of retrofit, if needed.

APPROVED AS CORRECTED ON 15 MAY 2008

Mr. Gromko shared information found thus far during the structural analysis and explained the Hangar 1 structural system. Structural analysis inspections were conducted on 12 December 2007, 11 January 2008 and 07 February 2008. The hangar is supported by gravity and lateral resisting systems and is actually three separate buildings connected with expansion joints. A computer model of the hangar has been built and each piece of steel that makes up the hangar, which consists of more than 25,000 structural members, is included in the model. Each member is connected to the blueprint drawings through a numbering system that allows the model to be tested for reactions from various parameters. Mr. Gromko said differences have been found between the blueprint drawings and the structure as built. These differences are included in the computer model. Currently, Exceltech is “debugging” the computer model and calculating input parameters using California historic building codes. To determine the input parameters, Exceltech is reviewing many resources such as local studies and reports. One such report conducted for a building south of the hangar includes liquefaction data, so the team is able to use that data as input parameters for the computer model.

Next steps

Mr. Gromko explained the next steps in the revised EE/CA process are to complete the structural analysis and incorporate the findings into the EE/CA document. Once the revised EE/CA is released, there will be an opportunity for written comment, and a public meeting will be held to receive oral and written comments on the document. After the revised EE/CA is completed, the next document that will be released is the action memorandum. This is the decision document that memorializes the remedy for environmental restoration of the site. The action memorandum will include a responsiveness summary of the comments received on the revised EE/CA.

Following are questions regarding the presentation:

- Mr. Moss asked whether a certain company’s chemical process to isolate and neutralize PCBs has been successful on the siding sample. To provide background information, Mr. Gromko said a company came forward with a liquid solution that they said could potentially break down PCBs when applied to the siding. Thus far, their laboratory tests have not shown the technology to be successful on the Hangar 1 siding sample because the solution cannot penetrate the low-permeable outer layers to reach the PCBs that are in the fourth layer. In addition, they indicated the solution would need to be applied without removing the siding; thus, dipping a siding panel into the solution would not be technically feasible. Any remedy that involves removing the siding would not be technically feasible because the siding was not designed to be removed from the hangar.
 - RAB member Mr. Lenny Siegel asked if the technology would work for the coatings on the steel frame. Mr. Gromko said that at this point the Navy has not gotten into this level of detail with the company.
- A community member asked whether any radiation technologies have been analyzed as an alternative to address the contamination. Mr. Newton said the team has not heard of any radiation technologies for the hangar, but will bring this question back to the project engineers. Mr. Siegel asked the community member whether the radiation would be ionized, and Mr. Don Chuck of NASA said there may be community concerns with using radioactive materials at the site.
- Mr. Peter Strauss, Technical Assistance Grant (TAG) consultant to the Center for Public Environmental Oversight (CPEO), asked whether the pins supporting the hangar’s structure are coated with paint. Mr. Gromko replied they are, and said PCBs and lead are in the paint on the pins located at the bottom section of the hangar. It is therefore assumed that the pins located at the top section of the hangar are coated with the same material.
- RAB member Mr. Kevin Woodhouse asked whether the presentation PowerPoint slides could be posted on the Navy’s website for downloading. Mr. Newton said he would look into this; in the meantime, presentations can be viewed on community member Mr. Steve Williams’ website, www.nuqu.org.

- Mr. Siegel said an important historical aspect of the hangar is how the structure was built without modern tools. A community member said the hangar was designed by an airship designer and Hangar 1 underwent the same wind tunnel testing as did airships. A brief dialogue of who designed the Akron, Ohio, hangar and Hangar 1 followed.
- Mr. Moss asked for an estimated completion date for the structural analysis. Mr. Gromko said the structural analysis should be completed in spring 2008; however, there is not a set schedule because the Navy wants to ensure it receives a quality product.
- RAB member Mr. Jack Gale asked where the Hangar 1 blueprint drawings were found. Mr. Gromko said they are archived at NASA and the drawings were provided to the Navy.
- A community member asked whether the PCBs found in wipe-samples were of the same source as in the paint. Ms. Sandy Olliges of NASA said the surface was cleaned and then a sample of the paint was taken. Mr. Newton added that the paint is lead-based and contains PCBs. The dust found inside the hangar contains PCBs, lead and asbestos.
- A community member said the Navy cannot take down the hangar because the problem can be solved with more money. The community member said she believes there is no contamination in the hangar and would like another consultant to analyze it. She said the hangar should be fixed; it is a landmark. She then asked why the Navy Exchange had been closed. Mr. Newton replied that while Navy BRAC is not affiliated with the Navy Exchange, contact information for the Exchange can be found on the points-of-contact sheet. The community member later said she does not believe that people are affected by PCBs.
- A community member observed the photos of the hangar's steel frame shown during the presentation seem to present the steel as being in good condition. The community member asked whether the steel's condition shown is representative of the whole hangar. Mr. Gromko said there is some flaking of paint, but at this time he is not aware of problems to the structural integrity.
- A community member asked about the size of the pins supporting the hangar's structure. Mr. Gromko said the pins are six inches in diameter. There are also hot rivets throughout supporting the structure.
- A community member asked how the PCBs migrated from the hangar if the liquid solution cannot penetrate the siding layers to reach the PCBs. Mr. Gromko said the PCBs migrated through parts of the siding that were deteriorating. Once the PCB migration was identified, the Navy applied an asphalt emulsion coating as part of the Time Critical Removal Action in 2003. The community member said that with this new coating, there shouldn't be additional leaching. Mr. Gromko said that to his understanding, nothing is completely impermeable; thus the siding has a low permeability. Mr. Newton said the coating is functioning as designed, but there's been some cracking, so there is some leaching that way. Mr. Siegel added that the deterioration is not uniform across the hangar, so there are some areas where PCBs can escape and other areas that are still protected.
 - The community member asked whether coating the structure again would solve the problem. Mr. Newton said a coating is one of the alternatives being analyzed in the EE/CA. Mr. Moss said coatings do work, but this is not a permanent solution and there is a limited number of times a coating can be applied. Mr. Gromko added that this is because the coating begins to peel itself off after a certain number of coatings.
- A community member asked about the ratio of PCBs escaping into the environment now to when the asphalt emulsion coating was initially applied. Mr. Gromko reiterated it would take a long time for the PCBs to break down to the level acceptable for human health and the environment. He also repeated the siding is not uniformly deteriorating. However, he pointed out that PCB concentration is as high as 150,000 milligrams per kilogram (mg/kg) while for industrial use, the acceptable level is 1 mg/kg. Ms. Olliges said the PCBs have washed out to the Eastern Diked Marsh and the settling basin, so there is the ecosystem to consider as well. The acceptable level for the ecosystem is 0.2 mg/kg.

APPROVED AS CORRECTED ON 15 MAY 2008

- Mr. Strauss asked whether enlarging the settling basin is an alternative. Mr. Newton said alternatives 12 and 13 are to capture and collect storm water. Mr. Gromko said that he believes NASA may have looked into enlarging the basin. Ms. Olliges said that building a settling basin to capture the runoff is one of the alternatives in the EE/CA; however, the hangar would not be useable because there would still be PCBs being emitted from the interior of the hangar. Mr. Siegel asked whether PCBs were being emitted from the interior paint or from the interior side of the siding. Ms. Olliges said it would seem that it is a combination. She said wipe-samples have shown that PCBs are being emitted inside the hangar.

Mr. Gromko concluded the presentation.

PETROLEUM PROGRAM UPDATE

Mr. Wilson Doctor, remedial project manager for the Navy, presented an update on Moffett Field's petroleum program, which included background information on the program and a summary of the program's current projects. The Water Board is the lead regulatory agency because the program is state regulated. There have been 80 petroleum sites closed to date and 50 sites are in progress for closure.

Building 29 and 55 pipelines

Mr. Doctor said there are two pipelines not previously investigated: Building 29 pipelines and Building 55 pipeline. The Building 29 pipelines are located near Hangar 1 and have been inactive since the 1950s. They are 900 feet in length, 2 inches and 3 inches in diameter, and made of metal. The Building 55 pipeline is located near hangars 2 and 3 and has been inactive since at least 1994. It is 1,400 feet in length, 3 inches in diameter, and made of metal. During the pipeline investigations, soil samples were collected every 20 feet along the pipeline. Field work and draft reports have been completed for these pipelines.

Mr. Doctor said there are two additional pipelines at Building 29, which are 3 inches and 8 inches in diameter, and 4,880 feet and 3,640 feet, respectively. These pipelines have been inactive since the 1960s. During the pipeline investigations, soil samples were collected every 50 feet along the pipeline. Field work was completed in November 2007, and the Navy is preparing the draft report, which should be available by the end of April 2008. The draft report is listed on the document sign-up sheet.

Building 55 sump

Mr. Doctor said the Building 55 sump was installed in 2005 during the Building 55 pipeline investigation to remove sheen from the water. The sump was located 10 feet under the ground and was made of polyvinyl chloride (PVC) pipe. In February 2008, soil samples were collected and in addition, the sump was removed because it no longer recovered much sheen. The Navy is in the process of conducting four quarters of groundwater monitoring.

Site 14 South

Mr. Doctor said Site 14 South covers about 1 acre and contains two 5,000-gallon underground storage tanks (USTs), tanks 19 and 20. The USTs were removed in 1986 and contained gasoline and diesel. Previous investigations of the site include:

- Initial soil and groundwater assessment in 1987
- Periodic groundwater monitoring in the mid-1990s
- Site assessment activities in 2003
- Chemical oxidation in January 2005
- Quarterly groundwater monitoring from 2005 to 2006

These investigations found no free product and determined the contaminant plume was stable. The tanks were replaced with tanks that are currently being used by NASA. These tanks are double walled and have double walled piping and a spill collection system. Mr. Newton said NASA is required to test these tanks once per year.

Testing includes testing both the tanks themselves and the monitoring systems. For the past three or four years, there have been no issues.

The final work plan for the current investigation at Site 14 South was completed in February 2008. The plan includes additional site characterization, installation of seven additional groundwater monitoring wells, four quarters of groundwater sampling, data evaluation, and potential tank testing. Although NASA has found no leakage of the new tanks, the Navy may test the tanks, depending on results of the current investigation.

Following are questions regarding presentation:

- Mr. Williams asked what type of reporting is done when petroleum sites are closed. Ms. Wells said the Water Board issues a closure summary letter if they concur with the Navy's report. If the Water Board does not concur, they send a letter to the Navy asking the Navy to address the Water Board's comments. Ms. Wells said GeoTracker is a database program that provides online public access to environmental data. The database program is being updated for Moffett Field documents. Mr. Doctor said the petroleum site reports can be requested on the document sign-up sheet as they become available.
- Mr. Gale asked what constitutes a site. Mr. Newton said each UST has a designated number. Ms. Wells added that some USTs may be grouped together to make up one site, such as, if they are in proximity to each other.
- Mr. Siegel asked about the depth of the Building 29 pipelines. Mr. Doctor said the pipelines are located just below the ground surface at a depth of about 4 feet, so they are not in the water table.
- In response to Mr. Strauss' question, Mr. Doctor said the soil samples are analyzed for petroleum products, which is the target compound. Mr. Strauss said that because there are other contaminants in the area and the pipelines create preferential pathways, soil sampling for other contaminants would better define where the plume is going. Mr. Newton said that other materials would be addressed under other Moffett Field environmental restoration programs. If it were suspected that there were other contaminants, the agencies would discuss action, but it is well documented that these pipelines carried fuel.
- Mr. Williams asked why the pipelines are not removed, and instead left in place, and asked who maintains the documentation that the pipelines are located there. Mr. Doctor said that because these pipelines are lengthy, leaving the pipelines in place is a standard practice in the industry. The pipelines are flushed out and the ends are capped. As the current property operator, NASA maintains the documentation. Ms. Wells said she initially preferred that the pipelines be removed. She said soil sampling is conducted to determine whether there is any petroleum product release, and typically a decision is then made on whether to leave the pipeline in place. However, in this case, because there are about 8,000 feet of pipeline and many obstructions, the pipelines will be left in place.
- Mr. Williams asked about the source of the oil sheen that the Building 55 sump was supposed to remove. Mr. Chuck said a concrete tank leaked. The tank was removed but the soil was contaminated and now the Navy is addressing the contamination.

Mr. Doctor concluded the presentation.

SITE 22 FIRST FIVE-YEAR REVIEW

Mr. Doctor presented information about five-year reviews, background information on Site 22, and the Site 22 First Five-Year Review report.

Background

Mr. Doctor said Site 22 is a landfill that operated from 1950 through 1967 and is now a golf course. It includes approximately 10 acres and contains about 90,000 cubic yards of domestic waste. The Final Record of Decision was signed in June 2002. Major components of the Site 22 remedy include a multi-layer, engineered cover constructed in 2003; quarterly groundwater and landfill gas monitoring; maintenance to ensure integrity of the cover; quarterly landfill inspections; annual reports; and land surveying for subsidence.

Five-Year Review report

The Final Five-Year Review report was issued on 11 February 2008, in concurrence with USEPA, and was received on 04 March 2008. The report found no constituents above screening levels except for chloroform in the groundwater and methane in the landfill gas. However, these constituents returned to acceptable levels in recent monitoring conducted for the report. The Navy recommends to continue groundwater and landfill gas monitoring and to complete a memorandum of agreement to implement institutional controls by August 2008. The Five-Year Review report determined that the Site 22 landfill cover remedy remains protective of human health and the environment. The next Five-Year Review report will occur in 2013.

Following are questions regarding the presentation:

- Mr. Strauss asked how the land surveying is done. Mr. Doctor said there are permanent survey markers in the landfill cap that are surveyed annually.
- Ms. Lucas asked whether any saltwater intrusion has been observed. Mr. Doctor replied that it has and said this is because the former Cargill Salt ponds are adjacent to the site. Mr. Siegel asked whether there is any leaching. Mr. Doctor said there are groundwater monitoring wells in place to monitor for leaching.
- Mr. Strauss asked what the screening level is for chloroform and whether chloroform was detected in the northern part of the site. Ms. Wells replied the screening level is about 3.7 micrograms per liter ($\mu\text{g/L}$). Mr. Doctor said chloroform was detected in two western wells. Levels detected were as high as 7 $\mu\text{g/L}$.
 - Mr. Williams asked when these chloroform levels were detected. Mr. Doctor said it was in 2006 through 2007 monitoring. However, 2007 through current monitoring has detected chloroform below the screening level.
 - Mr. Strauss asked whether it could be determined with certainty that the chloroform was coming from the landfill. Mr. Doctor said it is difficult to pinpoint the exact source. The Navy conducts monitoring and observes the trends. With the monitoring results, the Navy conducts statistical tests to determine whether there are contaminants at a significant amount higher than the trend.
- Mr. Williams asked whether the Water Board is the only regulatory agency involved. Mr. Doctor said the USEPA provides oversight as well.
- Mr. Kilpatrick asked whether seasonal variations could have contributed to the increased levels of chloroform. Mr. Doctor replied that chloroform was detected in all seasons.
- Mr. Strauss asked Ms. Wells what the Water Board concerns were with the Five-Year Review report. Ms. Wells said a memorandum of agreement not being in place is a concern and another concern is operations and maintenance.
 - Mr. Strauss asked Ms. Wells if the level of chloroform are a concern to the Water Board. Ms. Wells said it could be, but this particular landfill has a prescribed procedure to follow. If there is any exceedance, the Navy is required to compare samples across wells, which are located at various

cross-sections of the landfill; do a statistical analysis; and determine if any action is needed. Ms. Wells said the 2006 annual report did not show a significant difference between samples and the concentration level of chloroform had decreased. Ms. Wells said that overall there are a lot of monitoring activities at the site. For methane, monitoring occurs quarterly, and Santa Clara County is present when the landfill gas wells are monitored. Ms. Wells said if the golf course is irrigated, that could be a source of the chloroform. The Water Board asked the Navy to look into this and the Navy detected chloroform in the two down gradient wells, which are the western wells Mr. Doctor mentioned earlier.

- A community member asked about the cost of the remedy and monitoring. Mr. Doctor said the landfill cover cost approximately \$2 million. Mr. Newton said he thought the figure is in the hundreds of thousands for a 30-year monitoring program.
- A community member asked whether the methane level of 5 percent was the highest detected and whether the gas releases into the atmosphere. Mr. Doctor said the 5 percent by volume is the established regulatory limit and the wells have a seal to prevent any release of gas.
 - The community member asked about the ambient level of methane. Mr. Doctor said monitoring is conducted along the landfill surface and perimeter, and no methane has been detected; it is found only in the landfill gas monitoring wells.
- A community member asked whether there has been any thought of capturing the methane and using it for energy purposes. Mr. Doctor said the amount is not of significant quantity to be beneficial.
- In reference to the previously increased levels of chloroform and methane, Mr. Moss said that at least two more quarters of monitoring results will be needed for trend analysis.
- Mr. Siegel asked if other landfill gas compounds are monitored. Mr. Doctor replied they are not; however, before the cap was constructed, an analysis was conducted to determine the volatile organic compounds (VOCs) present. Additionally, if methane is detected at above acceptable levels for two out of three consecutive quarters, the landfill will be monitored for other compounds including VOCs.
- Mr. Siegel asked if there has been squirrel or other burrowing activity at the site. Mr. Doctor replied there has been, but maintenance of the site is part of the program to ensure the integrity of the cap is not compromised. Holes created by the animals are backfilled.
 - Mr. Siegel asked who operates the site. Mr. Doctor said NASA does. Mr. Kilpatrick added that NASA does squirrel abatement on the golf course. Ms. Lucas asked Mr. Kilpatrick if squirrel abatement affects the owls. Some RAB members agreed that it would. Mr. Doctor said the Navy does not conduct squirrel abatement.
- RAB member Mr. Gabriel Diaconescu asked whether it is possible to build a comprehensive geographic system of the area that describes environmental information. Mr. Chuck said NASA has a Geographic Information System (GIS) that has a lot of this information and they are updating the environmental portion. In response to Mr. Diaconescu's question, Mr. Chuck said he was not sure if the GIS is accessible to the public because there may be security concerns.

Deleted: includes

Mr. Doctor concluded the presentation.

RAB BUSINESS

Future RAB Topics

Mr. Newton asked for topic suggestions for future meetings. The following topics were identified as potential agenda items:

APPROVED AS CORRECTED ON 15 MAY 2008

- Hangar 1 EE/CA
- Background of PCBs and why they are a problem
- Groundwater
- Co-chair election

Other

- On behalf of the Save Hangar One Committee, community member Ms. Linda Ellis presented Mr. Newton with 194 additional signatures to the "Re-skin Hangar 1" campaign. There are now a total of 1,802 signatures collected. Mr. Newton read the cover letter.

RAB Schedule

The next meeting is scheduled for Thursday, 15 May 2008, from 7 to 9:30 p.m., at Building 943, Moffett Field, California. The RAB meeting schedule for 2008 is as follows:

- 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

GLOSSARY OF TERMS USED IN THESE MINUTES

BEC – Base Realignment and Closure
Environmental Coordinator

BRAC – Base Realignment and Closure

CPEO – Center for Public Environmental Oversight

EE/CA – Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis

GIS – Geographic Information System

MEW – Middlefield-Ellis-Whisman

µg/kg – Microgram per kilogram

mg/kg – Milligram per kilogram

NAS – Naval Air Station

NASA – National Aeronautics and Space
Administration

PCB – Polychlorinated biphenyl

PVC – Polyvinyl chloride

RAB – Restoration Advisory Board

TAG – Technical Assistance Grant

TBA – To Be Announced

UST – Underground storage tank

USEPA – U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

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/>***