

**FORMER NAS MOFFETT FIELD  
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD  
MOUNTAIN VIEW CITY HALL, FOURTH FLOOR  
MOUNTAIN VIEW, CALIFORNIA 94041**

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

**Subject: RAB MEETING MINUTES**

The Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) meeting for the former Naval Air Station (NAS) Moffett Field was held on Thursday, 13 July 2006, in the Eagle Room of Building 943, Moffett Field, Calif. Mr. Rick Weissenborn, Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) environmental coordinator and RAB co-chair, opened the meeting at 7:15 p.m.

**WELCOME**

Mr. Weissenborn 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
14	4	3	3	3	24

**AGENDA REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Mr. Weissenborn reviewed the meeting agenda. It was approved without changes.

Mr. Lenny Siegel, RAB member, asked for clarification of the asterisked notes appearing in the 11 May 2006 meeting minutes. Mr. Siegel also commented that Mr. Steve Williams, community member, felt misquoted in the minutes. After the meeting, Mr. S. Williams provided his clarification for the minutes.

Mr. Weissenborn said the asterisked notes are clarifications that were stated at the 11 May 2006 RAB meeting by Ms. Sarah Ann Moore, Navy deputy base closure manager. The 11 May 2006 RAB meeting minutes were approved as corrected. Revised meeting minutes are posted on the project website at [www.bracpmo.navy.mil/bracbases/california/moffett/](http://www.bracpmo.navy.mil/bracbases/california/moffett/).

**DOCUMENTS FOR REVIEW**

Sign-up sheets for the following documents were circulated during the meeting:

#	<u>DOCUMENT</u>	<u>APPROXIMATE SUBMITTAL DATE</u>
1	Building 88 Investigation Report	July 2006
2	Draft Groundwater Monitoring Well Installation and Sampling Report for Orion Park Housing Area	July 2006
3	2005 Annual Groundwater Report for WATS and EATS	July 2006
4	Final Site 22 Landfill Post-Construction Operations, Maintenance, and Monitoring Plan Addendum. (Waiting for EPA approval of tech memo)	August 2006
5	Draft Final Addendum to the Revised Final Station-Wide Feasibility Study Site 25	August 2006
6	Draft EATS Evaluation Report	August 2006
7	Site 29 (Hangar 1) Action Memorandum	

## **REGULATORY UPDATE**

Ms. Alana Lee, project manager for the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), provided an update on ongoing activities for the Middlefield-Ellis-Whisman (MEW) Superfund Study Area, which includes Moffett Field. In May 2006, the MEW companies and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) submitted a draft work plan for a supplemental remedial investigation/feasibility study (RI/FS) to address the vapor intrusion pathway at the site. The site begins south of Highway 101 and includes the private sites area. The groundwater contamination from the site has migrated onto Moffett Field and commingled with contamination on Moffett Field. EPA requested Navy, NASA, and MEW companies to compile data collected from area investigations conducted in the past three years, which includes NASA, Navy, MEW companies and EPA information, into an RI report. The due date for the draft RI was extended from 31 July 2006 to 14 August 2006 per request from the participating agencies. The draft FS will be issued 16 October 2006. Subsequently, EPA will prepare a proposed plan and hold a public review and comment period along with a public meeting, anticipated for winter 2007. The RI and FS documents will be available for public review and comment.

EPA provided comments on the draft work plan to the MEW companies and NASA; however, per agreement with EPA, the parties are not revising the work plan, but will address EPA's comments in the RI/FS document.

Following are questions related to the update:

- Mr. Peter Strauss, RAB member, asked if the Navy was involved in the development of the supplemental RI/FS report. Mr. Weissenborn said the Navy is not involved in this report because Navy policy, effective early 2004, states the Navy does not conduct indoor air sampling. However, Mr. Weissenborn expects there will be a new policy in September or October 2006 stating the Navy may address vapor intrusion. Until the new policy is released, the Navy cannot be involved. The Navy is staying up-to-date on MEW project activities.
- Per Mr. Siegel's request, Mr. Weissenborn will provide Mr. Siegel a copy of the policy.

## **HANGAR 1 UPDATE**

Mr. Weissenborn provided an update on the public comments received for the Hangar 1 engineering evaluation/cost analysis (EE/CA). There have been approximately 213 comments received; the majority was received via e-mail. The Navy is evaluating the comments and preparing responses. Many of the comments were general and pertained to saving Hangar 1, and few of the comments were technical. Regardless of the nature of the comment, all comments will receive a response in the responsiveness summary, which is scheduled for release in September 2006.

Mr. Weissenborn said there have been many questions about the bid costs. He corrected his previous statement that this information would be made available to the public – under federal contracting law the Navy can only list the contractor and the total bid amount. This information will be released after the selection process has been completed. Mr. Weissenborn will determine if costs for the various tasks and cost differences between the alternatives could also be released.

Following are questions or comments related to the update:

- Mr. Siegel asked for clarification on the contractor selection process and asked whether the Navy will simply select the contractor with the lowest bid. Mr. Weissenborn said he does not know what the final approach will be since the decision will be made in Washington, D.C. However, BRAC policy specifies the contractor be selected based on best value, not lowest bid.
- Ms. Sandy Olliges of NASA asked how the Navy is going to decide between alternatives within a contractor's proposal. Mr. Weissenborn said this will be done based on technical evaluations and will consider cultural and social issues.
- Mr. Bob Moss, RAB co-chair, said other organizations publicly identify their bidders and the amounts bid, and he finds it strange the Navy cannot release bidder information.

- Mr. S. Williams asked if it would be possible to release the terms and conditions from the request for proposal (RFP) so that the public can understand what the Navy is requesting contractors to do since Navy contracting procedure prohibits releasing information from contracting bids. Mr. Weissenborn will determine if this is possible.
- In response to a community member's question about when the RFP was released and its closing date, Mr. Weissenborn said he could not answer.
- In response to a community member's question of whether both alternatives 10 and 11 were included in the request for proposals, Mr. Weissenborn replied that they were.
- A community member asked how many independent bids were made for alternatives 10 and 11. Mr. Weissenborn said he does not know; all the bids go directly to the Contracting Officer. Mr. Weissenborn said he does not see the bids until technical evaluations are required.
- In response to Mr. S. Williams' question of why the Navy was going out to bid at this point, Mr. Weissenborn affirmed it was the next step in the process. Mr. S. Williams asked why the Navy is bidding two of the alternatives rather than all of them. Mr. Weissenborn said it is because the two alternatives, 10 and 11, seem to address the environmental problem most effectively and extensively. Since alternatives 10 and 11 are most extensive, it is easier to receive a large scale bid and then scale down should the Navy choose another alternative. Mr. Weissenborn affirmed Mr. S. Williams' comment that the EE/CA will not be modified.
- In response to Mr. Siegel's question if expenses incurred by others, such as NASA, will be included in the cost estimates, Mr. Weissenborn replied that they will not be included.
- A community member asked if the historic mitigation options for each alternative are being bid separately since it seems that removing the siding and leaving the steel frame, without replacing the siding, is an option under Alternative 10. The community member said he expected the EE/CA to state what the expected life of the hangar would be under these conditions. Mr. Weissenborn said there are optional components to satisfy historic mitigation, and the expected life of the hangar is not discussed in the EE/CA because the EE/CA is an environmental document.
- Mr. Weissenborn asked for clarification from the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (Water Board) about the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) process, stating there are distinct differences between CEQA and the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA). Mr. John Kaiser of the Water Board said Navy CERCLA cleanup actions are exempt from CEQA, which is a state law.
- Mr. Patrick Williams, community member, said he is concerned that many people are not qualified to speak to the technical side of the hangar, but can comment on the aesthetic side. Mr. P. Williams cited an example of the Murphy House and said the hangar is too important to lose. He also asked if the Navy has talked to the general public about the hangar. Mr. Weissenborn said the Navy held a 30-day comment period on the EE/CA, which was extended an additional 30 days and closed on 05 July 2006. Mr. Weissenborn said any comments regarding Hangar 1 made at this RAB meeting will not be addressed in the responsiveness summary.
- In response to RAB member Ms. Jane Turnbull's question about Site 25, Mr. Weissenborn said the Navy cannot pursue remedial action of Site 25 because of the up-gradient contamination of the site. This is EPA practice and Navy policy.
- Mr. Strauss, in response to Mr. Weissenborn's comment about remediation of Site 25, said he remembered an RI report response to comment that said there is no longer a source for polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) from wetlands because of NASA's retention basin. Ms. Olliges said the NASA retention basin is a storm water pollution control basin and is not 100 percent effective; there is some

sediment that gets through the basin into wetlands. By the time these PCBs are detected and remediated, there has been some exposure to ecological receptors.

- Mr. Siegel asked about the status of consultations with the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO). Mr. Weissenborn said the discussions with SHPO and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) will continue on 26 July 2006. The state Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) requested that this meeting include Navy and NASA. There will be a subsequent meeting with ACHP, the National Trust for Historic Preservation, Navy and NASA. Mr. Siegel asked if it mattered whether consultations were held after the close of the EE/CA comment period. Mr. Weissenborn will ask the Navy's legal counsel about this issue. Mr. Siegel said he was concerned that information from consultations occurring after the comment period could have affected public comments.
- Mr. Siegel then asked if the Navy's legal office has a position as to whether the action memorandum and removal action can be challenged by citizens. Mr. Weissenborn said he does not know.
- Mr. Moss stated that he believed Mr. Weissenborn's characterization of the number of technical comments received by the Navy on the EE/CA was incorrect. Mr. Weissenborn clarified that he could only recall two technical comments received via postal mail; other technical comments were received via e-mail. Mr. Moss restated his comments about the EE/CA and Mr. Weissenborn repeated that all comments will be addressed in the responsiveness summary.
- A community member asked if the Navy considered a treatment system using biological plants as an alternative. Ms. Olliges said biological plants are non native, invasive species.
- Upon request by a community member, Mr. Weissenborn stated the criteria under CERCLA for a removal action.
- A community member asked how much more weight certain organizations, such as the cities of Mountain View and Sunnyvale, have than individual letters or comments. Mr. Weissenborn said all comments have the same weight.
- A community member asked if any party has taken responsibility for contacting neighboring communities or workers from Moffett Field to see if there is a health hazard. Mr. Weissenborn said the Navy has not conducted these activities. Mr. Siegel added the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR) is responsible for evaluating the human health effects of exposure to hazardous substances and said no epidemiology studies have been done. He affirmed the community member's comment that the hangar is an environmental hazard.

## **BUILDING 88 PRESENTATION**

Ms. Elizabeth Barr, Navy remedial project manager, presented an update on the Former Building 88 investigation. The presentation summarized the study approach, soil gas survey, continuous coring, soils and groundwater data, installation of groundwater monitoring wells and investigation results.

Ms. Barr displayed a map of Moffett Field and identified the location of the Former Building 88. Building 88 was used as a dry cleaning and laundry facility from 1945 to 1987. The purpose of the study was to determine whether the dry cleaning facility contributed to ongoing contamination and, if so, how much contamination remains. The study was conducted using a tiered approach which included: (1) a soil gas survey, (2) soil coring, and (3) soil and groundwater sampling. In 1994, Building 88 was demolished, and contaminated soil was removed. At that time, a groundwater treatment system was installed which operated until 1997 when the West-Side Aquifers Treatment System (WATS) was built.

The soil gas survey was conducted to determine where to collect samples. The Navy installed 50 gas probes within or adjacent to the former building location and along the sewer line. Ms. Barr displayed an image of soil gas perchloroethylene (PCE) distribution, measured at five feet below ground surface (ft bgs). Based on results from the soil gas survey, the Navy drilled five borings and collected, logged and field screened the cores. The cores were examined to determine which type of soils would most likely contain residual contamination to aid

with selection of groundwater and sample depths. Soil and groundwater samples, 134 of each media, were collected at various depths in 23 locations. (Including the soil core samples, there were 170 total soil samples taken from an additional five locations.)

The soil and groundwater results indicated there is residual contamination in two areas: the north and east areas within the Building 88 footprint, and along the sewer line at the traffic island. The soil sampling results were used to estimate the mass and volume of contaminated soil above the screening level (residential preliminary remediation goal). For the Building 88 area, there is approximately 2.5 pounds of contamination in 775 cubic yards of soil. At the traffic island area, there is approximately 32 pounds of contamination in 12,400 cubic yards of soil. The groundwater sampling results around the Former Building 88 detected PCE contamination to a depth of 30 ft bgs. The concentrations in this area range from 20 micrograms per liter ( $\mu\text{g/L}$ ) to 1,100  $\mu\text{g/L}$ . PCE groundwater contamination at the traffic island was detected to a depth of 60 ft bgs. The concentrations in this area ranged from 2,000  $\mu\text{g/L}$  to 15,000  $\mu\text{g/L}$ . Based on these concentrations, a dense nonaqueous phase liquid (DNAPL) is likely.

Due to the results of PCE sampling in the Upper A and Lower A Aquifers, the Navy installed three additional monitoring wells in the B2 aquifer to determine if the B2 aquifer was also impacted. The results indicate that the B2 aquifer was not impacted by PCE.

A report of the Former Building 88 study findings will be released 21 July 2006. Currently, the residual contamination is being contained and treated by WATS.

Following are questions and comments about the presentation:

- Mr. James McClure, RAB member, asked why samples were not collected in locations historically known as PCE hotspots, such as adjacent to Hangar 1, and whether this could be addressed in the report. Ms. Barr said she did not know how close the building Mr. McClure referenced is to the Former Building 88, but the Navy's approach of using the soil gas surveys was a nonbiased, scientific approach aimed at determining hot spot locations based on soil vapor gas results.
- Mr. Siegel asked if any effort was made to determine if there was any PCE degradation product. Ms. Barr said the study's objective was to determine if there was residual PCE resultant from historic activities at Former Building 88. Mr. Dennis Goldman, Navy consultant, said the presence of degradation products are hard to determine since there is a plume, so the Navy analyzed PCE as a source. Mr. Siegel said he remembers from about 10 years ago that there was an obvious transformation.
- Mr. Don Chuck of NASA said the Navy conducted soil gas sampling to determine where to do groundwater sampling, and it seems like there are biased results to do sampling along the sewer line instead of down-gradient of Former Building 88. Mr. Chuck stated examples of other possibilities that would show a high concentration of PCE in the area. He will elaborate in written comments.
- Mr. Moss said he was struck by the high concentration of PCE at the traffic island. He said he agrees with Mr. Chuck's comment. The Navy should have done more evaluation and examination south of the traffic island since it seems likely there is another source. Ms. Barr said the report identifies ongoing sources from the sewer leak and Mr. Goldman said the report describes soil and water samples south and east of the traffic island that were found to have no PCE contamination. It appears contamination is coming from a sewer leak and there is nothing up-gradient to the south. Mr. Chuck responded to Mr. Goldman and said he understands Mr. Goldman's points of up-gradient samples, but if contamination stays in the drain, it will not be detected until it comes out of the sewer.

## **ORION PARK PRESENTATION**

Mr. Wilson Doctor, Navy remedial project manager, presented the Orion Park Housing Area groundwater results. The presentation included the housing area history, objectives, monitoring well installation and sampling, geology and hydrogeology, contamination distribution and conclusions.

Orion Park was initially used for agriculture. Housing on the site was constructed from 1941 to 1982. Trichloroethylene (TCE) and other volatile organic compounds (VOCs) were found in the groundwater, and the site has been operated by the Army since 2002.

The objectives of the study are to evaluate groundwater flow direction, TCE distribution and TCE sources. The Navy also conducted an isotope analysis, but is still evaluating this data and it will not be included in this presentation.

Eleven monitoring wells were installed in 2005 in the A aquifer. The wells were sampled over four quarters, August and December 2005, and March and June 2006, and analyzed for VOCs. The results of the sampling showed that the Upper A aquifer has coarse grained materials continuous across the site (i.e., sands, silts and gravels) and the Lower A aquifer has fine grained material (i.e., clays and silts). Groundwater flows more readily through the Upper A aquifer since it is made of coarse grained materials. Mr. Doctor displayed figures showing the distribution of coarse grained and fine grained materials across the Upper A and Lower A aquifers and showed a figure indicating groundwater flow direction for the Upper A and Lower A aquifers in the north/northwest direction. Groundwater flow was determined based on the wells monitored. Depth to groundwater of each well was measured and an interpretation was made based on the height of the groundwater. Although there may be a seasonal difference, samples were collected over four quarters, so the data presented is a general interpretation. However, the groundwater flow images Mr. Doctor displayed were based on a particular data set, not on a generalization of the four quarters. Mr. Goldman said although it is unknown which particular data set is being shown in the figure, the data did not change much from quarter to quarter.

Mr. Doctor displayed figures of TCE concentration distributions along the Upper A and Lower A aquifers. TCE contamination was found south of Orion Park and it was determined that groundwater flows north. Contamination in the Upper A aquifer is spread across the site. The dashed lines on the displayed figures represent estimations of contours. Mr. Goldman said data from EPA's hydropunches was incorporated, but the lines appear dashed in these areas because it is not from the same data set. Mr. Siegel said in the past there have been various maps drawn from the different parties; the various kinds of uncertainty represented by the dashed lines are confusing. Mr. Chuck said combining well data and hydropunch data is not good because there could be a big difference between the two if the sample date is unknown.

In conclusion, Mr. Doctor said the groundwater plume is influenced by geology and groundwater flow. Contamination seems to originate from the south, off-site of Orion Park. A report of these findings will be available.

Following are questions and comments about the presentation:

- In response to Mr. Kaiser's question, Mr. Doctor said the Upper A aquifer goes to 30 ft bgs and the Lower A aquifer goes to 60 ft bgs.
- Mr. Siegel asked if there was any attempt to determine any vertical contamination, or contamination moving up or down. Mr. Doctor said contamination was found to move from upper to lower. The Lower A aquifer has higher TCE concentrations.
- Mr. Strauss asked the method used to create the displayed geological figures. Mr. Doctor said the figures were created from cone penetrometer test (CPT) data collected from the monitoring wells and soil borings, in addition to CPT data collected from previous rounds of sampling, and data from EPA and the Army.
- Mr. Strauss asked Ms. Lee how the Navy's report will mesh with the RI/FS being conducted by EPA, NASA and MEW companies. Ms. Lee said at this point there has not been a link between Orion Park and the regional plume; therefore, Orion Park will not be addressed in the RI/FS.
- Mr. Kaiser asked if the Navy was coordinating with or informing the Army of its findings. Mr. Doctor said the Navy has been informing the Army and will continue to do so.

- Mr. Siegel said he finds it hard to come to the conclusion from these figures that contamination originates from the south, especially since there seems to be high concentrations in the middle of Orion Park, and he asked how the Navy came to this conclusion. Mr. Doctor said the conclusions are based on groundwater flow and geology. Mr. Weissenborn said contamination from south of Highway 101 has, over time, been transported north, and the higher concentrations in the middle of Orion Park can be explained by noting the contamination is in the transport process. This conclusion is supported by hydrogeology and water quality.
- Ms. Olliges said it is reasonable that there is an onsite source. Mr. Chuck said it would have been helpful if the Navy provided concentration versus time graphs. He also said the figures presented cannot be characterized as geology maps. They are more similar to isopach maps. The figures presented look like the sand, silt and gravel areas were mixed together, and the Navy is not showing how water is flowing through these areas. Mr. Chuck reminded the RAB of the regional hydrogeology presentation he made at the 12 January 2006 RAB meeting. The more permeable units seem to be in narrow channels, not in big beds as shown in the figures presented by Mr. Doctor. Mr. Doctor said more detailed figures will be included in the report - the Navy simplified the figures for this presentation.
- Ms. Turnbull asked to see figures from each of the four samples so the seasonal differences could be seen.
- A community member asked what were the suspected contamination sources south of Highway 101, how far south from the freeway are they, and if there are any suspected sources in the center of the housing area where the high concentrations are shown in the figures. Mr. Doctor said the Navy is evaluating onsite sources with isotope data that are not included in these figures.
- Mr. S. Williams asked what was at Orion Park before the housing that could be a contamination source. Mr. Doctor said there was farming; there are no industrial sources, and the Navy is looking at multiple factors to determine if there were other potential sources. Mr. Chuck said contamination could have been possible during the housing construction, and TCE was used to clean septic tanks and tractors. There is evidence of possible sources, and hot spots have been detected consistently.
- Mr. S. Williams asked how far the contamination is off-site. Mr. Chuck said one possible source is the Santa Clara County vector control area, which is next to the south end of the interchange. EPA detected contamination there. There is also an old dry cleaning facility at the end of Leong Drive. An Army investigation shows three detections of TCE at that site.
- In response to a community member's question as to whether it is uncertain of the amount of contamination and its origin, Mr. Doctor said the Navy has most of the contamination characterized. Contamination is supposed to degrade, but migration affects degradation. The community member expressed a concern about whether more concentration is coming.
- Mr. Siegel said his interpretation is that the Navy is trying to show that it is not responsible for the contamination.
- Ms. Olliges said there is not a clear enough data set to evaluate. NASA found that concentrations are continually rising over time, but the highest concentrations are not on the NASA site.
- Mr. McClure asked if it was possible to better integrate the data sets before the report is issued because the isopach maps, chemical distributions and groundwater flow contours do not seem to be consistent with each other.
- Mr. Joseph Chou, RAB member, asked what the Navy's next step will be after the report is issued and asked whether it was a decision document or a report. Mr. Doctor said the report will summarize the data; the Navy is not presenting a recommendation. The RAB, public and regulatory agencies will have an opportunity to comment on the report. Mr. Chou said the quality of the presentation and data is

questionable, and he recommends the Navy present more complete information in conjunction with isotope data in the report.

- Mr. Kevin Woodhouse, RAB member, said the contours south of Highway 101 are estimated contours. He suggested that Santa Clara County and the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) be added to the distribution list for the draft report. Mr. Doctor will include them on the distribution list.
- Mr. Moss said there are some uncertainties and said there are plans for housing on the site. He asked whether the data found establishes the level that can be expected over time and asked what result is to be expected from the data. Mr. Doctor said the report will summarize the data and then will be used to make a decision. Mr. Moss asked who will be the participating parties in analyzing the data and making a decision. Mr. Doctor said it is unknown at this time.

## **RAB BUSINESS**

**RAB Related Announcements** – There were no announcements made.

**RAB Schedule** - The next meeting is scheduled for Thursday, 14 September 2006, from 7 to 8:30 p.m., at Mountain View City Hall, Fourth Floor.

The RAB meeting schedule for the remainder of 2006 is as follows:

- November 9, 2006

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

- Hangar 1 responses to public comments
- Effects on Site 25 from Hangar 1 decision
- MEW companies presentation on vapor intrusion RI/FS
- Army response to Navy's Orion Park groundwater report
- Site 27 update

**Adjourn** – The meeting was adjourned at 9:12 p.m. and Mr. Moss thanked everyone for attending.

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

**Mr. Rick Weissenborn**

BRAC Environmental Coordinator, Former NAS Moffett Field

BRAC Program Management Office West

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

**Phone:** 619-532-0952 **Fax:** 619-532-0995 **E-mail:** [richard.weissenborn@navy.mil](mailto:richard.weissenborn@navy.mil)

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

ACHP – Advisory Council on Historic Preservation

ATSDR – Agency for Toxic Substances and  
Disease Registry

BRAC – Base Realignment and Closure

CERCLA – Comprehensive Environmental  
Response, Compensation, and Liability Act

CEQA – California Environmental Quality Act

CPT – Cone penetrometer test

DNAPL – Dense nonaqueous phase liquid

DTSC – Department of Toxic Substances Control

EE/CA – Engineering evaluation/cost analysis

EPA – U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

ft bgs – Feet below ground surface

MEW – Middlefield-Ellis-Whisman

µg/L – Micrograms per liter

NAS – Naval Air Station

NASA – National Aeronautics and Space  
Administration

OHP – Office of Historic Preservation (State of  
California)

PCBs – Polychlorinated biphenyls

PCE - Perchloroethylene

RAB – Restoration Advisory Board

RFP – Request for proposal

RI/FS – Remedial investigation/feasibility study

SHPO – State Historic Preservation Officer

TCE – Trichloroethylene

VOCs- Volatile organic compounds

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 Web Page at:  
<http://www.bracpmo.navy.mil/bracbases/california/moffett/>***