

5090
Ser 1843.1/7052
December 3, 1996

Dear RAB Member:

Seasons Greetings. Due to many activities during the month of December, please note that the RAB voted to **cancel the December RAB meeting.**

However, the Moffett Federal Airfield (MFA) Base Closure Team and the Community Co-Chair cordially invite you to our next RAB meeting on January 9, 1997.

Our last RAB meeting was held on November 14, 1996 at the City of Mountain View Senior Center in Mountain View, California. The meeting summary is provided as enclosure (1).

Our next RAB meeting will again be held on the second Thursday of the month, **January 9, 1997.** It will be held at the old meeting location, the **Mountain View Police and Fire Auditorium** in Mountain View, California. The meeting will begin promptly at 7:00 p.m. The agenda for the meeting is as follows:

7:00-7:05 PM Meeting Overview
7:05-7:10 PM Minutes Approval
7:10-7:30 PM Remedial Project Managers Meeting Report
7:30-7:45 PM MEW All Parties Meeting Report
7:45-8:00 PM Subcommittees Report
8:00-8:30 PM StationWide Feasibility Study (FS) Presentation
8:30-8:50 PM StationWide FS Discussion
8:50-9:00 PM Agenda/Schedule for the Next RAB Meeting

If you have any questions or comments, please contact me at (415) 244-2563, Mr. Hubert Chan of my staff at (415) 244-2562, or Mr. Robert Moss, Moffett's Community Co-Chair, at (415) 852-6018.

Sincerely,

Original signed by:

STEPHEN CHAO
BRAC Environmental Coordinator
Moffett Federal Airfield

Ser 1843.1/7052
December 3, 1996

Distribution:

Moffett Federal Airfield RAB Members
Karen Huggins, ARC Ecology/ARMS Control Research Center
Eric Ortega, Onizuka Air Station
Maurice Bundy, Potential RAB Member

Blind copy to:

184, 1843, 1843.1, 1843.2, 1843.3, 09CMN, 60.x
PRC Environmental Management Inc. (Attn: Michael Young)
Montgomery Watson (Attn: Chris Peterson)
NFESC (Attn: Maureen Little)
Information Repository (2 Copies)
Chron, pink, green
File: Moffett

Moffett RAB Members:

Elizabeth	Adams	Jack	Walker
Bernie	Album	John	Young
Maurice	Ancher		
John	Beck		
Charles	Berrey		
Anne	Blakeslee		
Dena	Bonnell		
Jim	Burgard		
Steve	Chin		
Diane	Cho		
Joseph	Chou		
Bob	Climo		
Ann	Coombs		
Robert	Davis		
Russ	Frazer		
Michael	Gill		
David	Glick		
John	Gurley		
Jim	Haas		
Thomas	Harney		
Bob	Holston		
Thomas	Iwamura		
Susan	Jun		
Byron	Leigh		
Paul	Lesti		
Michael	Martin		
James	McClure		
Stewart	McGee		
Bob	Moss		
Sandra	Olliges		
Edwin	Pabst		
Michael	Rochette		
Richard	Schuster		
Lenny	Siegel		
Cynthia	Sievers		
Ted	Smith		
Steve	Sprugasci		
Peter	Strauss		
Robert	Strena		
Mary	Vrable		

**MOFFETT FEDERAL AIRFIELD
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING**

MEETING MINUTES

**CITY OF MOUNTAIN VIEW SENIOR CENTER
266 Escuela Street
Mountain View, California 94041**

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 14, 1996

I. INTRODUCTIONS AND MEETING OVERVIEW

Mr. Stephen Chao, Navy co-chair, opened the meeting of the Moffett Federal Airfield (Moffett Field) restoration advisory board (RAB) at 7:10 p.m. Mr. Chao introduced Dr. Clarence Callahan of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and thanked him for attending. Mr. Chao reviewed the following agenda items for this meeting:

- Minutes approval
- Remedial project managers' (RPM) meeting report
- Committee reports
- Presentation: "Site-wide Ecological Assessment (SWEA)"
- Discussion of SWEA
- Agenda and schedule for next RAB meeting

II. MINUTES APPROVAL

Mr. Chao solicited comments on the minutes of the October 10, 1996 RAB meeting. There were no comments and the minutes were approved without correction.

III. RPM MEETING REPORT

Mr. Michael Rochette, California Environmental Protection Agency (Cal/EPA), San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) provided a report of the November 13, 1996 RPM meeting held at the Cal/EPA Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) offices in Berkeley.

Mr. Rochette reviewed action items from the previous RPM meeting. He stated that the Navy had submitted a report summarizing the testing of an oxygen releasing compound at Site 5 to stimulate biological activity to clean up groundwater. Mr. Rochette reported that the Navy will install four groundwater monitoring wells (two A1/A2 aquifer pairs) during December 1996 and revise the operable unit 1 (OU1) technical memorandum to include these results. The Navy will submit this report in March 1997. He said that the Navy had contacted Dr. Lynne Trulio, San Jose State University, about the health of the Moffett Field burrowing owl population. Mr. Rochette reported that Dr. Trulio's opinion was that Moffett Field's burrowing owl population showed good reproductive success but that natural variability among populations at different sites around the Bay was very great. Consequently, Dr. Trulio did not believe that a statistically significant comparison could be made between Moffett Field's population and other Bay area sites. Mr. Rochette added that the Navy will request written documentation from Dr. Trulio. He reported that the Navy's funding priorities letter was still in progress.

Mr. Rochette stated that the Navy's Site 9 source control measure treatment systems were operating continuously during the past month with only minor interruptions. He reported that groundwater extraction wells were producing about 1.5 gallons per minute (gpm) each and that the storm drain system was yielding about 10 gpm. Mr. Rochette noted that the Navy planned to collect the third round of water samples from the iron curtain pilot test area during December 1996. He added that results from the third round of samples would be available 3 weeks following the field work. Mr. Rochette reported that the Navy had excavated concrete and soil to a depth of 4 feet from a 10-foot by 10-foot area at hydrant 2 at the high-speed refueling facility to address a previous discovery of a small amount of fuel. A sump was constructed to capture any remaining fuel, the excavation was backfilled with clean soil, and the concrete replaced. The soil will be stored on site at the bioremediation pad. Mr. Rochette added that a letter summarizing the analytical results will be prepared. He stated that Mr. Don Chuck, Navy, had located the agricultural well near the southern end of the runways. Mr. Chuck reported that the well is flowing at about 10 gpm and that the Navy was collecting bids to destroy the well. He added that an inspector from the Santa Clara Valley Water District (SCVWD) had inspected the site on November 14, 1996.

Mr. Rochette stated that the Navy planned to submit the final design for the west-side aquifers treatment (WATS) system by the end of December 1996. This design will include pretreatment with ozone and hydrogen peroxide followed by an air stripper. He reported that the Navy and the regulatory agencies were

continuing to discuss discharge options for treated water from the proposed OU5 groundwater treatment system. Mr. Rochette said that the RPMs discussed issues related to consolidation of the Sites 1 and 2 landfills. One topic discussed was requirements involved in the designation of Site 1 as a corrective action management unit (CAMU). He noted that regulations that allow use of a CAMU are scheduled to expire on March 31, 1997. Mr. Bob Moss, RAB community co-chair, asked if other regulations would replace the expired CAMU regulations. Mr. Rochette replied that no other regulations would apply. Mr. Michael Gill, EPA, added that creating a CAMU allows hazardous wastes to be moved within site boundaries. If CAMU regulations expired, Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) land disposal restrictions would apply and seriously limit options for disposal. Under RCRA regulations, hazardous wastes removed from Site 2 would be required to be disposed off site at a Class I (hazardous waste) landfill. Mr. Gill added that he would confirm the expiration of the CAMU regulations.

Mr. Moss asked whether consolidation of the Sites 1 and 2 landfills would, therefore, be prohibited if the CAMU regulations were not in effect. Dr. Jim McClure, Harding Lawson Associates and consultant to the Middlefield-Ellis-Whisman companies, stated that, without the CAMU regulations, placement of hazardous wastes at Moffett Field would require the Navy to permit and construct a hazardous waste landfill. He added that the CAMU regulations have historically encountered strong opposition because the regulations were viewed as too lenient toward polluters. Ms. Mary Vrabel, League of Women Voters, asked what would prevent designation of Site 1 as a CAMU. Mr. Rochette responded that the required approvals from the regulatory agencies may take time. Mr. Paul Lesti, Mountain View resident, asked what process was involved in designation of a CAMU. Mr. Rochette replied that the Navy would make a request to the state. The state would forward the request to EPA for final approval. Mr. Lesti commented that rapid progress would be needed to meet the March 31, 1997 deadline. He asked whether designation of a CAMU would require consolidation of the landfills. Mr. Chao responded that creation of a CAMU could occur independently whether or not consolidation was chosen. Mr. Rochette added that a record of decision would be the best framework to request a CAMU, but that other mechanisms could be available.

Mr. Rochette continued his RPM meeting report. He reported that the regulators had received the Navy's response to regulatory agency comments on the draft final SWEA report. He added that regulatory agency comments on the Navy's responses were due on January 6, 1997. Mr. Rochette stated that the Navy recently submitted the draft final station-wide feasibility study (FS) report and that comments on this report also were due on January 6, 1997. He said that the Navy, PRC Environmental Management, Inc. (PRC),

and the Navy's construction contractor, International Technology Corporation, planned to hold a predesign meeting on November 19, 1996 to discuss the OU5 groundwater cleanup design and construction.

Mr. Rochette summarized activities conducted by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA). NASA has issued a work plan for additional investigation of fuel contamination at area of interest (AOI) 1. A report also was submitted summarizing the investigation of fuel contamination at AOI 3. A removal action work plan and fact sheet for AOI 4 are scheduled to be submitted in late November 1996. NASA has issued a report describing sampling results from AOI 5. The report summarizing work at the former Lindbergh Avenue storm channel (AOI 6) is in progress and additional monitoring wells are planned to be installed later this year. Additional samples collected at AOI 8 indicated only minimal fuel-related contamination. The results from this investigation will be included in a report scheduled to be submitted in late November 1996.

Mr. Rochette stated that NASA had reported a release of oil and sludge from Building 191. NASA replaced the pumps at this lift station with new, more powerful pumps. Initial testing of the pumps resulted in discharge of oily sludge from beneath the pumps to the Northern Channel. NASA set skimmer booms to recover the oil and vacuumed out the remaining sludge from beneath the pumps in Building 191. Ms. Tina Pelley, Science Applications International Corporation and consultant to NASA, added that the sludge was sampled to determine proper disposal and that sample results were expected during the week of November 18, 1996.

Mr. Rochette continued by stating that the RPMs had discussed groundwater monitoring requirements for consolidation of the Sites 1 and 2 landfills. Ms. Vrabel asked whether samples from the wells surrounding Site 2 indicated detections of contaminants. Mr. Chuck responded that vinyl chloride and 1,2-dichloroethene had been detected in samples from one well screened within the landfill waste. Mr. Moss commented that false indications of vinyl chloride are possible and that it is advisable to observe several consecutive detections before acting on vinyl chloride data. Mr. Chuck replied that the detections are consistent, but only in samples from one well screened within the waste. Mr. Rochette reported that the RPMs discussed requirements for detection monitoring at Site 2. Mr. Chao added that the groundwater beneath Site 2 is not a potential drinking water source because of its elevated total dissolved solids content. Mr. Moss said evaluation of vinyl chloride detections could be useful for risk assessments. He noted that consultants at the Page Mill site had assumed vinyl chloride was present in groundwater at levels just

below the detection limit at wells throughout the site. This assumption resulted in artificially elevated risk estimates.

Mr. Lesti asked whether the well that had vinyl chloride detections was within the landfill boundary. Mr. Chao responded that this was correct. Mr. Chuck added that samples from all the perimeter wells surrounding Site 2 indicated no detections of contaminants. Mr. Lesti asked whether the well within the landfill was screened throughout the thickness of the waste or whether waste existed below the screened interval. Mr. Chuck replied that no waste is present below the screen. Mr. Rochette concluded his RPM meeting report by stating that the next RPM meeting was scheduled for December 11, 1996.

Dr. McClure asked whether the agricultural well would be logged before it was destroyed. Mr. Tim Mower, PRC, responded that the well's screens would be located, perhaps using a downhole video camera, to allow appropriate abandonment of the well in accordance with SCVWD requirements. Mr. Moss reported that he had spoken to congressional representative Anna Eshoo about the shortfall in Navy funding to clean up Moffett Field. He said that Ms. Eshoo was aware of the RAB's letter on this subject but that she could not guarantee additional funds would be allocated.

IV. COMMITTEE REPORTS

Mr. Chao asked the committee chairs to deliver their reports. Dr. McClure reported that the technical, historical, and educational (THE) committee met on November 13, 1996. He stated that the committee discussed new documents including: (1) draft May 1996 quarterly report, (2) response to comments on draft final phase II SWEA report, and (3) response to comments on WATS preliminary design. There were no reports from the cost, organizational, or communications, media, and outreach committees.

V. SITE-WIDE ECOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION

Mr. Chao stated that questions raised at the previous RAB meeting concerning the SWEA and station-wide FS would form the basis for the discussion. He introduced Ms. Kim Walsh, Montgomery Watson, to lead the discussion. Ms. Walsh asked whether the members desired a brief review of phases I and II of the

SWEA to facilitate discussion. The members responded that this review would be useful. Ms. Walsh stated that the final phase I SWEA work plan was submitted in April 1993. The plan summarized sampling and analytical methods for identification of sources of contamination, pathways of exposure, and types of receptors. The phase I field work was intended to provide a qualitative evaluation of Moffett Field habitats and fill data gaps identified during previous investigations at the OU6 wetland areas. The final phase I SWEA report described these activities and was submitted in August 1995. Results from a data gap investigation focusing on surface water and sediment chemical concentrations also were included in the phase I report. The report recommended further evaluation of outfall areas within the wetlands and burrowing owl habitat areas within upland areas. The phase II investigation focused on a quantitative evaluation of these areas. The draft final phase II SWEA report was submitted in May 1996. The report concluded that some areas posed moderate to high risks to invertebrates and some effects were possible for individual burrowing owls but large uncertainties prevented generalizations for the owl population. Ms. Walsh summarized by noting that the station-wide FS will build upon the SWEA to discuss appropriate remedies for affected areas.

Ms. Walsh presented and discussed questions raised at the October 10, 1996 RAB meeting. The first question asked for identification of exposure pathways for ecological receptors. Direct ingestion of contaminated sediments or sediment pore water is a major pathway for invertebrates. For birds, ingestion of contaminated prey (fish or invertebrates) as well as incidental ingestion of contaminated sediment are pathways. Similar food chain or ingestion exposure pathways would apply to small mammals such as the salt marsh harvest mouse. The second question concerned whether technical experts had reviewed the SWEA reports. A broad group of scientists, including technical experts at the regulatory agencies, have reviewed the SWEA documents. Copies are also provided to the RAB THE committee and the Silicon Valley Toxics Coalition. Topic area experts, such as Dr. Trulio for burrowing owls, also were involved in the review process. Scientists from the California Department of Fish and Game and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service also provided comments on the SWEA.

The third question asked whether contamination was widespread or localized. Contamination is localized at outfall areas such as the northeastern corner of the Eastern Diked Marsh and the outfall from Building 191 into the Northern Channel. Localized high lead concentrations are present in upland soils surrounding some old buildings. The next question concerned whether observations from Moffett Field had been compared to other sites around San Francisco Bay. Information from mud flats, marshes, and saltwater

evaporators around the Bay were used in developing the SWEA. The state's regional ecological monitoring study was used for comparison to ambient conditions at other sites in the south Bay area.

The next question addressed how areas for remediation and remedial strategies would be selected. Ms. Walsh stated that the SWEA considered four different measures of risk and their accompanying uncertainties to provide information to the public and risk managers as they make these decisions. Mr. Moss asked what would be considered a significant risk. Ms. Walsh responded that agreement among different risk measures indicates areas of potential concern, but that the risk managers must make the choice of what is significant. Dr. McClure asked that the risk managers be identified. Mr. Chao responded that Mr. Gill, Mr. Rochette, Mr. Joseph Chou (Cal/EPA DTSC), and himself were the risk managers for Moffett Field. Mr. Moss asked whether different species had different values, for example, whether clapper rails were more valuable than crows. Dr. Callahan responded that during an initial evaluation at a site, all species are considered without regard to special status. Species that are determined to require special protection are identified and then the sampling program is designed to evaluate whether these species are affected by site activities.

Mr. Moss asked whether specific numeric criteria, for example a 20 percent reduction in reproduction, were used to evaluate effects. Dr. Callahan replied that benchmarks can be set. Mr. Moss asked whether these values could be used as cleanup levels. Dr. Callahan responded that a range of effects was established in the SWEA and the point at which minimal effects are observed would be the cleanup target. Mr. Moss asked whether these values would be site specific. Dr. Callahan replied that the values are site specific because factors such as location, receptors, and contaminants are unique to Moffett Field. Mr. Moss asked how benchmarks are determined. Ms. Walsh stated that the SWEA report contains ranges of hazard quotients and overall subdivisions of risk (low, medium, or high) using a weight-of-evidence approach, but that the risk managers must evaluate these categorizations to select appropriate actions. Dr. Callahan added that the Navy reviewed the scientific literature to select information most appropriate for Moffett Field. Mr. Moss asked how the data were presented to the risk managers. Ms. Walsh responded that maps were the most useful presentation tools. The risk maps in the SWEA extrapolate risks estimated from point data (a single sample) to an area to allow presentation of an areal distribution of risks. Mr. Gill added that maps represent a specific chemical for a specific receptor.

Ms. Vrabel asked whether the SWEA report recommends remediation. Ms. Walsh replied that this will be done as part of the station-wide FS. Mr. Chao said that ecological assessment is not a simple process and that the risk managers will study the risk maps and evaluate the uncertainties to develop broad approaches to managing risk. He stated that the risk managers will gather as much information as possible, including public concerns, to assess remediation strategies. Mr. Chao added that the risk managers' evaluation tasks are just beginning. Mr. Moss commented that determination of whether a hazard exists still appears unclear. Mr. Chao said that California Department of Fish and Game staff inspected the wetland areas at Moffett Field during October 1996 and believed that the wetlands were some of the best quality habitat they had viewed in the San Francisco Bay area. He added that the fish and game staff did not observe any adverse effects and they could see no reason to modify the existing habitat. Mr. Moss commented that perhaps contaminants could enhance biological growth. Dr. Callahan responded that organic compounds are known to encourage microbial growth, but microbes were not specifically addressed by the SWEA. He added that the SWEA was not designed to study every possibility, but to collect sufficient information to build a credible framework to evaluate ecological effects. Dr. Callahan stated that the use of Thiessen polygons to translate point risks to areas was an innovation in ecological assessments and the first such application in the Bay area.

Dr. McClure asked whether certain species were identified as valuable at Moffett Field during the initial evaluation and asked for a list of these species. Ms. Walsh listed the following organisms:

- Benthic infauna and epifauna (dwelling within or on mud) — food for wading birds
- Phytoplankton — food for fish
- Salt marsh harvest mouse
- Birds (great blue heron, American kestrel, mallard duck, black-neck stilt)
- Burrowing owl

Dr. Callahan added that the SWEA team consulted outside experts when members of the team did not have adequate expertise in a particular area. For example, the team contacted Dr. Trulio for assistance with burrowing owls. Ms. Vrabel asked whether the benthic studies included organism counts or analysis of individuals. Ms. Walsh responded that both counting and bioassay studies were conducted.

Ms. Walsh continued her discussion of questions raised at the previous RAB meeting. Another question addressed whether information from other associations around San Francisco Bay was used in the SWEA. Information from the state's regional monitoring program was used throughout the SWEA. The final

question concerned whether other areas of Moffett Field were suitable for wetlands creation if mitigation were required. The Navy's focus is on habitat restoration so mitigation will not likely be necessary.

Mr. Lesti asked about the hazard quotient (HQ) maps presenting risk to burrowing owls from lead in soils. He noted that one of the maps (HQ₃) showed high risks (red color) over the entire facility. He asked whether this situation indicated that background lead concentrations caused risk. Ms. Walsh responded that a range of toxicity values and a range of dose estimates were used to bound potential risks. Some chemicals and organisms have large ranges and, therefore, a wide range of risk estimates is produced. Mr. Lesti said that the state recommended the HQ₃ risk estimate and asked how a base-wide risk such as this would be addressed. Mr. Chao replied that the Navy intended to remediate only risks cause by Navy activities and not background concentrations as presented on the HQ₃ map. Mr. Tom Iwamura, SCVWD, asked whether vehicle exhaust from U.S. Highway 101 was the source of lead concentrations or whether these were ambient conditions. Mr. Chao responded that the highway did not appear to be the source.

Ms. Walsh noted that it is important not to focus on a single HQ to represent all receptors and all chemicals. She added that risks for each receptor and contaminant should be evaluated individually. Mr. Lesti asked why the state selected HQ₃ for the risk estimate for burrowing owl exposure to lead. Dr. Callahan responded that the HQ maps present best and worst case scenarios and that the concern is where the real risk lies within this range. He added that the more conservative scenarios can be used to select areas for more detailed study and that additional sample data may be useful to refine the risk estimates. Mr. Lesti asked whether lead was, therefore, a concern for burrowing owls throughout the station. Dr. Callahan replied that, at a screening level, this is correct. He added that he did not advocate continuous data collection, but that enough data are needed to reduce the uncertainties until the correct remediation decision can be made with confidence. Ms. Walsh stated that toxicity and dose estimates can range over several orders of magnitude and, consequently, risks can vary over a large range. Dr. Callahan said that HQs should be used only for screening and as a means to focus further examination of risks. He stated that the low no effect level (0.04 milligrams per kilogram per day) for lead was intended to be conservative to ensure potential problems were not overlooked. Mr. Chao added that toxicity reference values are based on lowest observed effects levels which imply only an effect, not mortality.

Mr. Moss asked how natural effects, such as climate and natural salinity changes, could be distinguished from effects caused by contamination. Dr. Callahan responded that the FS will consider a baseline

condition and evaluate each potential remedy's effects on the baseline, either to improve or degrade the site conditions. Mr. Moss commented that setting the baseline could be difficult. Dr. Callahan replied that reference sites can be useful for evaluating baseline conditions. He noted that applying similar assumptions across the entire station can also be valuable in creating a comprehensive risk evaluation. Mr. Moss asked whether the bay margin lands east of Palo Alto could be used as a reference site. Dr. Callahan responded that he had been involved in other studies throughout the San Francisco Bay area and that this information was incorporated into the SWEA.

Mr. Moss asked whether the risk managers were close to reaching a conclusion. Ms. Walsh replied that the SWEA highlights areas of increased risk for further analysis during the station-wide FS. Mr. Chao added that the station-wide FS will contain the remedy evaluations and conclusions. Ms. Walsh added that the SWEA team was continuing to decrease the uncertainties in the risk estimates through further discussions with local experts. Mr. Moss asked whether any sites appeared to be contaminated enough to warrant remediation. Ms. Walsh responded that overlaying the risk maps in the SWEA consistently indicates that outfall areas have higher risks, but that visual observations do not show obvious effects (such as stressed vegetation or dead animals). Mr. Moss commented that the Navy could count individuals within a low-risk area depicted on a map in the SWEA report and compare it to the count for a high risk area to evaluate effects. He added that natural variability (robust versus barren habitats, for example) could obscure the evaluation. Mr. Mike Young, PRC, replied that areas of concern were created by overlaying the SWEA risk maps and a range of remedies was assembled to address the risks. He stated that the uncertainties were assessed and the effects of each remedy were considered to evaluate whether the remedy achieved the remediation objectives.

Mr. Chao solicited final questions from the group. Mr. Moss asked how long the remedy evaluation period would extend. Mr. Chao responded that the draft final station-wide FS report had been submitted and that comments were due on January 6, 1997.

VIII. AGENDA AND SCHEDULE FOR NEXT RAB MEETING

Mr. Chao stated that the RAB meeting held in December 1995 was poorly attended and suggested canceling the December 1996 meeting. RAB members agreed with the suggestion. Mr. Chao added that he would discuss extending the comment period for the station-wide FS and SWEA reports with the regulators

to allow the RAB members to provide comments at the next meeting. He stated that the next RAB meeting would be held on January 9, 1997 at the Mountain View police and fire auditorium at 1000 Villa Street.

Mr. Moss commented that the most recent quarterly sampling event at the Page Mill site included sampling 81 of 84 monitoring wells and that either the Navy is not doing enough at Moffett Field or too much is being done at the Page Mill site. Dr. McClure responded that circumstances may be significantly different at the Page Mill site, both politically as well as scientifically. Mr. Rochette added that plume stability at Moffett Field was evaluated during the remedial investigation and migration was found to be very slow. Mr. Moss commented that plume migration at the Page Mill site had been evaluated over a period of 5 to 6 years but samples were still collected frequently. He added that sampling frequency should be based on a logical strategy. Mr. Chao responded that more than 6 years of data are available at Moffett Field and enough is known about plume movement to design the remediation. He noted that this design is underway and that sampling will continue, both before construction (baseline sampling) as well as after construction (long-term performance monitoring).

Mr. Chao reiterated that the next RAB meeting would be held on January 9, 1997. Dr. McClure reminded members that the next THE committee meeting would be January 8, 1997. Mr. Chao closed the meeting at 9:15 p.m.