



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

ENGINEERING FIELD ACTIVITY, WEST
NAVAL FACILITIES ENGINEERING COMMAND
900 COMMODORE DRIVE
SAN BRUNO, CALIFORNIA 94066-5008

N00296.003199
MOFFETT FIELD
SSIC NO. 5090.3.A.

IN REPLY REFER TO:

5090
Ser 6421/9026
November 25, 1998

Dear RAB Member:

The Moffett Federal Airfield (MFA) Base Closure Team and the Community Co-Chair wish to invite you to attend our next Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) meeting.

Our last RAB meeting was held on October 8, 1998 at the Mountain View Senior Center in Mountain View, California. The meeting summary is provided as enclosure (1). Our next RAB meeting will be held on **December 10, 1998 at the Mountain View Fire and Police Auditorium**. The meeting will begin 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 October Minutes Approval
7:10-7:40 PM Remedial Project Managers Meetings Report
7:40-8:00 PM Subcommittee Meetings Report
8:00-8:20 PM Treatment Systems Test Results & Discussion
8:20-8:40 PM Stationwide FS Update Discussion
8:40-8:55 PM Upcoming Documents and Decisions
8:55-9:00 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 this office at (415) 244-2562, or Ms. Cathrene Glick, Moffett's Community Co-Chair, at (408) 987-0210.

Sincerely,

STEPHEN CHAO
BRAC Environmental Coordinator
Moffett Federal Airfield

Distribution:

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

Moffett RAB Members:

| | | |
|----------|------------|---|
| Ann | Coombs | Alternate Member |
| Russ | Frazer | Alternate Member |
| Kevin | Woodhouse | Alternate Member |
| Stewart | McGee | Alternate Member |
| Tina | Pelley | Alternate Member |
| Maurice | Ancher | Community Member |
| John | Beck | Community Member |
| Robert | Davis | Community Member |
| Cathrene | Glick | Community Member |
| John | Gurley | Community Member |
| Paul | Lesti | Community Member |
| Bob | Moss | Community Member |
| Edwin | Pabst | Community Member |
| Richard | Schuster | Community Member |
| Lenny | Siegel | Community Member, Pacific Studies Center |
| Ted | Smith | Community Member, Silicon Valley Toxics Coalition |
| Steve | Sprugaschi | Community Member |
| Robert | Strena | Community Member |
| Rosemary | Stasek | Community Member, Mountain View Representative |
| Jack | Walker | Community Member, Sunnyvale Representative |
| James | McClure | MEW Representative |
| Sandra | Olliges | NASA Representative |
| Steve | Chin | Regulatory Member |
| Joseph | Chou | Regulatory Member |
| Scott | Flint | Regulatory Member |
| Lynn | Suer | Regulatory Member |
| Jim | Haas | Regulatory Member |
| Eugenia | Chow | Regulatory Member |
| Bob | Holston | Regulatory Member |
| Thomas | Iwamura | Regulatory Member |
| Joyce | Whiten | Regulatory Member |
| Peter | Strauss | Silicon Valley Toxics Coalition TAG Consultant |
| Warren | Belisle | Potential RAB Member |

Ser 6421/9026
November 25, 1998

Blind copy to:
10A, 642, 6421, 6422, 6423, 6426, 09CMN, 60B
Tetra Tech EMI (Attn: Tim Mower)
Montgomery Watson (Attn: Kim Walsh)
NFESC (Attn: Maureen Little)
Information Repository (2 Copies)
Chron, RF
File: Moffett

**MOFFETT FEDERAL AIRFIELD
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING**

MINUTES

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

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 8, 1998

I. INTRODUCTIONS AND MEETING OVERVIEW

Mr. Stephen Chao, Navy co-chair, opened the meeting of the Moffett Federal Airfield (MFA) restoration advisory board (RAB) at 7:15 p.m. Mr. Chao reviewed the following agenda items for this meeting:

- Minutes approval
- Middlefield-Ellis-Whisman (MEW) all-parties meeting report
- Remedial project managers (RPM) meeting report
- Committee reports
- Presentation: "MFA public health assessment"
- Presentation: "Stationwide feasibility study (FS) update"
- Treatment systems testing update
- Agenda and schedule for next RAB meeting

II. MINUTES APPROVAL

Mr. Chao solicited comments on the minutes of the August 13, 1998 RAB meeting. There were no comments and the minutes were approved without correction.

III. MEW ALL-PARTIES MEETING REPORT

Mr. Tim Mower, Tetra Tech EM Inc. (TtEMI) and consultant to the Navy, reported on the MEW all-parties meeting held September 10, 1998. Mr. Mower reported that the regional groundwater remediation system and source control systems south of U.S. Highway 101 are operating. The systems are extracting and treating approximately 185 gallons per minute (gpm) from several aquifer zones. The regional groundwater remediation system for the portion of the plume north of U.S. Highway 101 was scheduled to begin operation by September 25, 1998. Mr. Bob Moss, community member, asked whether the capture zones at the extraction wells were developing as expected. Dr. Jim McClure, Harding Lawson Associates and consultant to the MEW companies, replied that this evaluation was in progress but that he did not know the schedule for completion. Mr. Moss commented that the evaluation may take some months to complete.

IV. RPM MEETING REPORT

Mr. Chao introduced Dr. Lynn Suer, who has replaced Mr. Mike Gill as MFA project manager for the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). Dr. Suer is on a temporary assignment at EPA from her position with the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). Mr. Chao also introduced Mr. Jeff Kellam of the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR), who was scheduled to present public health assessment information later in the meeting. Mr. Joseph Chou, RWQCB, provided a report of the RPM meetings held on September 9 and October 14, 1998.

Mr. Chou reviewed action items from earlier RPM meetings. The Navy submitted the final quality assurance project plan (QAPP) for long-term groundwater sampling to EPA for final approval. EPA's quality assurance section was reviewing the report and comments or approval are expected soon. Navy counsel is continuing to discuss methods to implement institutional controls with staff from the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA). Mr. Peter Strauss, consultant to the Silicon Valley Toxics Coalition (SVTC), asked how the local community could be involved in these discussions. Mr. Chao responded that the community was not directly involved but that the Navy and NASA were considering how all relevant environmental information would be passed on if NASA were to transfer the station to a private party.

Mr. Strauss asked why the community could not be involved immediately. Mr. Chou replied that there are no guidelines for community involvement in this process. Mr. Chao added that staff at Navy headquarters in Washington, D.C. were discussing this issue. He said he would pass on the RAB's comments and report any new policies developed at Navy headquarters. Mr. Kevin Woodhouse, City of Mountain View, encouraged the Navy to provide opportunities for the communities to have input into the process and requested reports of progress on this issue. Mr. Robert Strena, community member, noted that the long-term plan for MFA includes introduction of commercial research ventures and asked how the institutional controls would apply to potential new tenants. Mr. Chao replied that the institutional controls would be included in NASA's planning documents, which new tenants would be required to follow. Mr. Strena commented that a new tenant could also spill chemicals that would need remedial action and asked whether the RAB also would review these cleanup actions. Mr. Chao responded that the RAB was created to address only the Navy's cleanup actions, but that NASA or other parties could form their own community groups to review other actions. Mr. Chou added that requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) also may apply and that the CEQA process requires public involvement. Ms. Rosemary Stasek, City of Mountain View, said that CEQA may not apply to a federal facility and asked who would monitor the actions if this were the case. Mr. Brian Staab, NASA, responded that the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) would still apply.

Mr. Chou reported on recent field activities. He said that the Site 9 source control measure treatment system was still operating. He reported that water overflowed from the Navy's west-side aquifers treatment system (WATS) on October 1, 1998. The overflow was more than 200 gallons and was discharged to the storm drain system. Mr. Chou reported that the Navy had implemented procedures to prevent future overflows. Ms. Cathrene Glick, Geoplexus and community co-chair, asked whether the water was groundwater. Mr. Don Chuck, Navy, replied that the overflow was groundwater pumped directly from the extraction wells and so received no treatment.

Mr. Chou reported that Battelle is continuing to prepare a summary report of the Iron Curtain pilot test. The report is scheduled to be submitted at the end of October 1998 and that Navy will forward copies of the report to the technical, historical, and educational (THE) committee. Mr. Strauss also requested a copy of the report.

Mr. Chou reported that the Navy is preparing a field work plan to study the hydrogeology in the area of the Building 191 lift station. The study will help to understand how the stormwater drainage system, including the lift station, affects groundwater flow directions and velocity. This knowledge will allow more effective monitoring of the Sites 1, 2, and 22 landfills and the east-side aquifer groundwater cleanup. The work plan is scheduled to be submitted in November 1998. Mr. Strauss asked why more study of this area was needed since operation of the lift station has been discussed many times previously. Mr. Chou replied that the start of groundwater monitoring at the Sites 1 and 2 landfills prompted the study of the Building 191 area. Dr. McClure asked whether potential vertical migration would be considered in the study. Mr. Chuck responded that both the A1- and A2-aquifer zones would be evaluated.

Mr. Chou said that construction at Sites 1 and 2 had resumed. The Navy placed rip rap along the northern shoreline of Site 1 to prevent erosion of the cap. Tasks remaining at Site 1 include placement of gravel on the access road surface and installation of one gas and one groundwater monitoring well and 15 gas vents. Remaining tasks at Site 2 include minor grading and installation of a storm drain inlet. Both areas will be hydroseeded when these activities are complete. Ms. Leslie Byster, SVTC, asked where the groundwater monitoring well would be located. Mr. Chou replied that the well will be located on the eastern side of the Site 1 landfill and will be one of 11 groundwater monitoring wells at that site.

Mr. Chou reported that construction of the east-side aquifer treatment system (EATS) was nearly completed and that he had received the Navy's discharge permit application earlier in the meeting. He added that RWQCB had coordinated closely with the Navy on the application and that he expected the application would be approved quickly. Mr. Chou reported that the functional tests for WATS were in progress and that the system was expected to be ready in 2 to 3 weeks. He added that the discharge permit for WATS should also be approved within that time.

Mr. Chou reported that the Navy met with the regulatory agencies on August 20, 1998 to discuss ecological monitoring in the stormwater retention pond as part of the stationwide remedial action. He said that the regulators also met in September 1998 to discuss these issues and review comments on the stationwide FS report. The Navy and the regulatory agencies will meet again on November 2, 1998 to further define the scope of the work at the stormwater retention pond. Mr. Chou reported that NASA was preparing a 60-percent completion design for the northern portion of the regional volatile organic compound (VOC) plume. He added that NASA submitted a 30-percent completion design to EPA in July 1998.

V. COMMITTEE REPORTS

Dr. McClure reported that the THE committee met on October 7, 1998. Dr. McClure said that the committee distributed and discussed the following reports: final Site 1 post-closure monitoring plan, draft May 1998 quarterly report, and final basewide petroleum sites evaluation methodology technical memorandum. The petroleum sites report includes a summary of the

development of RWQCB's underground storage tank regulations. Ms. Byster and Mr. Moss requested copies of this report. The committee also discussed the draft final Site 22 FS report. Mr. Strauss asked when comments were due on the FS report. Mr. Chou responded that the regulatory agencies were continuing to prepare comments and expected to have them completed by October 16, 1998.

VI. MFA PUBLIC HEALTH ASSESSMENT PRESENTATION

Mr. Chao introduced Mr. Jeff Kellam of ATSDR, who presented a summary of the agency's public health assessment of MFA. ATSDR is part of the Department of Health and Human Services and a sister agency of the Centers for Disease Control. ATSDR was created in 1980 by the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) to provide public health assessments at CERCLA sites. ATSDR's main task involves environmental evaluations for public health impacts. The ATSDR evaluation of MFA is in the public comment phase now and the agency is interested in community concerns.

The items ATSDR studies at a site are selected to address several questions, such as:

- What are the contaminants?
- Which media are contaminated (air, water, soil, sediment, food sources)?
- How much contamination is present?
- How do the contaminants move in the environment?
- How are people exposed?
- If people are exposed, will the exposures affect health?

In general, data are gathered from existing site reports, especially remedial investigation reports; little sampling is conducted. The surrounding community as well as the on-base community are considered in the evaluation and past, current, and likely future users are evaluated. However, the health evaluation does not consider effects to individuals in the sense of occupational exposures that are addressed by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) regulations. Ms. Rebekah Lacey of Eastern Research Group, who also attended the meeting, assisted in preparing the MFA report. ATSDR visited MFA in February 1998 to tour the site and collect reports.

ATSDR considered three main scenarios in evaluating potential health issues. One scenario evaluated exposure to contaminants in groundwater pumped from wells. Risks to on-site users were unlikely because the water from the contaminated aquifers is not used for drinking water and is unlikely to be used for this purpose in the future. Off-site users are unlikely to be affected because the contaminated groundwater has not migrated off site and is not likely to do so in the future.

A second scenario assessed exposure to contaminants in surface soils by dermal contact and incidental ingestion. The evaluation found the contaminated soils unlikely to pose a health hazard to past and current on-site residents and employees due to infrequent and only incidental contact. Areas posing a potential health hazard for long-term frequent exposure will be remediated.

The third scenario evaluated exposure to contaminants in surface water and sediments by dermal contact and incidental ingestion. The assessment found that past exposures would have been

unlikely to pose a health hazard and that remaining contamination in surface water and sediment at the facility is located in infrequently accessed areas, so there is little potential for exposure.

For all scenarios, ATSDR found small to no likelihood of public health issues now or in the future. ATSDR recommended continuation of monitoring to protect future uses. These scenarios and conclusions were also available in the handout provided at the meeting.

Ms. Byster asked how a health problem was identified. Mr. Kellam responded that ATSDR uses comparison values developed by its toxicologists that represent minimum levels of health effects. For example, 5 micrograms per liter ($\mu\text{g/L}$) is the comparison value for trichloroethene (TCE) in drinking water. The amount and type of exposure are important when evaluating the potential health effects. Mr. Strauss said that the Navy has conducted detailed human health risk assessments (HHRAs) that identified risk based on EPA standards. He asked why this evaluation is being done now and why it identifies no risk when the Navy HHRAs found risk. He also questioned how the ATSDR process is different from the Navy's HHRA. Mr. Kellam replied that ATSDR does not consider hypothetical scenarios as EPA sometimes does. ATSDR evaluates the current land use and considers controls to prevent future potential unsafe uses rather than evaluating various hypothetical future land uses. For example, EPA might evaluate the risk of drinking groundwater from the regional VOC plume that contains TCE at concentrations of 18,000 $\mu\text{g/L}$, while ATSDR would not consider this a public health hazard because no one currently uses the water for drinking and future use can be controlled.

Mr. Kellam said that one reason ATSDR does not evaluate hypothetical future scenarios is the high level of effort this assessment requires. ATSDR has only eight staff to evaluate more than 160 sites, so an intensive evaluation is not possible. He said that MFA was not a high priority based on the potential hazards. Mr. Chao added that ATSDR visited MFA many years ago during the prioritization phase. Mr. Kellam said that ATSDR began evaluating federal sites in 1988 when these sites were ruled to be subject to CERCLA. ATSDR acts as a public health auditor to provide an independent evaluation of health hazards posed by a site. Ms. Lacey added that the Navy HHRA used a residential scenario, but that this land use is very conservative and not part of the future use plan for MFA. Consequently, ATSDR did not consider residential exposures but focused instead on exposures that could occur at a restricted federal airfield. Mr. Kellam stated that ATSDR would reassess the potential risks if a significantly different future land use became likely.

Mr. Strauss asked if a risk model was created. Mr. Kellam replied that no specific model was created, although ATSDR toxicologists develop profiles for specific chemicals that are used during the risk evaluation. Mr. Strauss asked how the potential for volatilization of polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) was evaluated. Mr. Kellam responded that PCBs were not found in concentrations high enough to be considered a health concern. He added that he could provide the toxicological profile, but that dermal exposure to PCBs was the primary exposure route. Much higher PCB concentrations would be necessary before inhalation would pose a health risk. Mr. Strauss commented that the ATSDR report does not contain detailed data. Mr. Kellam replied that detailed data are included only when a significant health hazard is identified.

Ms. Glick stated that the report assumes that fencing and security measures will prevent future exposures and that treatment systems will continue operating to prevent exposures. However, she said that future workers could be exposed to contaminated soil. Mr. Kellam responded that a more detailed explanation of incidental exposure might be useful. For example, drinking 2 liters

of contaminated water every day would be a nonincidental exposure. A worker's exposure at that level every day is unlikely. Mr. Strauss asked if this model information was contained in the report. Mr. Kellam replied that the model is part of the toxicological comparison values. Ms. Lacey added that a table at the end of the ATSDR report shows the comparisons at all MFA sites and describes the comparison process. She said that the report specifically avoided repeating large amounts of previously published data and was written at a simple level to allow comprehension by the most people. Mr. Kellam said that a detailed evaluation is not conducted unless unacceptable exposures are identified and that no such exposures were observed at MFA.

Mr. Moss said that the report is very qualitative and the assumptions may not be valid because land use may change. Exposures could occur to workers during excavation, he said, adding that activities and exposures to potential residents could occur from using the groundwater for irrigation or sanitation even if the water was not used for drinking. The report should state that the risks will be reevaluated if the land use changes. Mr. Kellam replied that ATSDR assumes that any workers would be properly protected by a health and safety program. Mr. Moss stated that the report should be explicit if a risk is reasonably possible. For example, VOCs accumulating in buildings could pose a risk.

Ms. Byster asked when the comment period closed for the report. Mr. Kellam responded that comments are due by October 25, 1998. Ms. Byster asked how the Navy would use the ATSDR report. Mr. Chao replied that the Navy will not use the report, but that it provides an independent evaluation of risks at the facility. Ms. Glick commented that the report does not clearly distinguish between no exposure and no risk. Mr. Kellam responded that normal, daily, reasonable interactions between people and the environment that create a health hazard are identified as risks.

Mr. Strauss recommended that the RAB send a letter to ATSDR requesting that the report be withdrawn. He said the report may cause more harm than good because people who read the report will have a false sense that no problems exist at MFA when, instead, future risks are possible. Mr. Kellam reiterated that ATSDR would reevaluate its assessment if there is a significant change in land use, but that no such change is being considered. The statement that the assessment should be reevaluated if land uses and exposure situations change is one of the conclusions contained in the report. Mr. Strauss asked what purpose the report will serve. Mr. Kellam replied that the assessment is required by law at every CERCLA site. Mr. Strauss asked what would happen if the RAB requested withdrawal of the report. Mr. Kellam responded that, by law, the report still would have to be prepared.

Mr. Strena said that ATSDR's work should have been done 10 years ago before all the detailed investigations were completed by the Navy. He said that it is difficult for RAB members, who have reviewed so many reports, to believe such a brief summary. Mr. Moss commented that the first conclusion of the report (that there are no health risks) is dangerous because it does not contain the assumptions listed in the second conclusion, which states that reevaluation of risks would be necessary if land use changes. Unethical developers might take the first conclusion out of context without mentioning the assumptions. Mr. Kellam replied that he would clarify the exposures and future uses in the report. Mr. Moss said that the ATSDR report should also state that the Navy's reports realistically represent potential exposures at the facility. Mr. Paul Lesti, community member, said that ATSDR should also use the residential scenario in its evaluation. Mr. Kellam responded that ATSDR policy is not to assume exposures that do not exist or are not likely to exist, but instead to state that future uses will be controlled to prevent exposure.

Mr. Kellam closed his presentation by stating that his name, address, and telephone number were listed in the fact sheet distributed at the meeting.

VII. STATIONWIDE FS UPDATE

Mr. Chao introduced Ms. Sarah Jones, TtEMI, who presented a summary of the changes made to the revised draft final stationwide FS report. Ms. Jones stated that the final version of the stationwide FS report was scheduled to be submitted at the end of October 1998. Changes to the revised draft final version were made to address regulatory agency comments and to better define the remediation areas and cleanup goals. Areas of the report containing changes include topics such as risk assessments, media of concern, areas for cleanup, applicable or relevant and appropriate requirements (ARARs), and cleanup alternatives.

The description of risk assessments was revised to reincorporate the discussion of risk to human health and ecological receptors caused by various metals. These metals occur naturally at MFA and are not considered in the cleanup action, but the risks related to the metals are reiterated in the final FS report. The report also contains an expanded discussion of the identification of sediments as the primary medium of concern for the cleanup action. The final report includes cleanup areas based on more conservative and protective hazard quotient (HQ) values. Areas identified for cleanup include the Eastern Diked Marsh, Northern Channel, and Marriage Road Ditch. Contaminants in areas of the stormwater retention pond are only slightly above cleanup levels and are addressed by the ecological validation study currently under discussion by the Navy and the regulatory agencies. ARARs suggested by RWQCB and discussed in the final FS report include the San Francisco Bay Basin Plan, State Water Resources Control Board discharge and antidegradation policies, and ambient water quality criteria.

Remedial alternatives were revised for the final FS report and now include: no action, institutional controls, excavation and off-site disposal, and excavation and on-site treatment. On-site treatment technologies evaluated include bioremediation, thermal desorption, and solvent extraction. All active cleanup alternatives include placement of clean fill in the Eastern Diked Marsh and construction of a stream channel to transport stormwater from the NASA settling basin to the stormwater retention pond. The cleanup goal for on-site treatment technologies will be 1 milligram per kilogram (mg/kg) to allow unrestricted reuse of the soil on the station (outside of ecologically sensitive areas).

Mr. Strauss asked how the cleanup goal for on-site treatment (1 mg/kg) compared to the cleanup levels of 127 and 23 micrograms per kilogram ($\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}$). Ms. Jones replied that the cleanup levels (23 and 127 $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}$) are used to select the areas that require cleanup, while the 1 mg/kg treatment goal controls potential reuses of treated soil in nonecologically sensitive areas at MFA. Ms. Byster asked whether cleanup information based on HQ₄, as well as HQ₃, is presented in the FS report. She also stated that no decision should be proposed in the FS report, but instead the decision should be presented in the proposed plan. Mr. Chao responded that information based on HQ₄ is included in the final FS report and that the decision will be presented in the proposed plan.

Mr. Strauss said that EPA comments on the previous version of the FS report included statements about the volatilization and natural attenuation of PCBs and asked whether this information was included in the final FS report. Ms. Jones replied that information on

attenuation of PCBs is included in the report based on limited, time-related data already collected at MFA. Mr. Strauss added that the cleanup levels should account for the transfer of PCBs from sediment to water. Dr. Suer responded that the ARARs for the remedial action will address this concern. Dr. McClure asked whether the excavated sediments were expected to contain more than 1 mg/kg PCBs so that the cleanup action would not be simply moving contaminated sediments to a nonecologically sensitive area. Mr. Chao replied that much of the area to be remediated contains PCBs at concentrations in the tens of mg/kg. Ms. Glick said that if the excavated area were sufficiently large, the PCB concentrations could be effectively diluted and would not require treatment. Mr. Mower responded that although it could be possible to dilute contaminant concentrations by excavating additional uncontaminated areas, the cleanup action is also intended to minimize the excavated area to avoid any unnecessary habitat disruption. Ms. Glick asked whether treatment would be likely for most of the excavated sediment. Mr. Chao replied that this statement was correct.

VIII. TREATMENT SYSTEMS TESTING UPDATE

Mr. Chuck provided an update of construction progress at EATS and WATS. EATS has been tested and operated for a 24-hour test period. Treated water samples indicate effective destruction of all contaminants. WATS continues functional testing of system components and should be operating in the coming 1 to 2 weeks.

IX. AGENDA AND SCHEDULE FOR NEXT RAB MEETING

Mr. Moss distributed final reports for the 640 Page Mill site. Mr. Chao solicited topics for the next RAB meeting. Topics suggested included any comments on the final stationwide FS report and a schedule of upcoming documents and decisions. The schedule for the Site 22 landfill public meeting was of particular interest to members. Mr. Chao stated that the next RAB meeting would be held on December 10, 1998 at the Mountain View police and fire administration auditorium. Dr. McClure reminded members that the THE committee would meet on December 9, 1998. He added that he would distribute the final stationwide FS report as soon as it was available. Mr. Chao closed the meeting at 9:30 p.m.