DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
ENGINEERING FIELD ACTIVITY, WEST
NAVAL FACILITIES ENGINEERING COMMAND
900 COMMODORE DRIVE
SAN BRUNO, CALIFORNIA 94066-5006

N00296.003230
MOFFETT FIELD
SSIC NO. 5090.3.A.

IN REPLY REFER TO:

5090
Ser 6421/9084
March 31, 1999

Dear RAB Member:

THE APRIL 8, 1999 MEETING HAS BEEN CANCELLED.

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 in May.

Our last RAB meeting was held on February 11, 1999 at the Mountain View Senior Center in Mountain View, California. The meeting summary is provided as enclosure (1).

Since a representative of the Bay Area Wetlands group was not available for the April 8th meeting, Catherine Glick and the BCT thought it would be best to **CANCEL** the April 8, 1999 RAB meeting. Our **next RAB meeting** will be held on **May 13, 1999** at **the Mountain View Senior Center**. The meeting will begin, as usual, 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	December Minutes Approval
7:10-7:30 PM	Remedial Project Managers Meetings Report
7:30-7:45 PM	MEW All Parties Meeting Report
7:45-8:00 PM	Subcommittee Meetings Report
8:00-8:20 PM	Treatment Systems Test Results & Discussion
8:20-8:55 PM	EPA Wetland Studies Report
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

3230

5090
Ser 6421/9084
March 31, 1999

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	Sprugasci	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

MOFFETT FEDERAL AIRFIELD
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING

MINUTES

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

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 11, 1999

I. INTRODUCTION 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 began the meeting by reviewing the following agenda items for this meeting:

- Minutes approval
- Committee reports
- Remedial project managers (RPM) meeting report
- Monitoring demonstration project
- Treatment systems test results
- Site 22 landfill update
- Stationwide feasibility study (FS) update
- Agenda and schedule for the next RAB meeting

II. MINUTES APPROVAL

Mr. Chao solicited comments on the minutes of the December 10, 1998 RAB meeting. There were no comments and the minutes were approved without correction.

III. COMMITTEE REPORTS

Ms. Cathrene Glick, of Geo Plexus and RAB co-chair, reported that the technical, historical, and educational (THE) committee met on February 10, 1999. Ms. Glick said the committee discussed the proposal for a field investigation to be conducted at Site 22. She said that the field work included potholing the golf course in the area of Site 22 to evaluate the current soil depth. She stated that potholing was usually conducted as part of investigations for a cap design. The proposed remedial action at Site 22 is not a cap. However, the committee discussed whether potholing should be conducted if the landfill will not be capped and, therefore, there will be no need to know the current soil depth.

Ms. Glick also reviewed the documents that were received by the THE committee since the last RAB meeting. These documents included the Site 1 final closure plan, the draft August 1998 quarterly report, the final quality assurance project plan (QAPP) for long-term groundwater monitoring, and the in situ abiotic redox manipulation (ISRM) technical memorandum. Mr. Peter Strauss, consultant to the Silicon Valley Toxics Coalition (SVTC), said that he had read the ISRM technical memorandum. He asked why the next step of the ISRM study, the pilot-scale test was planned in an area where a pump-and-treat system is already in place. Mr. Chao replied that operation and maintenance (O&M) for the pump-and-treat systems are expensive. Both the ISRM barrier and the Iron Curtain do not have large O&M costs and would be less expensive to implement than maintaining the pump-and-treat system in the future. Mr. Strauss then asked whether the effects of the pump-and-treat system on groundwater flow would be taken into account in planning the pilot-scale test. Mr. Chao replied that it would be included in the design of the pilot-scale test. Mr. Strauss asked if the Middlefield-Ellis-Whisman (MEW) companies would be included in discussions for design of the pilot-scale test. Mr. Chao replied that because the pilot-scale test is entirely within the Navy's treatment area, the MEW companies would not be included in this stage of field testing.

Mr. Bob Moss, community member, said he had a concern about the ISRM technology. He asked about the effectiveness of the ISRM technology on the various organic contaminants found in the groundwater plume. Mr. Chao stated that ISRM is expected to be as effective as the Iron Curtain. If the ISRM technology were implemented on a full scale, the barrier would be designed to be wide enough to degrade the most persistent volatile organic compound (VOC) found in the plume. Mr. Moss then asked about the long-term effectiveness of the barrier. Mr. Timothy Mower, Tetra Tech

EM Inc. (TtEMI) and consultant to the Navy, replied that more than one injection of sodium dithionite may be necessary to maintain the treatment barrier over time. Ms. Glick stated that degradation of the VOCs dependents on reaction rate. The column tests discussed in the technical memorandum were not continued long enough to show the degradation of trichloroethene (TCE) breakdown products, such as dichloroethene (DCE).

IV. REMEDIAL PROJECT MANAGERS MEETING REPORT

Mr. Joseph Chou, San Francisco Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), provided a report on RPM meetings held on January 14, 1999 and February 10, 1999.

Mr. Chou reviewed action items from the RPM meetings. He said that the Navy and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) have received approval from the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC) on the coastal consistency determination for consolidation and capping at Operable Unit (OU) 1. BCDC also agreed with moving the alignment of the proposed Bay Trail to the north side of Site 1. BCDC stated that the Navy should post a sign near Site 1 indicating the presence of sensitive habitat, and indicated that any fencing installed between Site 1 and the proposed trail should be compatible with the fences already used on other portions of the trail. Mr. Lenny Siegel, Center for Public Environmental Oversight, mentioned that the signs and fencing used on the Bay Trail at the Shoreline municipal landfill are compatible with BCDC requirements and could be used as references.

Mr. Chou reported on the documents that either have been or will be submitted in the near future. He said that the regulatory agencies have received the ISRM technical memorandum and that comments are due by February 22, 1999. He also said that the draft Site 22 proposed plan and draft Site 22 record of decision (ROD) will be submitted in March 1999, and the draft Building 191 hydrogeological investigation field work plan also will be submitted soon. He reported that there was a discussion at the RPM meeting about the Building 191 investigation field work and use of the resulting data. The objectives, timing, and scope of the proposed field investigation were discussed. Mr. Chou stated that he believed that the field work was important to gain a more comprehensive knowledge of the hydrogeology in the northern area of the MFA to support the design of the Site 22 landfill remedy and for improved groundwater monitoring at OU1.

Mr. Chou reported that construction at OU1 was 99 percent complete. The only remaining work is the installation of one monitoring well on the Cargill property. The regulatory agencies will work with the Navy if necessary to facilitate access to the Cargill property. Mr. Don Chuck of the Navy reported that the vegetative cover on OU1 is doing well. Hydroseeding was finished in November 1998 and appears to be growing well.

Mr. Chou reported that after many meetings and much discussion between the Navy and the regulatory agencies, the project team has reached consensus on remedial activities in the Eastern Diked Marsh and the stormwater retention pond. The Navy provided information about all of the parameters used to calculate hazard quotients (HQs) and compared them to values used at other sites around the bay. He said that Dr. Lynn Suer and Dr. Clarence Callahan, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), reviewed the calculations and found the parameters similar. As a result, a cleanup value has tentatively been selected. Areas in the Eastern Diked Marsh and the stormwater retention pond with polychlorinated biphenyl (PCB) concentrations greater than approximately 475 parts per billion (ppb) will be excavated. This value is based on $HQ_4 = 1$. After the remedial activities, a biological monitoring program will be established. For 1 to 2 years after the removing action, the reproductive and fledgling success of birds in the Eastern Diked Marsh and the stormwater retention pond will be monitored. If there appear to be problems, further investigations will be conducted.

Mr. Chou went on to report that both the west-side aquifer treatment system (WATS) and east-side aquifer treatment system (EATS) are operating. Three WATS extraction wells (EA1-1, EA1-6, and EA2-2) are currently not working as well as expected, however. He said that the wells would be redeveloped.

Mr. Chou reported on NASA's investigation and remedial activities. He said that NASA has finished conducting a Gore-Sorber survey of Building 566. The survey was conducted to evaluate whether there were VOCs inside or in the soil surrounding the building. The Gore-Sorbers were placed in the building and outside of the building at 0.5 and 3 feet below ground surface (bgs). The Gore-Sorbers were removed and sent to the laboratory for analysis on January 26 1999. NASA will receive the results in March. Mr. Chou also said that NASA has prepared a report of

findings for soil and groundwater investigations at area of investigation (AOI) 5. TCE and tetrachloroethene (PCE) were found at concentrations below 100 ppb. A 60-percent remedial design for the groundwater extraction and treatment system for the NASA portion of the regional groundwater plume is scheduled to be completed on March 15, 1999. NASA is conducting a laboratory-scale treatability study to evaluate whether the ultraviolet light oxidation technology proposed for the treatment system will effectively clean the contaminated groundwater.

Dr. Jim McClure, Harding Lawson Associates and consultant to the MEW companies, asked whether there had been discussion at the RPM meeting about coordinating groundwater sampling from the Navy and WATS monitoring with the January sampling that was conducted by the MEW companies. Mr. Chao replied that this issue had been discussed. Because WATS was not fully operational in January, samples were not collected. However, now that the system is working, the Navy will collect samples by the end of February or the beginning of March and coordinate the next sampling event with the MEW companies.

Mr. Strauss asked if Mr. Chou could discuss the stationwide remedial activities again. He said that in the final stationwide FS report, the cleanup levels for PCBs were 23 ppb for invertebrates in the Northern Channel, and either 127 and 71 ppb for birds (Great Blue Heron) in the Eastern Diked Marsh. He asked why the new cleanup level of 475 ppb was selected. Mr. Chou replied that the difference in values was a result of a reinterpretation of the receptors in the Eastern Diked Marsh and stormwater retention pond. There are different exposure routes with a different receptor (Mallard duck). Dr. Suer added that the original receptor was a Great Blue Heron, which eats fish. Because no fish were observed, the Mallard duck was chosen as the most conservative receptor. Mallard ducks eat insects and algae; because the food transfer values for insects and algae are lower than for fish, the cleanup concentration increases. Mr. Strauss stated that the land use in this area may change eventually and there may be fish. If PCBs were left at the cleanup concentration levels, there may be an issue in the future. Mr. Siegel added that in the future, the stormwater retention pond may be restored as wetlands as has been done at other areas. He said that he did not want potential future uses to be limited by the cleanup action. The assumption should be that the retention pond levee will be opened to allow tidal flow. Mr. Chao responded that Navy guidance recommends cleanup based on the most likely future land use. Continued airfield

operations, rather than conversion to wetlands, is the most likely future use. He added that the cleanup levels chosen are based on very protective screening criteria.

Dr. Suer stated that the issue of whether to excavate in the stormwater retention pond has been discussed at length. She said that if the cleanup levels were lower, much more habitat would be destroyed. In addition, the validation study could cost as much as $500,000 and the cleanup could be overly conservative. She said that EPA believed that instead of doing the study, it would be better to look at the realistic use of the land and at how cost could be balanced with the amount of information gained. Dr. Suer added that the 475 ppb cleanup level is based on many, very conservative, assumptions and that the cleanup level is still likely overly protective. Mr. Chao noted that the stormwater retention pond has been evaluated by an EPA wetlands expert and found to be a good freshwater wetland habitat. Dr. Suer said that the focus should be on future use. With the emphasis on future use, there is a good argument for the proposed remedial activity: fewer acres of good habitat will be destroyed.

Mr. Strauss asked whether different in situ cleanup technologies (such as thermal treatment) have been researched. Mr. Chao replied that the Navy has evaluated other cleanup technologies including technologies studied by the Bay Area Defense Conversion Action Team (BADCAT), the Navy's research branch, and TtEMI. He said that in situ thermal treatment was considered, but would not be effective due to the wet conditions in the Eastern Diked Marsh and the stormwater retention pond. The Navy has examined at several in situ treatments and has not found one to be effective under these specific conditions.

Mr. Strauss said he was concerned by the regulatory agencies' focus on costs. He said that he understood that the regulatory agencies and the Navy were working as a team, but he felt that the regulatory agencies should not unduly consider cleanup costs. He said that he hoped that the agencies do not lose the perspective of the goals of the cleanup. Dr. Suer replied that EPA guidance stated that cost should be considered when evaluating a remedial action. Conducting a validation study with a cost greater than the cleanup itself would not be consistent with the objectives of the guidance. She said that she understood his concern and that the EPA's primary mission remains protection of human health and the environment.

Mr. Siegel stated that he did not understand the argument for not restoring a saltwater marsh. He asked how it was determined that freshwater wetlands are better than saltwater wetlands. Dr. Suer said that EPA created a program called the Wetland Habitat Goals Project to resolve this issue. The project is composed of focus groups that map and evaluate wetlands throughout the bay area. She suggested that at the next RAB meeting, a representative from the group could come to speak about the habitat goals in the area of MFA and why some wetlands should be freshwater and others should be saltwater.

Mr. Siegel said that he attended a conference about MFA wetlands about 1 year ago. He said that no freshwater marshes were discussed at the conference. He felt that the presence of contamination should not determine the future use of land and the possibility for restoration. Mr. Chao said that he understood the concern. However, NASA currently uses the runways, and consequently, needs the stormwater retention pond to keep the runways from flooding. Mr. Chou added that he had discussed this issue with Ms. Sandy Olliges of NASA, and Mr. Jim Haas of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. They both thought that opening the area to tidal flow was not feasible. Mr. Chou said that one concern was the possibility that off-site contamination could enter the site from Steven's Creek if the stormwater pond were opened to tidal flow. Mr. Chou believed that the Navy must concentrate on removing the sediment with the highest PCB concentrations in the Eastern Diked Marsh and stormwater retention pond and then evaluate the habitat. Mr. Siegel replied that he agreed that there would be engineering issues to be resolved before the area could be opened up to tidal flow but he did not want contamination to determine future use. Mr. Tom Iwamura, Santa Clara Valley Water District (SCVWD) and THE committee member, commented that land subsidence has changed the natural conditions that existed when the levees were built.

V. MONITORING DEMONSTRATION PROJECT

Mr. Chao then introduced Ms. Amber Evans of BADCAT. Ms. Evans explained that their program coordinates and evaluates demonstrations of innovative technologies for groundwater remediation and monitoring. She introduced Mr. Murray Einarson, of Einarson, Watson, and Fowler Precision Sampling. She said that he would give a presentation on current demonstrations of a multilevel sampling monitoring well developed jointly by Precision and the University of Waterloo.

Mr. Einarson started his presentation by describing two innovative groundwater remediation strategies, natural attenuation and passive reactive barriers. With these new technologies, it is necessary to know both the depth and variability of contaminant concentrations in groundwater using three-dimensional characterization. In the past, three-dimensional characterization was done by installing clusters of wells. However, this approach is expensive and is not always successful due to the difficulty in creating a good seal between wells in a cluster. The demonstrated technique uses one monitoring well with multilevel sampling ports in separate internal chambers. This design eliminates many of the problems associated with leaking seals. Each chamber is screened at a specific depth and has a separate sampling port. The multilevel well casing is constructed of continuous polyethylene tubing with seven separate chambers. The tubing is 1.7 inches in diameter and can be installed using a standard 3.5-inch casing direct-push rig.

Mr. Einarson described the general procedures for installation of the multilevel well. He said that installation is a three-step procedure. In the first step, the boreholes are cored using a direct-push rig. Based on the geology in the core, the desired depths of the sampling ports are selected. The second step of installation is building the well at the surface. The screen intervals are attached and surrounded by a self-contained sand pack; the seals are constructed of bentonite in the same way. In the third step of installation, the completed well is lowered into the borehole and the direct-push casing is removed.

Mr. Brian Reddig, Science Applications International Corporation (SAIC) and consultant to NASA, asked if the seals on the wells were effective in preventing communication between the various sampling ports. He also asked if the wells were acceptable to SCVWD. Mr. Einarson replied that both the California Department of Water Resources and SCVWD have conducted tests on the wells and found them to be effective. He added that 30 multilevel wells have already been installed in California and in Ontario, Canada.

Mr. Einarson went on to report on a current demonstration that was conducted to monitor a funnel and gate system at Alameda Point. The demonstration involved installing 12 multilevel wells across the area of the groundwater plume being treated through the funnel-and-gate system. For the BADCAT demonstration at MFA, the objectives were to: (1) confirm the integrity of the

bentonite seals; (2) assess whether the well material is affected by chemicals in the groundwater plume; (3) test the multilevel construction in varying hydrogeologic settings; and (4) compare hydraulic head data and analytical results from groundwater sampled from the multilevel wells to samples from conventional monitoring wells. The results of the Alameda Point demonstration showed large variability in contaminant concentrations across the groundwater plume that had not been identified with conventional wells. Mr. Einarson concluded by saying that he will make copies of the presentation for anyone who is interested.

Mr. Siegel asked whether the results of the demonstration could be used to adjust the WATS. Mr. Chao said that pump-and-treat technology was implemented as a phased approach at MFA. The data collected from the study could be used in the next phase of treatment. Mr. Siegel stated that he thought that the multilevel well technology could be used to make pump-and-treat more efficient.

VI. TREATMENT SYSTEM TEST RESULTS

Mr. Chuck reported on current activities at EATS and WATS. He said that EATS is pumping at 33 gallons per minute (gpm) and that four of the five extraction wells are working. WATS is currently pumping at 75 gpm and five of eight extraction wells are working. He said that well EA1-4 is not pumping at its expected capacity because one of the regional A2 aquifer zone wells is near EA1-4 and is pumping from both the A2 and the A1 zones, leaving no water for well EA1-4.

VII. SITE 22 LANDFILL UPDATE

Mr. Chao stated that the remedial action proposed for the Site 22 landfill is placement of a biotic barrier on the slopes of the landfill. Ms. Glick asked about the draft field work plan submitted on February 7, 1999. She asked why potholing was planned if surface grading was not part of the remedial action proposed for Site 22. Mr. Chao replied that it would be necessary to know the current depth to soil if the remedial action were a cap. However, the decision process is dynamic. At the time that the work plan was submitted, one potential option for remedial action at Site 22 was a soil cap; since that time, a biotic barrier has become the preferred alternative.

Mr. Mower then reported on current conditions at Site 22. He stated that there is no existing permit for the landfill and there are no groundwater or landfill gas problems. The only potential risk at Site 22 is exposure to waste. Squirrels burrow into the slopes of the landfill and could expose waste. Burrowing thus presents a potential threat to golfers and golf course maintenance staff. The remedial action at Site 22 would involve installing a biotic barrier, constructed of geotextile and cobbles, where the squirrels could burrow. Groundwater and vadose zone gases would also be monitored as part of this remedial action.

Mr. Mower said that activities proposed for Site 22 are different from those at the Site 1 landfill due to the differences between these two sites. At Site 22, the landfill has been covered by a golf course for more than 30 years. Over the 30 years, the area has been irrigated and has received approximately twice as much water as Site 1. If groundwater has not been affected by 30 years of irrigation, it is unlikely that further irrigation will alter groundwater quality. Another difference between Site 22 and Site 1 is the existence of sensitive habitat in the Site 1 area. Mr. Siegel asked if there were burrowing owls at Site 22. Mr. Mower replied that burrowing owls were present and the biotic barrier would accommodate the presence of the owl.

Mr. Mower stated that the waste at Site 1 is also different than at Site 22. From visual characterization, the waste at Site 22 appears to be municipal. In addition, due to the irrigation at Site 22, the waste has degraded more than at Site1. Mr. Siegel asked whether the Navy is concerned about the potential presence of barrels in Site 22. He stated concern that there might be a future release. Mr. Mower replied that a potential future release is the reason for the groundwater monitoring program. Mr. Chao added that the waste at Site 22 is submerged below the water table. Even with a cap, the potential for leachate production remains. Mr. Strauss stated his concern about a contingency plan. Mr. Mower replied that a corrective action program is a state requirement as part of the groundwater monitoring program, depending on the nature of the release. Mr. Strauss commented that there was a physical barrier at Site 1 in place if a potential future corrective action were needed. Mr. Mower replied that the presence of the barrier at Site 1 was due to the proximity of sensitive habitat. There is no such habitat at Site 22. Mr. Chou added that the state will require a comprehensive monitoring plan that would include trigger levels and a corrective action program.

Mr. Paul Lesti, community member, asked if Mr. Mower could expand on the discussion indicating that Site 22 does not have a permit. Mr. Chao replied that the permit requires that the landfill be closed. He said that capping would satisfy the closure requirement, but that the remedial actions associated with the biotic barrier and a cap are equally protective: both would isolate waste and include groundwater and gas monitoring. He added that RWQCB must be satisfied with the conditions of the groundwater, whether the landfill is officially closed or not,.

Mr. Chou replied that RWQCB's major concern is water quality. The data from Site 22 show that the landfill has not affected the groundwater; there are only low and infrequent detections in the perimeter wells. Mr. Lesti asked about the political side of the issue. He asked if the requirements for the owner would be different if the same conditions were found at a privately operated site. Mr. Chou replied that if the same conditions and groundwater quality were found at another site, the requirements would be the same. Mr. Strauss asked if the Department of Fish and Game would be concerned about the effects on surface water ecology in the area. Mr. Chou said it appears that there is a no-flow boundary between groundwater in the area of Site 22 and surface water. He added that the monitoring plan would evaluate whether communication between groundwater and surface water existed.

Mr. Siegel asked how much waste was below the water table. He also asked how long the groundwater would be monitored and what institutional controls were planned for Site 22. Mr. Mower said that approximately half of the waste is below the water table. He also said that groundwater will be monitoring for 30 years, the time required for monitoring at a closed landfill. Institutional controls at Site 22 would be the same as at Site 1 and would include restrictions on intrusive activities. Dr. Suer said that the Navy and regulatory agencies reviewed many different cap designs as part of the Site 22 discussions. Most of the designs required drainage systems that would divert water into a perimeter drainage trough. The use of pesticides and fertilizers on the golf course might cause a waste stream that could be more harmful than the current conditions at Site 22.

Ms. Leslie Byster, SVTC, asked if the Navy knows the dimensions of the waste. Mr. Mower replied that the extent of the waste was evaluated during trenching activities and is estimated at 92,000 cubic yards. Mr. Siegel said that the potential future use for Site 22 is a ferry terminal and

that Site 22 could become a parking lot. Mr. Chao replied that a parking lot would make a very good cap.

Mr. Lesti asked if there have been detections in perimeter wells. Mr. Mower replied that contaminants have been detected but at low levels and infrequently.

VIII. STATIONWIDE FEASIBILITY STUDY UPDATE

Ms. Byster asked when the revised final FS would be submitted. Mr. Mower replied that it is scheduled to be submitted in either April or May 1999. Mr. Strauss asked what how long the comment period would be. Mr. Mower replied that there is no comment period for a final FS report. Dr. McClure said that there will be a formal comment period as part of the proposed plan. Mr. Strauss said that the issues were different the last time the stationwide FS was discussed. After reading the final FS report, he wondered why metals and pesticides were not included. Mr. Chao said that the Navy and regulatory agencies have only reached a decision about the cleanup levels in the last few days. Therefore, there is no formal schedule. Dr. Suer said that there should be a more formal presentation of the calculations used to select cleanup numbers. Mr. Siegel suggested that this presentation could be provided at the RAB meeting after the document has been submitted.

Ms. Glick said that there was no documentation of changes in cleanup values from the final FS to the revised final FS. Dr. Suer suggested using a technical memorandum written by Ms. Kim Walsh, Montgomery Watson and consultant to the Navy. Mr. Chao replied that the explanation would have to be refined for public presentation. Ms. Glick said that she thought it was necessary to have documentation on record. Ms. Byster stated that she was concerned that a decision was made between the regulatory agencies and the Navy without public input. Mr. Chao replied that there will be time for comment after the revised final FS is submitted.

IX. AGENDA AND SCHEDULE FOR THE NEXT RAB MEETING

Mr. Chao solicited topics for the next RAB meeting. Mr. Mower said that one agenda item was a report of the MEW all-parties meeting. Mr. Lesti suggested including a review of the metals discussion from the final stationwide FS report and a summary of costs for remedies presented in the stationwide FS report. A report on EPA wetland studies was also discussed as a potential topic for the next meeting. Mr. Chao stated that the next RAB meeting would be held on April 8, 1999 at the Mountain View senior center. Mr. Chao closed the meeting at 9:30 p.m.