



**Moffett Federal Airfield
Superfund Site**

Southwest Division Naval Facilities Engineering Command
Mountain View, California

N00296.000391
MOFFETT FIELD
SSIC NO. 5090.3

**RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD
MEETING AGENDA**

Date/Time: Thursday, November 8, 2001, 7 to 9:15 p.m.
Location: City of Mountain View Community Center
201 South Rengstorff Avenue, Room 3

7:00 to 7:20 WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS
RAB ANNIVERSARY CAKE
REVIEW AGENDA
PRIOR MINUTES APPROVAL (August 9, 2001)
CIRCULATE DOCUMENT SIGN-UP SHEETS
INTRODUCE NEW RAB APPLICANT (Libby Lucas)
RAB ELECTION
TOPICS FOR FUTURE RAB MEETINGS
NFA PROPOSED PLAN PUBLIC MEETING UPDATE
BUDGET UPDATE

7:20 to 7:30 GROUNDWATER REMEDIATION SYSTEM UPDATE

7:30 to 8:00 PRESENTATION: ANNUAL GROUNDWATER REPORT

8:00 to 8:15 Q & A

8:15 to 8:25 **BREAK**

8:25 to 8:35 SITE 25 STATUS

8:35 to 8:55 MOFFETT COMMUNITY HOUSING PHASE 1 SITE
ASSESSMENT & WORKPLAN SUMMARY

8:55 to 9:00 REGULATORY UPDATE

9:00 to 9:05 SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

9:05 to 9:15 NASA REDEVELOPMENT UPDATE

9:15 ADJOURN

Note: The Technical, Historical, and Educational (THE) subcommittee meeting will be held on Thursday, November 8, 2001 at 5 p.m. in Room 2 of the Mountain View Community Center.

**MOFFETT FEDERAL AIRFIELD
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD
MOUNTAIN VIEW COMMUNITY CENTER
MOUNTAIN VIEW, CALIFORNIA 94041**

Subject: RAB MEETING MINUTES

The Moffett Federal Airfield Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) meeting was held on Thursday, **09 August 2001**, at the Mountain View Community Center.

Ms. Andrea Muckerman, Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Environmental Coordinator (BEC) and Navy RAB Co-chair opened the meeting at 7:10 p.m.

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Ms. Muckerman welcomed everybody and introduced herself and the Community Co-chair, Mr. Bob Moss. The Moffett Field RAB meeting was attended by:

RAB Members	Regulators	Navy	Contractors & Navy Support	NASA	Public Members
9	2	5	5	2	6

REVIEW AGENDA

Ms. Muckerman informed the attendees that the meeting agenda had been changed slightly from the one that had been mailed. She asked everybody to review the revised agenda and offer any suggestions for change. The RAB did not suggest any changes to the agenda.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ms. Muckerman solicited comments on the minutes from the 10 May 2001 RAB meeting. Mr. James McClure asked that the 1st paragraph on page four specify the new date of the Site 25 Proposed Plan public meeting. He also noted that in the first bullet under "Subcommittee Report" on page six, the word "salt" should be replaced by "solvent." The minutes were approved unanimously with the above changes.

DOCUMENTS FOR REVIEW

Ms. Muckerman informed the RAB that several documents were planned to be issued in the next quarter and sign-up sheets for the same would be circulated during the meeting. She asked the RAB if the current document distribution system was effective. The RAB responded that the system was working well. Sign-up sheets for the following documents were routed among the attendees:

- Moffett Community Housing, Draft Workplan
- Moffett Community Housing, Response to Comments on Draft Workplan
- Moffett Community Housing, Draft Phase 1 Environmental Assessment

- Final Piezometer Installation Workplan, 12 October 2001
- 2nd Quarter 2001 Groundwater Gauging Quarterly Report
- 3rd Quarter 2001 Groundwater Gauging Quarterly Report
- No Further Action Sites, Draft Final Proposed Plan
- Draft Final Annual Groundwater Monitoring Report, 22 October 2001
- No Further Action Sites Proposed Plan, Draft Feasibility Study Data Gaps Workplan
- Site 27, Draft Final Feasibility Study Data Gaps Workplan
- Site 27, Draft Feasibility Study Data Gaps Workplan Response to Comments
- Sites 1 & 2, Draft Interim Remedial Action Report, 21 September 2001
- Sites 1 & 2, 1st Quarter 2001 Post-Closure Monitoring and Maintenance Report
- Sites 1 & 2, 2nd Quarter 2001 Post-Closure Monitoring and Maintenance Report
- Sites 1 & 2, 3rd Quarter 2001 Post-Closure Monitoring and Maintenance Report
- Sites 1 & 2, Draft Groundwater Technical Memorandum, 7 November 2001
- Site 22, Public Meeting Transcript
- Site 25, Public Meeting Transcript
- Site 25, Record of Decision (ROD)
- Site 22, Draft Final ROD
- Site 25, Draft Pre-Construction Sampling Workplan
- Site 27, Northern Channel, Federal Facilities Agreement Modification Letter, 13 June 2001

BUDGET SYNOPSIS

Ms. Muckerman provided a budget synopsis and a brief review of each project. She informed the attendees that the dispute with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) on Site 27 had been resolved with an amendment to the Federal Facilities Agreement (FFA). A sign-up document for the letter recording the amendment was distributed among the attendees.

A handout was distributed that indicated the amount that has been spent or will be spent in fiscal year 2001 (FY01) and the amounts that have been budgeted by the Navy for fiscal year 2002 (FY02). The funding for FY02 will only be confirmed once the Appropriations Bill is passed. Ms. Muckerman explained that the Federal fiscal year goes from 1 October to 30 September.

The following questions and answers were presented:

- Mr. Kevin Woodhouse inquired if funds for FY01 would roll into FY02 if they were not utilized. Ms. Muckerman informed him that all money budgeted for FY01 would be awarded before 1 October 2001. However, funds may be “obligated,” that is the work is contracted out and is ongoing, and payments might not be made before the end of the fiscal year.
- Mr. Lenny Siegel informed the attendees that he had received communication from Navy headquarters that pointed toward a \$ 92 million cut in the Navy’s BRAC

budget. He expressed concern about the impact of this cut on the FY02 budget requirements. Ms. Muckerman stated that the Navy has put forth a request for the amount they anticipate needing. In her experience, funding to meet FFAs is normally not denied.

- Mr. Bob Moss questioned if on-going site requirements have been accounted for in the FY02 budget. He was informed that all required funds were included in the budget estimate.
- Mr. McClure inquired about the length of time that the Eastern Aquifer Treatment System (EATS) and the Western Aquifers Treatment System (WATS) budget for FY01 and FY02 would support the operations and maintenance costs of the project. Ms. Muckerman indicated that she would find out the answer to the question and get back to Mr. McClure.
- Ms. Catherine Glick expressed concern about the lack of any funding for Orion Park in FY02. She was interested in knowing the proportion of the 630K from FY01 that had been used up or allocated. Ms. Muckerman informed the RAB that the Orion Park schedule of work would be presented by Ms. Angela Patterson in greater detail later this evening. However, it was her understanding that the present funding takes the project through several more months, at which time a determination of the primary responsible party will be made.

NEW RAB APPLICANTS

Ms. Muckerman introduced three new individuals who wished to serve on the RAB for Moffett Federal Airfield:

- Ms. Barbara Healy, a new RAB applicant
- Mr. Michael Stanley Jones, who will be substituting for Ms. Leslie Byster
- Mr. Robert Strena, an ex-RAB member

Each applicant briefly spoke about his/her background and interest in Moffett Federal Airfield. A ballot was provided to each community RAB member present and in session. The ballots were counted and Ms. Muckerman announced that each applicant was unanimously voted onto the RAB.

COMMUNITY RELATIONS PLAN UPDATE

Ms. Muckerman informed the attendees that the Navy was getting ready to conduct interviews for the Community Relations Plan (CRP). She referred them to the list of potential interviewees that had been mailed previously and opened the floor to suggestions for other people who should be contacted. Ms. Muckerman noted that she had already received feedback from Ms. Carmen White of the U.S. EPA, which included the following organizations:

- Bay Conservation Development Commission
- Santa Clara Audubon Society
- Watershed Management Initiative, Phil Bobel

- Clean South Bay

The following additional suggestions were offered by the attendees:

- School district offices rather than individual schools. The Mountain View and Whisman Elementary School Districts have merged and are now located at San Pierre Way with Dr. Patricia Bubenik serving as the superintendent.
- Mid-Peninsula Regional Open Space District
- Save the Bay
- Acterra
- Businesses in the North Bay Shore Area
- Cargill representatives
- Los Altos representatives, e.g. council members, community organizations etc.
- San Francisco Bird Observatory, Janet Hanson
- Lockheed Martin
- Valley Transit Authority (VTA)
- Other Federal property owners, such as the Air Force and the Army Corps of Engineers
- Los Altos TV cable station
- Dr. Lynn Trulio, burrowing owl specialist and consultant to NASA

UPDATE - GROUNDWATER REMEDIATION SYSTEM

Ms. Mary Parker, the Navy Remedial Project Manager (RPM) for WATS, provided an update on the WATS groundwater remediation system. Reviewing the site background, she informed the RAB that WATS had been shut down on 29 March 2001 due to acetone in effluent samples in excess of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) discharge requirements. The shut-down was coordinated with the U.S. EPA and the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). A corrective action plan was submitted and approved by the regulatory agencies and implemented..

The system upgrades were completed on 17 July 2001 and included:

- Addition of four granulated, activated carbon units following the air stripper for additional polishing.
- Installation of double check valve assemblies at each wellhead to further ensure that backflow into the well does not occur.
- A retrofitted system to run influent water through an equalization tank prior to its entering the treatment train to enhance the control of flow and influent concentrations.
- Replacement of granulated, activated carbon with virgin carbon to enhance removal of any residual contaminants.

Ms. Parker showed the RAB the modified process flow diagram and pointed out the system modifications. She stated that start-up testing, conducted between 18 July and 27 July 2001, was successful and the system has been online since the 27th with no NPDES discharge exceedances. Weekly effluent sampling will continue to be conducted for an additional four weeks.

The attendees were informed that the system has removed approximately 1,122 lbs. of contaminant mass to date. In response to a question about its composition, Ms. Parker stated that the contaminant basically consists of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) such as trichloroethylene (TCE). Acetone is not a site contaminant and is probably a by-product formed in the treatment train. An inquiry was also made about the technique by which the contaminant mass removal number was derived, since it was felt that this number was significantly large. Ms. Parker explained and noted that a total of over 67 million gallons have been treated to date at WATS. She further explained that these numbers are derived using standard engineering calculations. Ms Parker presented the latest monthly WATS update graph, which records monthly activity at WATS beginning in November 1998. This graph was passed to the RAB for review.

Ms. Glick inquired if the Navy was previously using regenerative carbon, since the update indicated a switch to virgin carbon. Ms. Parker stated that a different type of carbon was used as part of the upgrade to better treat low acetone and other VOC levels. It was clarified that the virgin carbon now being used is coconut shell carbon. Ms. Parker said she did not think regenerative carbon was previously used. It was also clarified that while carbon is replenished periodically as part of the operation and maintenance, this change-out was not related to the routine carbon change-out. Ms. Parker said she could get more information to Ms Glick if she liked. Mr. McClure suggested that detailed issues on the subject could also be addressed at a Technical, Historical, and Educational (THE) subcommittee meeting, if there was interest. There was no response from the RAB members. Andrea Muckerman suggested the next agenda topic be presented since there were a lot of agenda topics to be covered.

PRESENTATION - MOFFETT COMMUNITY HOUSING (MCH)

The Moffett Community Housing project pertains to groundwater investigations underway at two housing areas, Orion Park and Westcoat Housing, on and adjacent to Moffett Field. Ms. Patterson, the Navy RPM, provided an update on activities conducted at the site. She distributed a timeline that projects site activities through January 2003, supported by the funds presently budgeted for Moffett Community Housing.

The Navy's investigation at Moffett Community Housing will have multiple objectives, including identification of the type and extent of contamination, source of contaminants, potential risks to inhabitants, etc. Ms. Patterson added that the screening level risk assessment indicated that there was no unacceptable risk to the residents at Moffett Community Housing.

The Draft Phase 1 Environmental Assessment will be submitted to the regulatory agencies on 21 August 2001 and the Draft Workplan on 28 August 2001. In addition to going to the agencies, these documents will also be distributed to the RAB.

Mr. Siegel inquired about the regulatory framework under which this work was being conducted. He was informed that Moffett Community Housing is not covered by the FFA for Moffett Field. However, the project is receiving oversight by the regulators.

The regulatory framework will be decided once the source of the contamination is identified.

UPDATE - NASA REDEVELOPMENT

The NASA update was postponed until the next RAB meeting.

PRESENTATION - SITE 25 PROPOSED PLAN

Ms. Patterson presented information on the Site 25 Proposed Plan. RAB members were informed that a longer version her presentation would be used for the public meeting on 16 August 2001.

Reviewing its background, Ms. Patterson stated that Site 25 comprises the Eastern Diked Marsh and the stormwater retention pond located in the northwestern part of Moffett Federal Airfield. It serves as a seasonal wetland habitat and is used by numerous species of shorebirds and waterfowl.

Site 25 has been used for stormwater management by the Navy and NASA since 1953. Prior to 1991, there was no mechanism for removing sediment from stormwater prior to its entering the wetlands. She stated that it was important to note that cleanup of contaminated sediments is based on current and anticipated land use. Since current and anticipated land use is expected to stay the same, as indicated by NASA, the cleanup alternative will be selected keeping in mind the use of the site for stormwater management.

The Remedial Alternatives are also evaluated on their ability to meet Remedial Action Objectives (RAOs). The overall RAO is for the remedy to be protective of humans and ecological receptors (plants and animals). Since ecological receptors are more sensitive to the contaminants than humans, cleanup requirements for ecological receptors are also protective of human health. There is also the secondary RAO of minimizing habitat destruction.

Ms. Patterson explained that the RAOs are appropriate due to the following reasons:

- Approximately 95% of the polychlorinated biphenyl (PCB) contaminated sediments would be excavated
- RAOs are protective of receptors based on site use and the fact that the site serves as seasonal wetland habitat for shorebirds and waterfowl
- Habitat destruction would be marginal compared to a cleanup alternative with lower RAOs

Ms. Patterson reviewed the three remedial alternatives; 1) no action, 2) excavation and off-site disposal, and 3) excavation and ex-situ bioremediation and on-site reuse or off-site disposal. She stated that numerous other alternatives, such as soil incineration, oxygenation and chemical oxidation were also evaluated, however, they were either too expensive or not effective in meeting RAOs. The Preferred Alternative, excavation and off-site disposal, was selected after a comparative evaluation of the three alternatives against nine criteria established by the U.S. EPA. While seven of the nine criteria have been evaluated, state and community acceptance will be evaluated after the end of the

public comment period. A decision on the preferred remedy will be made only after careful review and consideration of public comments. A responsiveness summary of the Navy's response to all comments will be made available to the RAB and the public.

It was explained that the Preferred Alternative also consists of 5-year reviews and institutional controls. The 5-year reviews will ensure the effectiveness of the remedy and will allow for modifications if circumstances change, for instance if there is no seasonal drying. She further explained that the institutional controls don't prevent or prohibit changes in site use, however, they ensure that appropriate measures accompany any land use changes. She indicated that NASA would be responsible for additional studies or cleanup if land use is changed. She went over the draft implementation schedule which included key milestones.

Ms. Patterson concluded her presentation by inviting questions from the attendees. The following issues and questions were raised:

- Mr. Peter Strauss questioned the nexus between the Feasibility Study/Remedial Investigation and the Proposed Plan. As an example, he stated that the Remedial Investigation points to health risks to occupational workers. And while the Proposed Plan acknowledges these risks, it states that NASA administrators consider the risks conservative and with that the focus shifts to ecological receptors.

In response to this concern, Ms. Patterson explained that the Remedial Action Objectives (RAOs) center around ecological receptors because they are more sensitive to the contaminants present at the Site. Hence, measures aimed at protecting ecological receptors would also be protective of occupational workers. Mr. Strauss indicated that he was unable to trace this decision and the data supporting it in any of the previous documentation. Ms. Muckerman suggested that in order to facilitate a detailed thorough analysis of site 25 issues and a document review, a separate special technical subcommittee meeting should be organized. It was agreed that a subcommittee meeting would be held on Tuesday, 21 August 2001 from 3-7 p.m. RAB members would be contacted at a later date about the meeting location and any other pertinent details.

- Ms. Glick pointed out that this was the third major presentation on plans for Site 25. A previous presentation in July 2000 resulted in a serious discussion on cleanup values. She noted that the current Proposed Plan contains the same values and questioned whether there had been any agreement between the Navy and federal and state regulators as to the values being protective of human health and ecological receptors.

Ms. Carmen White and Ms. Adriana Constantinescu assured the attendees that they were in agreement with the cleanup values contained in the Proposed Plan. They added that the zinc value is subject to revision, depending on whether rain water could result in zinc leaching from the sediment.

- Mr. Siegel inquired whether the Navy had evaluated an alternative without institutional controls.

Ms. Patterson stated that in 1998 the Navy had conducted a Feasibility Study to investigate cleanup of PCBs to make the site habitable by the great blue heron. She added that another overall objective to keep in mind is the minimization of habitat destruction. It was found that this option would be very costly to monitor and furthermore, there are not enough fish at the site to serve as food for the blue heron.

Mr. Siegel stated that he had never seen any documentation of how much excavation would be needed to make the site conducive for the blue heron or what the destruction to habitat would be under this alternative.

- Mr. Siegel stated that the two alternatives presented in the Proposed Plan are extremely similar and no “alternative” cleanup strategy has been investigated. He also pointed out that the Mid-Peninsula Open Space District owned property on Site 25 and inquired whether they were in concurrence with the Proposed Plan. The Navy informed the attendees that the Open Space District had not been contacted and that the issue would be investigated further.
- Mr. Woodhouse announced that the Mountain View City Council had passed a resolution on 31 July 2001 stating that tidal marsh is a reasonably anticipated future land use for Site 25 and therefore remediation should be conducted to a level that would support future restoration to tidal marsh. The Mayor also submitted a letter on this issue to the Navy and Mr. Woodhouse summarized its contents for those present. The letter stated that the City agreed with the Navy’s choice of remediation of the highest contaminated areas at the site and that this remediation should continue with a contingency ROD. However, while this cleanup proceeds, additional evaluation of an alternative that would be compatible with tidal marsh use also be conducted simultaneously.

Once this additional alternative is better understood it should be brought to the public for further input and the contingency ROD could be finalized. The cost sharing agreement between the Navy and NASA, determining the party responsible for additional remediation funding, should also be clarified in the ROD. On behalf of the Navy, Ms. Muckerman thanked the city of Mountain View for its timely feedback.

- Mr. Tom Mohr wanted to know if the Navy felt assured that removal of the top 1 foot of soil precludes bioturbation and whether it has confidence in the data set and in the ability of the Preferred Alternative to reap results.

Ms. Patterson stated that based on the available data, it is believed that the concentration of chemicals significantly decreases after the top 1 foot of soil. In addition to that, five-year reviews will be conducted to ensure the continued efficacy of the remedy. She added that at present there is insufficient data from certain areas of the site, however, the data set would be supplemented before any remedial action is taken.

- Mr. Stanley-Jones inquired whether the other feasibility studies were also pre-screened on the RAO of bringing the site back to existing use.

Ms. Patterson said that she would get back to Mr. Stanley-Jones with the answer to his question.

- Mr. Moss added that there are experts who speak of pitfalls in restoring an area, such as this, to a marshland. He emphasized the need to give due consideration to this input as well. He also pointed out that bioremediation would not be successful in treating heavy metals such as lead.
- Ms. Healy wanted to know if the Navy had conducted epidemiology studies on workers. She was informed that no such studies have been conducted by the Navy.
- Ms. Glick expressed concern about the Proposed Plan going before the public. She felt that a lot of the issues from previous years still needed to be resolved.

Ms. Muckerman thanked everybody for their comments. She introduced Ms. White of the U.S. EPA and Ms. Constantinescu of the Regional Water Quality Control Board.

UPDATE - REGULATORY AGENCIES

Ms. White and Ms. Constantinescu informed the attendees that several documents had been under review since the last RAB meeting. Some of these included the Site 22 Draft ROD; Site 25 Proposed Plan; Operable Unit 1, Site 1 & 2 Interim Remedial Action Report; and the Draft Addendum to the No Further Action Sites. The agencies had also been working on the resolution of the dispute over the Site 27 schedule as indicated by Ms. Muckerman.

SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

Mr. McClure listed the issues that were discussed at the THE meeting:

- Internal Navy contracts with consultants
- Status of WATS
- Typical agenda structure for BRAC Cleanup Team (BCT) meetings and whether RAB members should be invited to attend the BCT meetings
- Site 25 issues, especially with regard to community concerns and public meeting presentation structure
- Conference on institutional cleanup and groundwater issues

RAB BUSINESS

Next RAB Meeting: It was agreed that the next RAB meeting would be held on **Thursday, 08 November 2001**, from 7 to 9 p.m.

Agenda Topics: The following items were suggested and will be included on the 8 November 2001 agenda.

1. NASA redevelopment update
2. Groundwater remediation system update
3. Site 25 update
4. Budget update

5. Moffett Community Housing update - Mr. Michael Stanley-Jones reminded the Navy that he had requested at the last RAB that the risk evaluation model used for the screening level risk assessment be presented to the RAB.
6. Synopsis of Annual Groundwater Monitoring Report, including information on the Middlefield Road-Ellis-Whisman Road (MEW) plume and the impact of the commingled plume on cleanup.

Next Subcommittee Meeting: It was decided that the subcommittee meeting would be moved to the day of the RAB, rather than the day before. Hence, the next THE meeting was scheduled for Thursday, 8 November, from 5 to 7 p.m.

Ms. Muckerman thanked everyone for attending the meeting and adjourned at 9:35 p.m.

Ms. Muckerman can be reached in any of the following ways:

Mail: Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Southwest Division, 1230 Columbia Street, Suite 1100, San Diego, CA 92101

Telephone: 619-532-0911

Fax: 619-532-0995

E-mail: muckermanam@efdswnavfac.navy.mil

RAB meeting minutes are located on the Navy's Southwest Division Environmental Web Page at: <http://www.efdswnavfac.navy.mil/DEP/ENV/default.htm>



Moffett Federal Airfield
Superfund Site
Southwest Division Naval Facilities Engineering Command
Mountain View, California

WELCOME! THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND INTEREST IN MOFFETT AIR FIELD RESTORATION ACTIVITIES.

Please sign in (initial first column).

INITIALS	NAME	AFFILIATION	POSITION
	Ms. Roberta Blank	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency	Regulator
	Mr. James Boarer	Locus Technologies	MEW consultant
	Mr. Carl Bonura	Southwest Division, Naval Facilities Engineering Command	Navy RPM
	Mr. Steven Chinn	Bay Area Air Quality Management District	Participating agency
	Mr. Joseph Chou	Public at large	RAB member
<i>DC</i>	Mr. Don Chuck	National Aeronautics and Space Administration	NASA/ Participating agency
<i>AVC</i>	Ms. Adriana Constantinescu	California Regional Water Quality Control Board	Regulator/ RAB member
	Mr. David Cooper	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency	Regulator
	Mr. Mike DeAngelis	Foster Wheeler Environmental Corporation	Navy consultant
<i>W.D.</i>	Mr. Wilson Doctor	Southwest Division, Naval Facilities Engineering Command	Navy RPM
<i>P.E.</i>	Mr. Pete Everds	Foster Wheeler Environmental Corporation	Navy consultant
	Ms. Cathrene Glick	Geo Plexus	RAB member
	Mr. Jim Haas	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	Participating agency
	Ms. Barbara Healy	Public at large	RAB member
	Ms. Sarah Jones	Tetra Tech EMI	Navy consultant
<i>L.L.</i>	Mr. Lawrence Lansdale	Southwest Division, Naval Facilities Engineering Command	Navy RPM
<i>A.L.</i>	Ms. Alana Lee	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency	Regulator/RAB member
<i>P.L.</i>	Mr. Paul Lesti	Public at large	RAB member
<i>K.L.</i>	Ms. Karen Linehan	Katz & Associates, Inc.	Navy consultant
	Mr. Alan Lui	Locus Technologies	MEW consultant
	Mr. Joe Lukas	Integrated Science Solutions, Incorporated	NASA consultant
<i>J.M.</i>	Mr. James McClure	Olivia Chen Consultants	RAB member/MEW consultant
<i>S.M.G.</i>	Mr. Stewart McGee	City of Sunnyvale, Dept. of Public Safety, Fire and Special Operations	Alternate member



Moffett Federal Airfield
 Superfund Site
 Southwest Division Naval Facilities Engineering Command
 Mountain View, California

WELCOME! THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND INTEREST IN MOFFETT AIR FIELD RESTORATION ACTIVITIES.

Please sign in (initial first column).

INITIALS	NAME	AFFILIATION	POSITION
	Mr. Dennis Mishek	California Regional Water Quality Control Board	Regulator
	Mr. Tom Mohr	Santa Clara Valley Water District	Participating agency
✓ BM	Mr. Bob Moss	Bamm Park Association Foundation	RAB Community Co-chair
✓ AM	Ms. Andrea Muckerman	Southwest Division, Naval Facilities Engineering Command	RAB Co-chair, Navy
	Mr. Gary MuneKawa	Southwest Division, Naval Facilities Engineering Command	Navy ROICC
	Mr. Bill Ogel	Foster Wheeler Environmental Corporation	Navy consultant
	Ms. Sandra Olliges	National Aeronautics and Space Administration	NASA/ Participating agency
✓ MP	Ms. Mary Parker	Southwest Division, Naval Facilities Engineering Command	Navy RPM
	Dr. Martin Reinhard	Stanford University	Academic consultant
	Mr. Luis Rivero	Foster Wheeler Environmental Corporation	Navy consultant
✓ LR	Ms. Rashee Rohatgi	Katz & Associates, Inc.	Navy consultant
✓ LHS	Mr. Lee Saunders	Southwest Division, Naval Facilities Engineering Command	Navy PAO
	Ms. Michelle Schutz	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency	Regulator
✓ JS	Mr. Lenny Siegel	Center for Public Environmental Oversight	RAB member
	Mr. David Smith	Southwest Division, Naval Facilities Engineering Command	Navy ROICC
✓ SDS	Mr. Steve Sprugasci	Public at large	RAB member
	Ms. Louisa Squires	Santa Clara Valley Water District	Participating agency
	Mr. Brian Staab	National Aeronautics and Space Administration	NASA/ Participating agency
	Mr. Michael Stanley-Jones	Silicon Valley Toxics Coalition	RAB member
✓ GS	Mr. Glenn Starr	Foster Wheeler Environmental Corporation	Navy consultant
✓ PS	Mr. Peter Strauss	P.M. Strauss & Associates	Silicon Valley Toxics TAG Consultant
	Mr. Robert Strena	Public at large	RAB member
✓ AT	Mr. Art Tamayo	Southwest Division, Naval Facilities Engineering Command	Navy RPM



Moffett Federal Airfield
 Superfund Site
 Southwest Division Naval Facilities Engineering Command
 Mountain View, California

WELCOME! THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND INTEREST IN MOFFETT AIR FIELD RESTORATION ACTIVITIES.

Please sign in (initial first column).

INITIALS	NAME	AFFILIATION	POSITION
✓	Ms. Hilary Waites	TechLaw, Inc.	U.S. EPA consultant
	Mr. Jack Walker	City of Sunnyvale	Community member
	Ms. Carmen White	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency	Regulator
✓ KDW	Mr. Kevin Woodhouse	City of Mountain View	RAB member
	Ms. Mary Lou Zoglin	City of Mountain View	Alternate member
✓	Mr. Jim Knight	Tetra Tech EM Inc	Navy consultant
✓ S.S.	Mr. Scott Gromko	Southwest Div. Naval Facilities	RPM
	Mr Thomas Anderson	PAI NASA AMES Research Center	NEPA COMPLIANCE
✓	Mr Duncan M. Simmons	Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District	Attorney
✓	Ms. TERRY RYLAND	FOSTER WHEELER ENVIRONMENTAL	GEOLOGIST
✓	Mr. Dennis Goldman	Foster Wheeler Environmental	hydrogeologist
✓	Jim Kennedy	Foster Wheeler Eng.	Hydrogeologist
✓	Bill Reagon	Congresswoman Zoe Lofgren's office	Congressional Asst.
✓	Seena Hoose	Santa Clara Valley Water District	Hydrogeologist
✓	Jilly Lucas	Treasurer of Mountain View	Resource char-
✓	JOSH KWAN	SJMN	reporter

December 04, 2001



Luis Rivero
Foster Wheeler Environmental Corporation
1230 Columbia Street, Suite 640
San Diego, CA 92101

RE: *Community Relations Support for Moffett Federal Airfield*
Transmittal: November 08, 2001 Restoration Advisory Board Meeting Materials

Dear Mr. Rivero:

This letter serves as formal transmittal of the materials made available at the 08 November 2001, Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) meeting. The meeting was held at the Mountain View Community Center from 7 to 9:15 p.m. These materials include:

1. Agenda
2. Minutes from the 09 August 2001 RAB Meeting
3. Sign-in sheet

In addition to these items, RAB applications were available for new meeting attendees and RAB ballots were used for the new member election. If you have any questions about this transmittal, please do not hesitate to call me at 858-452-0031 x390.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Karen Linehan".

Karen Linehan
Project Manager

Attachment: 9 copies

Cc: DC File, FWENC
P. Everds, FWENC
A. Muckerman, SWDIV
L. Lansdale, SWDIV
A. Tamayo, SWDIV
W. Doctor, SWDIV
M. Parker, SWDIV
D. Silva, SWDIV Administrative Record File