

James G. McClure
Moffett Field RAB, THE Committee
c/o Harding Lawson Associates
P.O. Box 6107
Novato, California 94948

November 28, 1995

Mr. Don Chuck
Navy Environmental Office
P.O. Box 68
Building 107
Moffett Field, California 94035

**THE Committee Final Comments
Feasibility Study and Proposed Plan - OU5
Eastside Groundwater
Moffett Federal Airfield, California**

Dear Mr. Chuck:

I am writing this letter on behalf of the Technical, Historical, and Educational Committee (THE Committee) of the Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) for Moffett Federal Airfield (Moffett Field), formerly known as Naval Air Station Moffett Field. The THE Committee is currently reviewing the Feasibility Study (FS) and Proposed Plan for Moffett Field Operable Unit 5 (OU5), also known as the eastside groundwater operable unit. In my November 7, 1995, and November 15, 1995, letters on behalf of the THE Committee, I conveyed a number of issues and questions that the Navy will have to adequately address before the FS and Proposed Plan will meet with THE Committee members' approval. I have attached copies of those earlier letters, for reference.

The purpose of this letter is to confirm an additional THE Committee comment that I conveyed from the floor during the November 16, 1995, public meeting on the OU5 FS and Proposed Plan. Specifically, THE Committee members feel strongly that uncertainties in the OU5 site characterization and in the design and implementation of the OU5 Proposed Plan are so large that the Navy and the involved regulatory agencies should commit to a formal program of ongoing public review and comment, with formal Navy response, after approval of the OU5 Record of Decision (ROD). Community involvement should include, but not be limited to, participation in the design of OU5 monitoring systems and in the interpretation of data collected from those systems.

This ongoing program of community review and approval should be easy to implement through the existing structure of the RAB, and is important to providing adequate public assurance that appropriate and cost-effective remedial actions will be carried out in a timely manner. A clear and strong commitment to providing a meaningful opportunity for the Community to actually influence remedial design and implementation after the ROD is approved will be important to achieving community approval of the ROD. It will also help to simplify the review and approval of the Basewide FS and Proposed Plan.

November 28, 1995
Mr. Don Chuck
Navy Environmental Office
Page 2

Problems with the Basewide FS and Proposed Plan review could arise if the Community feels that it needs to use the Basewide FS/Proposed Plan review and comment process to correct problems with the OU5 FS and Proposed Plan.

If you or your consultants would like to pursue this issue or any of the issues identified in earlier letters, please call me or any of the Committee members. I would also be happy to discuss these topics in more detail during regularly scheduled Navy/MEW/NASA technical coordination meetings.

Very truly yours,



James G. McClure
Moffett Field RAB, THE Committee Chair

JGM:gj/GJ43272.DOC -McC

Attachments

cc: Stephen Chao
Michael Young
Michael Bessette
Joseph Chou
Michael Gill
Elizabeth Adams
Sandy Olliges
Peter Strauss
Paul Lesti
Eric Madera
Vincent T. Jones
Gordon Atkinson
Thomas Trapp
Dennis Curran
Jim Boarer
Richard Andrachek
Tom Iwamura
Leslie Byster
David Glick
Bob Davis
Christina Scott
Cynthia Sievers
Stewart McGee
Robin Parker
Dena Bonnell
MEW Repository c/o Smith Environmental Technologies, Inc.