

5090
Ser 1843.1/7139
March 6, 1997

Dear RAB Member:

On behalf of the Moffett Federal Airfield (MFA) Base Closure Team and the Community Co-Chair, you are invited to our next Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) meeting. Your attendance is strongly urged for this meeting. We will be accepting nominations for our next Community Co-Chair at this meeting.

Our last RAB meeting was held on February 13, 1997 at the City of Mountain View Police and Fire Auditorium in Mountain View, California. The meeting summary is provided as enclosure (1).

Our next RAB meeting will again be held on the second Thursday of the month, March 13, 1997. It will be held at the usual meeting location, the Mountain View Police and Fire Auditorium in Mountain View, California. 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 Minutes Approval
7:10-7:30 PM Remedial Project Managers Meeting Report
7:30-7:45 PM Subcommittees Report
7:45-8:00 PM Community Co-Chair Nominations
8:00-8:30 PM Operable Unit 1 Proposed Plan Presentation
8:30-8:50 PM Operable Unit 1 Proposed Plan Discussion
8:50-9:00 PM Agenda/Schedule for the Next RAB Meeting

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

Sincerely,

ORIGINAL SIGNED BY:
STEPHEN CHAO
~~BRAC Environmental Coordinator~~
Moffett Federal Airfield

Ser 1843.1/7139
March 6, 1997

Moffett RAB Members:

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

Ser 1843.1/7139
March 6, 1997

Distribution:

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

Blind copy to:

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

**MOFFETT FEDERAL AIRFIELD
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING**

MEETING MINUTES

**CITY OF MOUNTAIN VIEW POLICE/FIRE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING
1000 Villa Street
Mountain View, California 94041**

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 13, 1997

I. INTRODUCTIONS AND MEETING OVERVIEW

Mr. Hubert Chan, Navy, opened the meeting of the Moffett Federal Airfield (Moffett Field) restoration advisory board (RAB) at 7:05 p.m. Mr. Chan reviewed the following agenda items for this meeting:

- Minutes approval
- Remedial project managers (RPM) meeting report
- Committee reports
- Navy/NASA groundwater monitoring program
- Stationwide feasibility study (FS) discussion
- Presentation: "West-Side Aquifers Treatment System Design"
- Discussion: "West-Side Aquifers Treatment System Design"
- Nominations for Co-Chair
- BADCAT Survey
- Agenda and schedule for next RAB meeting

Mr. Chan noted that the groundwater monitoring discussion, nominations for co-chair, and the Bay Area Defense Conversion Action Team (BADCAT) survey were added items not included in the agenda previously mailed to the members.

II. MINUTES APPROVAL

Mr. Chan solicited comments on the minutes of the January 9, 1997 RAB meeting. There were no comments and the minutes were approved without correction.

III. RPM MEETING REPORT

Mr. Michael Gill, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), provided a report of the February 12, 1997 RPM meeting held at the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) offices at Moffett Field. Mr. Gill stated that the Navy's Site 9 source control measure treatment systems were operating continuously during the past month with only minor interruptions. He reported that the total system flow rate was approximately 23 gallons per minute (gpm). Mr. Gill noted that the flow rates from the four extraction wells were about the same as last month, but that flow from the storm drain action was much higher due to recent heavy rains. He added that overflows from the storm drain action system were a problem during the past month and explained a schematic diagram of the storm drain action and the Building 45 treatment system. Mr. Gill explained that the Navy planned to implement an interim solution

to the overflow problem by rerouting the overflow line from the storm drain action back to the Hangar 1 tunnel instead of allowing it to discharge to the facility storm drain system. This modification will allow the Hangar 1 tunnel to act as a surge chamber and eliminate the overflow problem. Mr. Gill added that the Navy would provide a permanent solution to the problem when the west-side aquifers treatment system (WATS) was constructed during summer 1997. This solution will involve a higher-capacity transfer pump and, perhaps, a larger storage tank. Mr. Peter Strauss, MHB Associates and consultant to the Silicon Valley Toxics Coalition (SVTC), asked what type of treatment was conducted at the Building 45 system. Mr. Don Chuck, Navy, replied that the system used an air stripper followed by granular activated carbon (GAC) for treatment.

Mr. Gill reported that activities at the iron curtain pilot test included groundwater sampling at 62 monitoring points. He added that a tracer test was planned during March 1997. Ms. Mary Vrabel, League of Women Voters, asked what compound had been selected as the tracer. Mr. Gill responded that bromide would be used. Ms. Vrabel asked whether the bromide would react with the iron in the cell. Mr. Gill replied that the bromide would not react with the iron. Ms. Vrabel commented that she believed that the iron would collect the bromide, as it would also collect chloride. Mr. Tim Mower, PRC Environmental Management, Inc. (PRC), responded that the iron cell would not collect bromide or chloride, but that these ions would pass through the cell. Mr. Gill reported that a meeting of a national process action team studying innovative in situ treatment systems, including permeable reaction cells, would meet on February 25 and 26, 1997. Mr. Strauss noted that he had been asked by local citizens about the iron curtain and if it was a pilot test or whether it would replace other cleanup controls. Mr. Gill replied that the iron curtain is a pilot test and does not replace other cleanup plans. Mr. Strauss asked whether the iron cell would be removed after the pilot test was completed. Mr. Gill responded that it would most likely be left in place since it is working effectively. He added that the iron curtain could be expanded to have a larger effect on the contaminants in the west-side aquifer system. Ms. Vrabel asked whether the results from the pilot test were good. Mr. Gill replied that the Navy sampled the pilot test area wells frequently and that results indicated effective destruction of contaminants.

Mr. Gill reported that the Navy was investigating injection of sodium dithionite, a common chemical used in paper bleaching, to create in-place zero-valent iron. The process uses the iron already existing underground instead of excavating and placing iron granules. Mr. Mower added that the Navy had not yet selected a location to test this technique, but that the west-side aquifers were a likely candidate due to the high contaminant concentrations in groundwater. Mr. Chan noted that the Naval Facilities Engineering Services Center (NFESC) was tasking Battelle to evaluate whether the technology was suitable for a trial at Moffett Field. If the evaluation is favorable, a small test may be suggested. Mr. Strauss commented that the Navy should seek input from the RAB early in the process rather than just announcing an intention to test a technology. He added that injecting chemicals sounded risky. Mr. Chan replied that consideration of the technology was in its earliest stages and that the RAB would have the opportunity to review and comment on the work plans that would be prepared before any technology was tested. Mr. Chan stated that he would provide Battelle's evaluation report to the technical, historical, and educational (THE) committee when it was available.

Mr. Gill continued his report by stating that the Navy planned to conduct a seismic reflection survey to provide three-dimensional data over a portion of the western side of the station. He added that the objectives of the survey were to optimize the location of WATS groundwater extraction wells as well as to better understand the performance of the iron curtain pilot test. Mr. Gill reported that quarterly sampling activities were scheduled for the week of February 17, 1997 and were focused on new wells. Mr. Gill added that the number of wells sampled during each quarter had declined recently. However, the number of samples collected would soon increase as preconstruction baseline sampling events were conducted and as

regular long-term sampling begins after the treatment systems are built and started. Mr. Bob Moss, community co-chair, asked whether water elevations also would be collected. Mr. Gill responded that elevations continued to be monitored at all wells every quarter.

Mr. Gill reported that activities related to consolidation of the Site 2 landfill into the Site 1 landfill at operable unit 1 (OU1) were progressing and that the regulatory agencies were reviewing a draft proposed plan for this action. He stated that the public meeting to discuss the proposed plan was scheduled for March 20, 1997. Mr. Gill added that reaching a final record of decision (ROD) by the end of April 1997 was the goal of the Navy and the agencies.

Mr. Gill stated that agency comments on the stationwide FS report had been submitted. He noted that the Navy suggested simplifying the FS by separating Golf Course Landfill 2 from the rest of the FS, which is centered on ecological issues. Handling this landfill separately may allow for more rapid action at that site. Mr. Gill reported that the Navy also was considering addressing ecological monitoring separately since it is such a complex issue. He stated that the regulatory agencies suggested that additional attention be paid to mitigation in the development of remedial alternatives, such as creating or enhancing existing wetlands as Ms. Jenny Decker of the California Department of Fish and Game mentioned at the last RAB meeting.

Mr. Gill reported that the Navy had submitted the WATS 100-percent design and draft long-term monitoring plan. He stated that comments on the design were due by February 28, 1997 and comments on the monitoring plan were due on March 28, 1997. Mr. Gill noted that the Navy was planning to hold an open house in place of the May RAB meeting to present the designs for the east-side and west-side aquifer treatment systems. He added that the preliminary design for the OU5 (east-side) treatment system was scheduled to be submitted on February 24, 1997.

Mr. Gill summarized activities conducted by NASA. NASA completed a second round of sampling at area of interest (AOI) 1, a fuel farm, and has concluded that the soil above the groundwater is not contaminated. NASA has installed two new groundwater monitoring wells at AOI 3, the north aircraft ramp area. A removal action work plan and fact sheet have been submitted for underground storage tanks near the large wind tunnel (AOI 4). Installation of additional wells along the Lindbergh Avenue storm channel has been delayed by the heavy rains. NASA submitted a report discussing AOI 8 to the state regulatory agencies. NASA may consider also presenting the status of its activities at the May 1997 open house. Mr. Gill concluded his report by stating that the next RPM meeting is scheduled for March 12, 1997.

Ms. Byster asked whether the short comment periods for some OU1 reports were correct. Mr. Gill responded that some periods were as short as 2 weeks. Mr. Chan added that the accelerated schedule was necessary to allow construction during summer 1997. Mr. Strauss asked whether the public would have longer to comment on the proposed plan for OU1. Mr. Gill responded that the public comment period was scheduled through April 7, 1997.

IV. COMMITTEE REPORTS

Mr. Chan asked the committee chairs to deliver their reports. Dr. Jim McClure, Harding Lawson Associates and consultant to the Middlefield-Ellis-Whisman (MEW) companies, reported that the THE committee met on February 12, 1997 and that the committee members had received two document distributions since the last meeting. Dr. McClure noted that the committee discussed two topics. The first topic was the coordination of ecological data and analyses. Ms. Cynthia Sievers arranged a fact-finding meeting on February 27, 1997 with Mr. Phil Bolbo and Ms. Helen Farnham who are officials at two of the region's largest wastewater treatment facilities. The meeting is intended to solicit information about what

data exchange may already be occurring within the region. The second topic concerned the long-term groundwater monitoring plan for the WATS and its new portrayal of hydrogeologic data for the treatment area. Dr. McClure reported that figures within the monitoring plan provided another way of viewing the data. He added that a printing error exists on the color data-presentation figures and that PRC had volunteered to provide corrected figures before the final report was submitted, if requested. Dr. McClure concluded his report by stating that the next THE committee meeting was scheduled for March 12, 1997.

Mr. Chan asked whether the cost committee was still active. Mr. David Glick, Geoplexus, responded that it was active but no significant cost issues had recently required the cost committee's attention. He added that more issues may arise as construction of various remedial actions approaches.

V. NAVY/NASA GROUNDWATER MONITORING PROGRAM

Mr. Mower summarized recent quarterly sampling activities at Moffett Field. Since 1989, the Navy has monitored groundwater contaminant plumes at the station. Since 1992, wells in the east-side (OU5) volatile organic compound (VOC) plume have been sampled 12 times. Likewise, wells monitoring the west-side VOC plume have been sampled 11 times since 1992. Other information in addition to the data collected by the Navy are available to monitor the west-side groundwater at Moffett Field. The MEW companies have collected several rounds of data from the west-side VOC plume; the most recent set of samples was collected in 1992. NASA also monitors its 80 wells in the northern portion of the west-side VOC plume quarterly.

In November 1994, as Navy activities moved out the remedial investigation (RI) phase and into the FS phase, the Navy began an 18-month quarterly sampling cycle. For six quarters, sampling was focused on individual plumes across the station to support FS and design activities, instead of the more widespread characterization sampling that was conducted previously. The areas sampled during the six quarters included the west-side VOC plume, the OU5 VOC plume, the Site 5 petroleum-contaminated area, the leading edge of the west-side VOC plume, deeper aquifer wells, and new wells. By February 1996, adequate information was available for FS and design purposes and the quarterly sampling program changed to focus on sampling newly installed wells to provide a baseline data set for each well. When the 18-month cycle was designed, groundwater remediation systems were scheduled to be in operation at or near the end of the cycle. A regular sequence of performance monitoring samples accompanies each treatment system, and the Navy did not intend to continue the sampling cycle beyond 18 months because the regular performance monitoring program would accomplish this function.

The treatment system design and construction schedule ultimately did not coincide with the end of the 18-month quarterly sampling cycle and a slightly longer time elapsed than intended between the end of the cycle and the start of performance monitoring. However, construction of both the east-side and west-side groundwater treatment systems is scheduled for summer 1997 and a baseline round of groundwater samples also is scheduled in summer 1997 for both these plumes. The regulatory agencies are reviewing the long-term groundwater monitoring plans for the treatment systems and regular performance monitoring samples will be collected after the systems begin operation. Mr. Mower then solicited questions from the members about the groundwater monitoring program.

Mr. Strauss asked how the sampling frequency changed. Mr. Chan responded that sampling progressed from many wells for characterization, to the 18-month cycle to support FS and design activities, to only new wells prior to initiation of treatment system operations. He added that, because of a miscommunication, the regulatory agencies believed that the 18-month cycle would begin again after the six quarters of sampling were completed. However, the Navy did not intend to continue the cycle because

designs were scheduled to be in place before the end of the cycle. Mr. Strauss asked whether the agreement for the 18-month quarterly sampling cycle was recent. Mr. Gill responded that the Navy and the regulatory agencies agreed on this approach to quarterly sampling in 1994. He added that NASA's data are adequate to monitor the west-side VOC plume and that baseline sampling before startup of the remediation systems is near enough that continuation of the sampling cycle is not necessary. Mr. Strauss asked how much money was saved each quarter by reducing the number of wells sampled. Mr. Mower replied that approximately \$40,000 to \$60,000 was saved each quarter.

Mr. Moss commented that the baseline period should be four quarters rather than a single event. He added that Hewlett Packard (HP) was required by the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) to sample more frequently during the implementation of its cleanup. Mr. Chan responded that samples may be collected at Moffett Field at a similar frequency when it reaches a similar stage in the remedial process. Mr. Moss noted that many more wells are sampled at the HP site even though the contaminated area is much smaller than the area at Moffett Field. He added that unexpected results are often observed every quarter and that the increased sampling frequency aided in understanding site conditions. Mr. Gill replied that EPA has suggested that the Navy apply a cost-effective sampling approach developed at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratories to the long-term monitoring of its portion of the west-side VOC plume. Mr. Moss stated that he was aware of the study, but that his technical advisers had indicated that the approach did not significantly reduce the frequency of sampling.

Mr. Strauss asked Dr. McClure whether sampling requirements for the MEW site were consistent with those planned by the Navy. Dr. McClure responded that sampling requirements were not the same for both sites and that the Navy had significantly more latitude in determining the sampling frequency for Moffett Field than the private parties had for the MEW site. He commented that regulatory agency policy often appears arbitrary and technically unfounded. Dr. McClure cited his experience at a site owned by Teledyne/NEC at which a technically justified request to reduce sampling frequency was rejected by the regulatory agency without technical basis. He noted that liability control and well locations may control sampling entirely outside of technical reasons. Dr. McClure added that current inconsistencies between the Navy and MEW sampling programs will be reconciled for the long-term monitoring of the area. Mr. Strauss agreed that consistency over the long term was important.

Mr. Moss stated that valid technical reasons are necessary to support a sampling program. Dr. McClure responded that, nevertheless, this is often not true. Mr. Moss added that HP was in the process of reducing the frequency of sampling in some areas and that he hoped that the end product would be a rational sampling plan rather than an agency decree. Mr. Michael Rochette, RWQCB, replied that he had worked for private companies before his current position at RWQCB and that he had observed that private dischargers often feel overtaxed in comparison to federal facilities. He added that RWQCB is funded for full-time management of federal facilities, but not for private sites. Therefore, private parties must build a stronger case because RWQCB has less time to review the information. Mr. Rochette noted that the Navy may be allowed slightly more flexibility, but RWQCB can spend the time to monitor the Navy much more closely to ensure that the Navy's plans are technically sound.

Mr. Chan then introduced Ms. Tina Pelley, Science Applications International Corporation (SAIC) and consultant to NASA, who summarized NASA's quarterly sampling program. Ms. Pelley stated that NASA monitors wells in four sections at Moffett Field and monitors about half of the wells each quarter. She noted that 44 wells in sections 10 and 14 are sampled during the first and third quarters of the year and that 32 wells in sections 11 and 15 are sampled during the second and fourth quarters. Ms. Pelley added that, similar to the Navy, newly installed wells are sampled for four consecutive quarters. She said that NASA was still in the characterization stage and was only beginning to evaluate whether a reduction in sampling

frequency was appropriate. Mr. Moss asked whether NASA had an estimate of when the characterization phase would be completed. Ms. Pelley replied that she did not know whether NASA had made such an estimate.

Mr. Chan proposed postponing the presentation and discussion of the WATS design to allow time for the stationwide FS discussion. Ms. Byster asked when comments on the design were due. Mr. Strauss replied that comments on the WATS design were due on February 28, 1997. Dr. McClure added that he had distributed copies of the design to members of the THE committee. Mr. Strauss asked whether the THE committee planned to prepare comments on the design. Dr. McClure replied that no committee members had yet indicated the need for comments. He added that much of the design details were not of interest, but that the monitoring plan, extraction well locations, and commitment to the objectives of the cleanup were the important aspects. Mr. Chan stated that the Navy would review the WATS design with anyone who was interested.

VI. STATIONWIDE FS DISCUSSION

Mr. Chan stated that the stationwide FS discussion was intended to provide the regulatory agencies an opportunity to present their comments without response from the Navy. Mr. Gill summarized EPA comments that were submitted on January 31, 1997:

1. The FS report should propose cleanup levels based on site-specific data rather than on literature values.
2. The Navy should present alternatives that address the more protective hazard quotients (HQs) and should use a more protective point of departure to present ecological risks. Similarly, the Navy should use 10^{-6} as the point of departure for human health risk evaluations. No cleanup is required for risks less than 10^{-6} and cleanup is definitely required for risks greater than 10^{-4} . In the range between 10^{-4} and 10^{-6} , the cleanup decision is made based on site-specific information. The Navy should present cleanup alternatives to address the risks in the 10^{-4} to 10^{-6} range.
3. Any long-term ecological monitoring must also contain a contingency for corrective action if a problem is discovered.
4. The Navy should investigate whether consolidation of wastes at Golf Course Landfill 2 into Site 1 should be added as a remedial alternative, instead of only considering capping.
5. The Navy should consider on-site disposal of contaminated sediments in developing the cleanup alternatives. The proposed corrective action management unit (CAMU) at Site 1 would be acceptable for disposal of contaminated sediments.
6. Wetlands mitigation should be expanded as a cleanup alternative.
7. More details should be provided to support the estimates of the quantities of sediments to be removed.
8. More justification is needed to screen out metals from the analysis. The agencies and the Navy have agreed that metals are naturally occurring in soil and groundwater. However, an analysis of sediments, as a separate medium, should be conducted.

Mr. Rochette stated that RWQCB had many of the same concerns addressed by EPA. He summarized RWQCB concerns:

1. The FS report should contain additional information from the sitewide ecological assessment (SWEA) for explanation, especially of the HQ presentation.
2. The Navy should use 10^{-6} , not 10^{-4} as the point of departure for risk presentations.
3. The horizontal hydraulic conductivity of sediments should be re-evaluated. The values used in the FS report appear too low, especially compared with values used at OU5.
4. The compilation of cleanup alternatives is too limited. Capping and excavation are the primary options considered. Little background information is provided concerning why innovative technologies won't be effective. Mr. Rochette solicited the RAB members for ideas on remediating wetland areas.
5. Mitigation should be expanded as an alternative. RWQCB requires a minimum of 3 new wetland acres for every 1 acre destroyed. RWQCB provided a list of wetland restoration projects around San Francisco Bay in their written comments. The RAB may be interested in the outreach programs from other agencies also concerned with wetlands issues.
6. Consolidation of Golf Course Landfill 2 should be addressed.
7. Metals screening for sediments should be expanded.
8. Additional explanation should be provided concerning the proposed excavation depth of 1 foot for many of the alternatives. Sample data often extend to 2 feet below surface and it is not clear why excavation should stop at 1 foot.
9. Continuing sources of contaminants, especially polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), need to be eliminated.

Mr. Joseph Chou, California EPA Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), stated that most of DTSC's comments had already been covered. He summarized additional concerns:

1. The FS report should summarize risks across OUs and not be limited in focus.
2. The methods of using HQs should be more fully supported. Whether the alternatives are sufficiently protective should be evaluated. Perhaps bioassays of lower organisms should be used if agreement cannot be reached on HQs.
3. The Navy should use 10^{-6} , not 10^{-4} as the point of departure for risk presentations.
4. The Navy should develop a broader range of alternatives with more distinctly different technologies. The alternatives presented in the FS report are too closely related.

Mr. Strauss commented that the Navy had considered only variations in cleanup extent and not different technologies in the development of remedial alternatives. Mr. Chou responded that the stationwide FS is different from traditional studies because of its ecological emphasis, but that additional cleanup technologies are still needed. He added that future land use may affect cleanup levels and that the FS should consider conservative uses, such as residential development. Mr. Chou stated that the Navy and the regulatory agencies need to minimize uncertainties in the analysis to be confident a correct action is selected. Mr. Strauss stated that the FS does not consider cumulative risks across various OUs. He added that long-term operation of the Building 191 pump station is not mentioned in the FS report, but should be since it is part of the future land use question. Mr. Strauss said that the next submittal of the FS report would be a revised draft final version, so the RAB would have another opportunity to comment.

Dr. McClure noted that a key objective of the stationwide FS was to consider additive effects between OUs. He added that an historical assessment of the facility presented as an annotated bibliography or a flow chart would be useful in the FS report. Dr. McClure commented that contaminant sources in the storm drain system were not adequately addressed in previous Navy reports and should be addressed in the FS report. He added that the storm drain issue has been a concern for several years. Mr. Strauss stated that the stationwide ROD should not be limited in scope as the FS is. He added that an annotated historical discussion should be included in the FS report.

Mr. Moss noted that the City of Palo Alto requires all sites to be remediated to drinking water standards so that housing can be constructed in any area and future land uses are not limited. Mr. Gill replied that the cleanup at Moffett Field is no different. Mr. Alex Terrazas, City of Mountain View, added that the city believes that cleanup should be conducted to allow the maximum range of future land uses.

Mr. Chan stated that the majority of the differences between the Navy and the regulatory agencies were in addressing ecological issues. He added that the Navy had proposed separating significant issues and addressing them separately. Mr. Chan noted that the Navy would be having additional meetings with the regulatory agencies to discuss the FS. Mr. Terrazas asked what would be the next step in the stationwide FS process. Mr. Mower responded that the next submittal of the FS report would be at least 45 days from the date Navy receives DTSC's comments. Mr. Chou added that these comments were scheduled to be submitted on February 14, 1997. Mr. Gill stated that EPA had proposed completing the SWEA before continuing the FS, which could delay the next version of the FS report by 1 to 2 months. Mr. Chou reiterated that the next submittal of the FS would be a revised draft final version and that the regulatory agencies and the RAB would have another opportunity to comment.

VII. NOMINATIONS FOR CO-CHAIR

Mr. Moss stated that his term as community co-chair had expired and it was time to select a new co-chair. He added that he would consider serving an additional term as co-chair and asked for other members who were interested to identify themselves. Ms. Byster proposed to continue the nomination on the next month's agenda because there had not been sufficient time for members to consider this issue since it was not announced in the agenda sent to the members but was added during the meeting. Mr. Chan stated that members interested in serving as community co-chair should send information to Mr. Moss or himself. Mr. Chan asked if specific procedures from the RAB bylaws apply to multiple terms for the co-chair position. Mr. Paul Lesti, Mountain View resident, replied that the bylaws do not limit the number of terms a co-chair can serve, but the position must be elected by the RAB each year. Mr. Glick added that notification of nominations for community co-chair should be added to the announcement for the next RAB meeting. Ms. Byster stated that nominations could be made in March and the election held in April 1997. Dr. McClure suggested that the notification for nominations be prominently displayed on the meeting announcement to

ensure that members were aware. Mr. Lesti noted that a quorum of members must be present for the election and that the RAB may want to reconsider the process of establishing active members.

VIII. BADCAT SURVEY

Mr. Chan stated that a survey form from BADCAT soliciting input from RAB members was available at the meeting. He added that members could send the form to the Navy's office in San Bruno or bring it to the next RAB meeting.

IX. AGENDA AND SCHEDULE FOR NEXT MEETING

Mr. Chan announced that a list of upcoming documents was available at the meeting and that this list may be useful in selecting items for the agenda of the next RAB meeting. Mr. Chan suggested that a discussion of the consolidation proposed for OU1 would be timely since the public meeting for this topic is scheduled for 1 week following the next RAB meeting. Dr. McClure added that a summary of the February 27, 1997 meeting between the THE committee and regional treatment facility officials could also be placed on the agenda. Mr. Chan reminded members that the next meeting was scheduled for March 13, 1997 and closed the meeting at 9:15 p.m.