

5090
Ser 1843.1/7176
April 7, 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 again strongly urged for this meeting. The RAB will be electing our next Community Co-Chair at this meeting.

Our last RAB meeting was held on March 13, 1997 at the City of Mountain View Police and Fire Auditorium in Mountain View, California. The meeting summary is provided as enclosure (1). As enclosures (2) and (3), the resumes of our two current nominees are attached.

Our next RAB meeting will again be held on the second Thursday of the month, April 10, 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
7:45-8:15 PM Budget Presentation
8:15-8:30 PM Community Co-Chair Election
8:30-8:45 PM Break (Ballot Count)
8:45-8:50 PM Election Results
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 1843.1/7176
April 7, 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

Ser 1843.1/7176
April 7, 1997

Moffett RAB Members:

Elizabeth	Adams
Maurice	Ancher
John	Beck
Dena	Bonnell
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	Sprugas
Peter	Strauss
Robert	Strena
Mary	Vrable
Jack	Walker

**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, MARCH 13, 1997

I. INTRODUCTIONS AND MEETING OVERVIEW

Mr. Don Chuck, Navy, opened the meeting of the Moffett Federal Airfield (Moffett Field) restoration advisory board (RAB) at 7:10 p.m. Mr. Chuck reviewed the following agenda items for this meeting:

- Minutes approval
- Remedial project managers (RPM) meeting report
- Committee reports
- Nominations for Co-Chair
- Presentation: "Site 2 Landfill Consolidation"
- Discussion: "Site 2 Landfill Consolidation"
- Agenda and schedule for next RAB meeting

II. MINUTES APPROVAL

Mr. Chuck solicited comments on the minutes of the February 13, 1997 RAB meeting. There were no comments and the minutes were approved without correction.

III. RPM MEETING REPORT

Mr. Michael Rochette, California Environmental Protection Agency (Cal/EPA), San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), provided a report of the March 12, 1997 RPM meeting held at the Cal/EPA Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) offices in Berkeley.

Mr. Rochette mentioned that members from the Bay Area Defense Conversion Action Team (BADCAT) attended the first part of the RPM meeting to discuss cleanup activities at Moffett Field. BADCAT is a private-public partnership of regulators, technical experts, and the Navy that evaluates needs at the bay area's closing military bases to highlight and explore the use of innovative technologies. The program was formed by a partnership between cities, counties, and businesses to assist local businesses in becoming involved in cleaning up closing bases. The program was implemented in two phases. Phase I included surveying bases to identify cleanup needs. Survey results revealed that metals and petroleum contamination were common at most bases. Phase I was completed with soil washing technology demonstration at Hunters Point Naval Shipyard. Phase 2 includes looking at the types of concerns at each base and finishing the surveys to match technologies and bases. BADCAT was interested if soil washing would work at other facilities. The group noted that it would be a challenge to implement it at Moffett Field because of the difficulties in cleaning fine-grained soils that are common there. Mr. Bob Moss, community co-chair, concurred on the difficulty of washing fine-grained soil.

Mr. Rochette summarized action items from the previous RPM meeting. He reported that the Navy is sending Ms. Lynne Trulio, San Jose State University, a letter to document that the burrowing owl population does not appear affected by contaminants at Moffett Field. The agencies and the Navy signed the Operable Unit (OU) 5 consensus letter for effluent levels for extracted groundwater and the types of discharge methods. Mr. Michael Gill, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), added that the consensus letter was a clarification to the OU5 record of decision (ROD) that noted the differences between groundwater levels and discharge levels.

Mr. Rochette provided an update of field work and recent documents. He stated that the Navy's Site 9 source control measure treatment systems were operating continuously at 21.2 gallons per minute during the past month. He reported that last month there were concerns of overflows to the storm drain systems which the Navy addressed by rerouting the discharge. He mentioned that the Navy conducted slug testing at groundwater wells at the iron curtain to help evaluate groundwater flow patterns. Eighteen tests were conducted, 6 within the iron reaction cell and 12 outside. Mr. Rochette noted that this was one of the few sites in the U.S. that specific information was being developed about the flow path of groundwater through the iron curtain. He reported that the Navy would also be conducting bromide tracer tests to learn more about the flow path. Ms. Mary Vrabel, League of

Women Voters, asked whether tracer testing had been previously performed. Mr. Timothy Mower, PRC Environmental Management, Inc. (PRC), reported that one tracer test was performed before the iron curtain was constructed, but the bromide was not detected.

Mr. Rochette discussed miscellaneous field activities at Moffett Field. He stated soil from the Palo Alto harbor project is being delivered to Moffett Field in trucks at a maximum rate of 200 truckloads per day and an average of 100 truckloads per day. This material will be used for the work at the Sites 1 and 2 landfills. He reported that the soil was being placed adjacent to Site 2 in an vacant area chosen by the Navy and NASA. Palo Alto is trying to complete hauling the soil by April 15, 1997 because of ecological concerns at the harbor. Mr. Chuck noted that the project may be completed during the week of March 17, 1997 depending on weather conditions. Mr. Rochette summarized the status of OU1 by noting that a public meeting will be held next Thursday, March 20, 1997, at the City of Mountain View City Council chambers at 7:00 p.m. The public meeting highlights the OU1 proposed plan.

Mr. Rochette reported on the station-wide activities at Moffett Field. Discussions were being held on DTSC's comments on the site-wide ecological assessment (SWEA). There are several outstanding issues that may take time to resolve and the Navy is working with the state to resolve them. Mr. Paul Lesti, Mountain View resident, asked for a summary of the state issues. Mr. Joseph Chou, DTSC, stated that issues included how the Navy used transfer coefficients, which are used to estimate how chemicals bioaccumulate and affect the food chain. Other issues include evaluating individual polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) or total PCBs, using the upper or lower bound hazard quotient range as the best estimate of ecological risk, and clarifying whether there are any affects to the burrowing owls with Ms. Trulio. He reported that the Navy and state would be meeting over the next few weeks to discuss the issues. Ms. Leslie Byster, Silicon Valley Toxics Coalition, asked whether the results of the discussions could be presented to the RAB next month. Mr. Chou noted the issues would most likely not be resolved by then since the state needs time to consider the Navy's responses. Mr. Chan stated that the Navy could provide a progress report at the next meeting. Mr. Moss noted his concern about the resolution process. Mr. Chou responded by summarizing the dispute resolution process that involves elevating the issue to a committee of senior regulatory agency and Navy staff for resolution. Mr. Chan reported that he did not believe the Navy and the state were that far apart and the issues will be resolved in time. Mr. Moss stated his concern that the disagreements do not result in limited uses

for the facility. Mr. Rochette added that it is an ongoing issue and that resolution of the SWEA issues is important for completing the station-wide feasibility study.

Mr. Rochette reported on the status of the west-side aquifers treatment system. He noted that the Navy had reconsidered reuse of the treated water. It will cost approximately \$250,000 to \$300,000 for the federal government (Navy) to supply the treated water to the Moffett Field golf course for irrigation. It will take the government approximately 12 to 15 years to recover this amount based on the low cost the golf course currently pays for irrigation water. Reuse options for the treated water are not as cost-effective as previously hoped. The most cost-effective solution may be discharging the treated water to the storm drain system under existing permits. Mr. Rochette reported that the preliminary design for the east-side aquifers (OU5) was completed and the Navy was interested in expediting the final design to accommodate an early construction period. He reported that the agencies and the Navy were discussing the level of design that would appear in the final design package.

Mr. Rochette reported on activities performed by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) at Moffett Field. No new activities have been performed at areas of interest (AOIs) 2, 5, 7, 9, 10, 11, and 12. A draft report on delineation of petroleum contamination at AOI 1, the former jet fuel farm, was completed and under internal review and canopies were installed over the fueling pits. A report is being prepared summarizing field investigations in January 1997 at two groups of tanks at AOI 3. DTSC commented on a removal action work plan for AOI 4 and Mr. Rochette added that RWQCB does not comment on NASA activities because of an agreement between DTSC and NASA. Mr. David Glick, Mountain View resident, asked if Santa Clara County reviewed the tank work and Mr. Rochette confirmed that they did. NASA installed two new wells at AOI 6, near the former Lindbergh Avenue storm drain channel and were awaiting comments from DTSC regarding contamination areas at AOI 8, the NASA biotreatment area. Mr. Lesti asked what AOI 8 was used for and Ms. Tina Pelley, NASA, responded that the area was previously farm land that is now used for the biotreatment pad and disaster relief training.

Mr. Rochette noted some additional items that were discussed during the RPM meeting. RWQCB was working with the Navy to create a list of petroleum-related documents and a plan to address low-risk petroleum sites under the new state regulations. The Navy proposed a plan to expedite Site 22, Golf Course Landfill 2, by removing it from the station-wide sites and preparing a separate feasibility study,

proposed plan, and ROD. A plan was considered to consolidate the Golf Course Landfill 2 with Site 1, but Site 1 does not have adequate capacity. Ms. Vrabel asked about the contents of Golf Course Landfill 2, if it was characterized, and if contamination has leached out. Mr. Mower responded that the contents were similar to Site 1, the landfill was characterized to the extent recommended by EPA, and no leaching has been observed in groundwater data. Mr. Chuck added that removing the landfill from the station-wide sites will speed up the design and construction while issues with the SWEA were being resolved. Mr. Lesti asked about the contents of golf course fill area 3. Mr. Chuck responded that this site was not a landfill, but rather an old water hazard that the golf course used to place tree branches, brush, and grass clippings.

Mr. Rochette reported that there may be a 30 percent funding reduction under the Department of Defense (DoD) State Memorandum of Agreement (DSMOA), the vehicle the DoD uses to fund the state for oversight at federal military facilities. Some support positions, such as community relations, may be cut as a result. Ms. Byster asked about the status of Ms. Elizabeth Adams, EPA RPM for the Middlefield-Ellis-Whisman (MEW) companies. Mr. Gill responded that she would be working on another site in the Central Valley and that Mr. Loren Henning would be the replacement; his telephone number is (415) 744-2243. Mr. Henning has a Master's Degree in geology and 5 years experience at EPA. Mr. Moss expressed his concern that work at sites may be dropped or things will not be carefully reviewed as a result of the funding cuts. Mr. Rochette replied that sites without significant contamination may be dropped, but sites like Moffett Field will continue to be a focus of agency review. Mr. Moss questioned how to decide which sites to drop and Mr. Rochette replied that sites will remain within state programs until regulatory requirements have been met.

IV. COMMITTEE REPORTS

Mr. Chuck asked the committee chairs to deliver their reports. Dr. James McClure, consultant to the MEW companies, reported that the technical, historical, and educational (THE) committee met on March 12, 1997. He noted that Mr. Stephen Chao, Navy RAB co-chair, attended the meeting. The meeting focused on how data collected for ecological evaluations around the South Bay area are distributed. He reported that Ms. Cynthia Severs, League of Women Voters, arranged a meeting with operators from the Palo Alto and Sunnyvale publicly owned treatment works (POTW) to discuss

coordination between agencies collecting ecological information. Two conclusions were noted from the discussion: (1) although public agencies are collecting ecological data, no efficient mechanism exists to distribute the information to other parties conducting ecological assessments, and (2) distribution of ecological data is not on the critical path for activities at Moffett Field. The League of Women Voters or some other group may follow up on this issue separately. The focus of the RAB should return to the Moffett Field ecological assessment and where the feasibility study is heading. Dr. McClure stated that a number of people in the RAB are concerned that the amount of money spent on the ecological assessment may not have been productive since the results can not be realistically evaluated. There is a good basis for conducting ecological assessments but it is not clear if the assessments are productive for making cleanup decisions. Mr. Gill added that although the ecological assessments are costly, it is a new process that needs to start somewhere. There are many more things to consider in an ecological assessment, compared to human health risk assessments which only consider one receptor. Moffett Field is one of the first bases to go through an ecological assessment and the agencies want to take the time to do it right. Mr. Bob Davis, Mountain View resident, stated that if the purpose of the ecological assessment was to develop assessment methodologies, then it should be defined that way and not used for cleanup decisions. Mr. Gill responded that the ecological assessment at Moffett Field was not a research project, but to help clean up the facility.

Mr. Davis noted that the state of cleanup is not clear: are conditions the same, better, or worse? Can the results of the ecological assessment even be applied to Moffett Field? Mr. Gill replied that affected areas can be identified, but how to apply the results is not yet known. Dr. McClure added that there is not much the Navy can do except spend more resources or identify possible risks and make a risk management decision. Dr. McClure added that EPA should reconsider the role of ecological assessments in the Superfund process. EPA could address the need for data collection, but also acknowledge that the current state of the field of ecological assessment does not yet allow reliable decision making. The Palo Alto POTW has been studying effects from specific metals to one species of clam near its outfall for over 20 years and has only begun to understand the results. It is very difficult to investigate most sites which are much more complex and expect to answer questions regarding effects to the ecological community.

Mr. Lesti added that the problem is timing since Moffett Field is more advanced in the cleanup process and ecological assessment methodologies are only beginning to be worked out. Results of the Moffett Field ecological assessment should be qualified as preliminary since this is so unclear. Mr. Gill

responded that the differences between the Navy and the state on several issues are a good example of the differences in methodologies. Superfund actions may not be the best place to perform ecological assessments, however, EPA decided impacts to ecological communities could no longer be ignored. Dr. McClure noted that this is not really a Moffett Field issue, but rather a Superfund and congressional issue. Mr. Moss noted that the community thinks that the Navy is cleaning up sites for the community to use, but the objectives of the cleanup appear to have changed midway through the process. Mr. Chou noted that the goal is to clean up Moffett Field with the added benefit of generating new ecological data. Mr. Davis again asked whether the base is actually being cleaned up. Mr. Gill responded that conditions are improving based on baseline conditions and a change in operational practices.

There were no reports from the cost, organizational, or communications, media, and outreach committees.

V. NOMINATIONS FOR COMMUNITY CO-CHAIR

Mr. Chuck asked for nominations for the community co-chair position. He noted that a nomination for Mr. David Glick, Mountain View resident, had already been received. Mr. Glick's nomination was seconded. A nomination for Mr. Moss was provided by Ms. Vrabel and was also seconded. There were no other nominations and Mr. Chuck announced that voting would be conducted at the next RAB meeting. Mr. Chan agree to distribute any information provided by the candidates in the next meeting announcement.

VI. SITE 2 LANDFILL CONSOLIDATION PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION

Mr. Chuck introduced Mr. Brian Werle, PRC, who gave a presentation on the Site 2 landfill consolidation. Mr. Werle summarized the chronology of events that began with the June 1995 original proposal to cap Sites 1 and 2 with single layer covers. Based on regulatory agency and public comments on the proposal, the Navy revised the proposal in December 1995 to include multilayered covers at both Sites 1 and 2 and groundwater and landfill gas collection trenches at Site 1 as contingency measures. During fall 1996, the Navy conducted exploratory trenching to gather design

information. The trenching results revealed a smaller area and thickness of waste at Site 2 than originally anticipated.

The Navy conducted an alternatives analysis to evaluate whether Site 2 should be capped as originally planned or if the Site 2 waste should be excavated and consolidated at Site 1. The analysis considered the nine screening criteria used by EPA to evaluate cleanup alternatives. The analysis indicated that both alternatives are protective of human health and the environment and that both satisfy applicable laws. Over the long term, consolidation would eliminate operation and maintenance needs at Site 2, would remove the waste at Site 2 from below the water table and place it above the water table at Site 1, and would allow a greater range of future land uses at Site 2. Over the short term, capping Site 2 would require increased truck traffic to bring in materials and would require more time to complete. There also may be short-term exposures to workers if Site 2 were excavated and consolidated, but health and safety procedures can minimize these risks. Costs for capping Site 2 are approximately \$1,372,700, while costs for consolidation are about \$1,091,700. Additionally, state and federal regulatory agencies support the consolidation of Site 2.

Based on the analysis, the Navy revised the proposal to include capping Site 1 as originally planned (there were no changes to Site 1), excavation of waste at Site 2 and placement at Site 1, backfill and restoration of the land surface at Site 2, and groundwater monitoring at Site 2. Future activities include review of the proposed plan by the public during the public comment period (March 7 to April 11, 1997), a public meeting on March 20, 1997, addressing public comments, and preparing a ROD. The design for the Site 2 consolidation is currently being prepared and should be completed in summer 1997 and consolidation construction activities should begin in late summer 1997. The design for Site 1 should be completed in late 1997 and the Site 1 cover is expected to be constructed during summer 1998.

Mr. Steve Sprugasci, community member, asked how the original waste volume estimate of 169,000 cubic yards was obtained. Mr. Werle replied that the estimate was made during the remedial investigation and feasibility study (RI/FS) and assumed the maximum observed waste thickness (20 feet) was present throughout the maximum extent of the site (5 acres). Ms. Vrabel asked why Golf Course Landfill 2 (Site 22) was not included in OU1. Mr. Werle responded that Site 22 was not identified when the OUs were delineated. Mr. Thomas Harney, San Jose resident, asked whether the

land surface elevation of Site 1 would be higher after the consolidation and cap construction. Mr. Werle replied that the area would be higher on the eastern side of Site 1, and that airfield flight restrictions limited the permissible elevations at Site 1.

Ms. Byster asked for more information about the groundwater monitoring planned for Site 2 after wastes have been removed. Mr. Rochette responded that groundwater samples will be collected quarterly for the first year following consolidation and then semiannually for 2 more years. The data will then be evaluated to assess whether groundwater monitoring should be continued. Ms. Byster asked whether the THE committee believed this was an adequate plan. Dr. McClure asked whether the planned monitoring schedule was similar to that which would be required for a closing Class I (hazardous waste) landfill. Mr. Rochette replied that comparison to a landfill was not appropriate because no waste will remain at Site 2. Mr. Lesti asked whether the operation of Building 191 would be included in the OU1 ROD. Mr. Gill responded that this was correct although the OU5 ROD already addressed this issue. Mr. Lesti asked whether the Palo Alto soils were tested for their suitability for use at the Moffett Field landfills. Mr. Werle replied that the regulatory agencies had approved the use of the Palo Alto soils for all cap layers and for backfill at Site 2. He added that the same soils had been used for the Palo Alto landfill. Mr. Lesti asked whether any contaminants had been detected in the soils. Mr. Werle responded that only metals had been detected. Mr. Glick asked whether the installation of additional wells at Site 1 remained a separate task from the consolidation activities. Mr. Mower replied that this was correct. Mr. Rochette added that the public can still provide comments beyond the April 11, 1997 deadline by attending the May 21, 1997 RWQCB board meeting. Mr. Rochette will present the OU1 ROD to the board at this meeting and public comments will be accepted.

VI. AGENDA AND SCHEDULE FOR NEXT RAB MEETING

Mr. Chuck asked that members submit any completed BADCAT survey forms. Mr. Chan announced that Navy headquarters was considering reducing the 1997 budget for Moffett Field from \$3.2 million to \$1.3 million. The reason is that the Navy expected to have more cost savings at closing bases than have been realized to date. The Navy is working to secure funding necessary to complete planned work at Moffett Field and overall activities should not be seriously affected. Funding for the west-side aquifers treatment system, OU5 treatment system, and Site 2 consolidation is in place and will not be

affected. Some future operation and maintenance activities and construction oversight activities may be eliminated but primary construction funding is not affected. Dr. McClure asked when the Navy's budget exercise was to be completed. Mr. Chan indicated that his input was required in the next day or two. Dr. McClure stated that the community response, therefore, would be necessary immediately. Mr. Chan responded that he had noted in his preparations that the community would be very concerned about any reductions in funding. Mr. Moss stated that he was appalled that "bookkeepers" could run the cleanup process and that the RAB should go on the record as being outraged at this potential action. The government must be responsible to clean up its contamination, he said. Mr. Lesti added that the reduction in funding represents a breach in the community's faith in the Navy's ability to clean up Moffett Field and that a budget-driven cleanup approach was not acceptable. He noted that Congresswoman Anna Eshoo was scheduled to speak at a community meeting in Sunnyvale during the week of March 17, 1997 and would not be pleased to hear of these Navy plans. Mr. Lesti added that the current period at Moffett Field is a critical one as NASA also faces budget reductions and the likelihood of NASA operating the airfield in the future is more in doubt than ever. Mr. Moss stated that forcing the communities to address the Navy's contamination problems is not good policy.

Mr. Chuck reiterated that the next RAB meeting would be held on April 10, 1997. Mr. Moss stated that he would report on an analysis of sampling frequency conducted at the Page Mill site in Palo Alto at the next RAB meeting. RAB members generally proposed that Navy budgets be the topic of the next RAB presentation. Mr. Chan responded that the Navy would provide a report or prepare a presentation of the budget issues for Moffett Field. Ms. Byster announced the availability of a symposium regarding approaches to preventing pollution in the South Bay to be held March 21, 1997 in San Jose. Mr. Chuck closed the meeting at 9:15 p.m.

March 27, 1997

Stephen Chao
Engineering Field Activity - West
Naval Facilities Engineering Command
900 Commodore Dr. - Building 101
San Bruno, Ca 94066-2402

Dear Mr. Chao;

I would like to be re-elected as the community co-chair for the Moffett Field RAB. I served as community co-chair since February 1996 and believe that I have been of service to the community, the Navy, NASA, and the RAB.

As co-chair of the RAB I raised the issue of inadequate funding to complete the site remediation and received favorable responses from several government officials, including Congresswoman Eschoo. I also questioned the reduction in well sampling and monitoring frequency. My contacts with the responsible parties at H-P, Varian, EPA and RWQCB regarding monitoring and sampling protocols allowed a comparison of sampling and monitoring programs at Moffett and at other nearby sites. The results suggest that more frequent well sampling can be justified technically.

I have more than 8 years experience in oversight and remediation activities for 2 superfund sites in Palo Alto. I am a member of the Board and Treasurer of the Barron park Association Foundation which has 2 Technical Assistance Grants from EPA for community representation and oversight of the 1501 and 640 Page Mill Road Superfunds sites in Palo Alto. Activities at the 1501 site are in the final cleanup stage of routine operation of the treatment system. The grant for the 1501 Page Mill site expired Dec. 31, 1995. The 640 Page Mill site will move to routine remediation and monitoring in 1997. Our grant for the 640 Page Mill site expires in July 1998.

I am an engineer at Space Systems/Loral with more than 30 years experience designing and building spacecraft. My prime expertise is in materials, processes, and contamination prevention and control. I am a Registered Professional Metallurgical Engineer in California. I am part chair, and a present member of the executive committee of American Society for Testing and Materials (ASM) Committee E-21, Applications of Space Technology, and have been chair of subcommittee E21.05, Contamination, for almost 20 years. I received the ASTM Award of Merit and am a Fellow of ASTM. Previously I was on the editorial Board of MicroContamination Journal, and was assistant editor of the Society of Advanced Materials & Processes Engineering (SAMPE) Journal.

Other current activities include Board of Directors of Cable Communications Co-operative of Palo Alto, vice-president of the Palo Alto Civic League and past president of the Civic League, Board of the Barron Park Association, member of the Terman Advisory Committee, and secretary of PA-COMNET (Palo Alto Community Network).

In 1983 the Palo Alto Civic League named me Citizen of the Year. I am on the Technical Advisory Committee for the 1998 Space Simulation Conference, and was on the Technical Advisory Committee for the 1994 and 1996 Space Simulation Conferences.

Previously I was President of La Comida de California, the senior nutrition program for Palo Alto and adjacent areas, treasurer of Council for the Arts, Palo Alto and Midpeninsula Area (CAPA), Chairman of Palo Alto School for Jewish Education, a member of the Jordan-Garland School Site Disposition Committee, and as member of the Terman Working Group, which established new uses for a closed school.

My experience with the 2 superfund sites, plus my other very broad community and professional experience provides an excellent background in contamination, test and evaluation, and analytically evaluating information and promptly reaching valid conclusions. As a community member my main interest is assuring the toxic sites at Moffett are cleaned to the greatest and most cost-effective level possible, and will present no future health risks or inhabit future reuse of the site.

I enjoyed the past 15 months of service as community co-chair. I believe that I have contributed to the past success and lack of acrimony among RAB members. if the RAB members wish to have me continue serve as chair or co-chair for Moffett I will be honored and will do my best to assist in moving cleanup forward as quickly and effectively as possible.

Yours very truly,

Bob Moss
4010 Orme
Palo Alto, Ca, 94306
852-6018 (w)

DAVID C. GLICK

REGISTRATION

Registered Geologist: California
Certified Hydrogeologist: California

Certified Engineering Geologist: California
Registered Environmental Assessor: California

EDUCATION

B.S., Geology, San Diego State University

PROFESSIONAL AFFILIATIONS

Association of Engineering Geologists
Seismological Society of America

Earthquake Engineering Research Institute.
National Water Well Association

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE AND BACKGROUND

Mr. Glick is the Director of Geologic and Environmental Services for Geo Plexus and has over 19 years of experience in management and business development, engineering geology, environmental management, ground water hydrology, geotechnical engineering, earthquake engineering, value engineering, and construction technology in private industry and the federal government. During his association with the Western Division, Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Mr. Glick was responsible for road and airfield construction designs, performing hydrology studies for design of surface water control structures; design and construction of shoreline and channel slope protection; design and installation of hillside dewatering/drainage structures; and for providing construction support in all aspects of geotechnical engineering and engineering geology.

Mr. Glick is currently responsible for the management and execution of preliminary and detailed (Phase I, II, and III) environmental site assessments, geologic studies, and hydrogeologic investigations throughout the Western United States for the assessment of leaking surface and underground storage tanks, electroplating surface impoundment closures, and landfill investigations. Specific projects have included: professional oversight during tank closures, subsurface characterization investigations, ground water characterization studies, determining soil and hydraulic characteristics of aquifer materials, contaminant migration assessments, and remedial feasibility studies. He has been responsible for the selection, negotiations, and direct management of consultants and contractors for site investigations and remedial action, preparation of remedial action construction contracts, and implementation of remedial activities.

Mr. Glick has been responsible for preparation of remedial action designs, preparation of bidding packages, and for management of remedial earthwork projects including contractor selection and management, coordination of equipment, transportation, and disposal of contaminated soil. Mr. Glick has also been responsible for design, installation, and maintenance of in-situ remedial systems including: ground water extraction, vapor extraction, co-extraction, air-sparging, passive bioventing, and oxygen releasing compounds (for low risk case remediation).

Mr. Glick has provided independent consultation and professional oversight to various construction firms for installation of gas extraction and gas monitoring systems for City of Mountain View landfill closure projects.

As Production Director for Huerfano Productions (a division of Geo Plexus) Mr. Glick is responsible for productions of construction documentation and training videos, oral histories and personal documentaries with responsibilities including: lighting, staging, video/audio mixing, video recording (Hi-8, VHS, SVHS, and Beta formats), audio recording, and editing. Mr. Glick is the Bay Area's independent technical service manager for Foto Fantasy for installation and maintenance of video, audio, and printing equipment.

Mr. Glick is also supports Geo Plexus Commercial Services Division for direct marketing and sales and development of independent dealers for Alpine Industries Air Purification products.