

**FORMER NAVAL AIR STATION MOFFETT FIELD
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING
BUILDING 943, EAGLE ROOM
MOFFETT FIELD, CALIFORNIA**

NOTE: An acronym list is provided on the last page of these minutes.

Subject: RAB MEETING MINUTES

The Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) meeting for former Naval Air Station (NAS) Moffett Field was held on Thursday, 11 June 2009, at Building 943 in the Eagle Room at Moffett Field, California. Bob Moss, RAB community co-chair, and John Hill, U.S. Navy Base Closure Manager, opened the meeting at 7:00 p.m.

WELCOME

Mr. Hill and Mr. Moss welcomed everyone in attendance. Mr. Moss asked those present to introduce himself or herself after he provided a brief overview of the agenda for the meeting.

The former NAS Moffett Field RAB meeting was attended by:

RAB Members	Regulators	Navy	Consultants & Navy Support	NASA	Public & Other
11	4	3	3	8	62

ANNOUNCEMENTS

- Mr. Hill introduced Kathy Stewart, the new Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Environmental Coordinator (BEC) for former NAS Moffett Field.
- Mr. Moss asked the RAB members if they had any announcements they would like to make. RAB member Arthur Schwartz read a letter from the City of Sunnyvale written to Kimberly Kesler (Navy), dated August 18, 2008, regarding the Site 29 (Hangar 1) Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis (EE/CA). The City of Sunnyvale does not agree that the Navy’s Alternative 10 is an acceptable remedy for Hangar 1. The City feels the Navy’s costs discussed in the EE/CA for Alternative 10 were not accurate and do not effectively address the contaminants inside Hangar 1. The City of Sunnyvale does not support removal of the siding on Hangar 1 and encourages the Navy to reach out to the community. The letter was signed by the City of Sunnyvale’s Mayor, Anthony Spitaleri.
- Jac Siegel (City of Mountain View Council Member) presented a letter to Mr. Hill from the City of Mountain View. The letter stated the City of Mountain View is in favor of the Navy being held responsible for remediating and re-siding Hangar 1.
- Mr. Moss read a letter from Congresswoman Anna Eshoo’s office stating that a path forward for re-siding and reusing Hangar 1 should be in place before the Navy begins to remove the siding. Representative (Rep.) Eshoo is requesting Navy leadership to develop a plan to re-side the hangar. Rep. Eshoo is concerned the Navy will leave the skeleton of Hangar 1 exposed to the elements while a path forward is established for residing and reuse. Mr. Moss stated the new Secretary of the Navy should be evaluating the

issues that involve Hangar 1 and review all of letters that support re-siding the hangar received from elected representatives, cities, and community members.

APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

Mr. Moss asked for corrections to the 12 March 2009 meeting minutes. Mr. Moss said that on page 5 the sentence, “Mr. Moss agreed to revise the RAB resolution to delete the discussion of Alternative 4 and resubmit it to the RAB for review” should be corrected to read, “Mr. Moss agreed to revise the RAB resolution to remove all references to Alternative 4, and to request approval of the rest of the resolution by the RAB. After a brief discussion, the RAB voted 9 to 1 in favor of approving the resolution rejecting actions to complete Option 10, removal of the walls of Hangar 1, unless and until there is a firm, funded commitment to replace the siding.”

The 12 March 2009 meeting minutes were approved as corrected. Meeting minutes are posted to the former NAS Moffett Field project website at:

<http://www.bracpmo.navy.mil/basepage.aspx?baseid=52&state=California&name=moffett>.

DOCUMENTS FOR REVIEW

Documents are available in CD-ROM format. Sign-up sheets for the documents listed below were circulated during the meeting.

<u>#</u>	<u>DOCUMENT</u>	<u>APPROXIMATE SUBMITTAL DATE</u>
1.	Final Site 28 2008 Annual Groundwater Report	June 2009

SITE 29, HANGAR 1 PROGRESS UPDATE

Mr. Hill said the Navy has been developing a plan for a Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) removal action at Hangar 1 for five years. Mr. Hill gave a brief update on the Navy’s actions since the Action Memorandum (AM) for Hangar 1 was signed on 31 December 2008. The Navy developed a scope of work for Alternative 10 and issued a formal request for proposals (RFPs) on April 7, 2009. The Navy is utilizing an Environmental Multiple Award Contract for solicitation to four contractors (Innovative Technical solutions, Inc; TN & Associates; Shaw Environmental; and AMEC Earth & Environmental Inc.). Proposals are due to the Navy on July 6, 2009. A technical evaluation board will review the submitted proposals and the goal is to award the contract by the end of July 2009. The period of performance for this action has been extended to 30 months. Following contract award, it is anticipated that the first 6 months will be utilized for preparation of all required work plans. The remaining 24 months will be utilized for mobilization and implementation of the selected alternative.

The following are summaries of questions and answers for the various subject matters.

- A community member asked for clarification on the Navy’s schedule. Mr. Hill responded the Navy will need to prepare work plans before mobilization and implementation of the selected action including removal of the siding. It is anticipated it will take 6 months to prepare the work plans. A detailed schedule will be prepared following contract award.
- A community member said that a National Historic District document from February 1994 designates Hangar 1 as a historical monument as listed on the National Register of Historic Places and stated that it

does not seem as if the Navy has checked the designation of Hangar 1 as a historic site. Mr. Hill said he is not familiar with the specifics of the referenced document, but clarified that Hangar 1 is individually eligible for listing for the National Register of Historic Places and stated the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) is an applicable or relevant and appropriate requirement (ARAR) for this CERCLA action. The Navy has involved the California State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) which provided final comment pursuant to the NHPA. The comments from SHPO and ACHP were included in the responsiveness summary in the AM. The community member suggested the Navy and community review the "Page and Trimble Report," which can be found on the Internet.

- RAB member Lenny Siegel asked for Navy's explanation of consultation and the significance of an NHPA as an ARAR. Mr. Hill said the Navy considered all of the comments received from the CA SHPO and ACHP, met with both agencies, and had multiple telephone calls to discuss the path forward for Hangar 1. The ACHP recommendation was for the Navy to complete the CERCLA undertaking and for National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), as the cultural resource manager of this installation, to take actions to preserve the hangar, and for both agencies to coordinate schedules for the protection and preservation of Hangar 1. Mr. L. Siegel read ACHP's final comment letter to the Navy and asked what the Navy has done to comply with ACHP's recommendations. Mr. Hill replied that the Navy has responded to ACHP's letters. Mr. L. Siegel requested copies of the correspondence and Mr. Hill agreed to post all correspondence on the Navy's BRAC PMO website.
- Lewis Braxton (NASA) explained the matter of not re-siding Hangar 1 is the result of a lack of funding. NASA is requesting the Navy postpone its removal action plans until the Navy plans for and funds the re-siding of Hangar 1. Mr. Braxton stated NASA is a strong member of the community and believes the hangar should be restored. He explained that the Navy's and NASA's independent cost estimates for re-siding the hangar are significantly different. NASA had planned to receive private funding to re-side the hangar, but that option is currently not available. NASA was pushing for the removal action and re-siding of the hangar in an 18-month time frame. NASA has been in discussions with a company from southern California that produces lighter-than-air ships to potentially lease Hangar 1. NASA's March 2009 letter to the Navy indicated that the Navy should not begin to remove the siding until it developed a plan to re-side the hangar. Mr. Braxton stated NASA is awaiting the appointment of the new Secretary of the Navy before proceeding with further discussions regarding Hangar 1 and the transfer of the remaining environmental restoration (ER) program, and relayed his confidence that an agreement will be reached with the Navy on both subjects
- Mr. L. Siegel asked if the Navy's decision is amendable and if the Navy is locked once the contract is awarded. Mr. Hill responded he is not aware of the Navy having retracted an awarded contract. Mr. L. Siegel asked Mr. Hill to talk to Navy legal counsel and to establish at what point in the contracting process the Navy becomes legally bound to continue. Mr. L. Siegel stated his concern is that the Navy will continue to go down a path that no one in the room supports and not necessarily who should be responsible for funding the re-siding of the Hangar. Mr. L. Siegel asked if the Navy conducted studies on potential damage to the skeleton of the hangar if it is exposed to water, wind, and bird feces. The Save Hangar 1 Committee volunteered to assess the damage to the skeleton from weather and bird feces. Mr. Hill said the four proposals the Navy will receive are to address long term protectiveness of each contractor's proposed coating. The Navy has not conducted a separate assessment from the analysis performed under the EE/CA. Mr. L. Siegel asked if the Navy has considered washing the frame of the hangar or if there are other ideas besides coating. Mr. Hill said the Navy will evaluate all of the technical approaches identified in the contractor's proposals.

DRAFT

- Deborah Feng (NASA) asked about the contingencies the Navy has identified for continued airfield operation and planes landing on the airstrip near Hangar 1. If the Hangar 1 frame is exposed, it may be an aviation hazard. Mr. Hill responded that the contract requires airfield hazard mitigation plans and the technical approaches will be part of the proposals to be received. The Navy has and will continue to work closely with NASA regarding airfield operations.
- A community member asked about the long-term use of Hangar 1. Hangar 1 and the area around it could be used for general aviation for the surrounding community. Mr. Braxton said that Hangar 1 would not be used for commercial aviation or for shipping cargo. A specific reuse has not been identified for Hangar 1; however, NASA plans to use Hangar 1 to support aeronautical, air, and space science.
- RAB member Peter Strauss asked if the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) supports the Navy transferring the ER program to NASA. Mr. Hill said EPA is aware of the discussions between the Navy and NASA to transfer the ER program and it would be EPA's preference that NASA enter into a Federal Facility Agreement (FFA) or other similar agreement with EPA should it occur. Alana Lee (EPA) noted that discussions about the transfer of the ER program are still preliminary.
- A community member said his company is interested in becoming a tenant at Hangar 1 and referenced a letter he wrote discussing the dangers of birds in airplane flight paths in response to the recent plane accident over the Hudson River. He asked about the measures the Navy will take to make sure the birds do not perch on the hangar since it is in the flight path of commercial and federal planes. Mr. Hill said the Navy's RFP requires air field hazard mitigation measures, including potential hazards from birds. The Navy's technical review board will closely review the hazard mitigation plans. Mr. Asmus asked who will be ultimately responsible if there is an accident. Mr. Braxton said the Navy is ultimately responsible for their work. Mr. Hill stated NASA is the Federal Facility Owner and manager of the airfields. NASA will provide oversight throughout the Navy's work at Hangar 1.
- A community member asked if the Navy or NASA would be able to obtain any of the stimulus package funding to re-side the hangar. Mr. Braxton said the stimulus package is to create jobs and stimulate a community financially. Mr. L. Siegel said the Department of Energy and Superfund received recovery action funding and BRAC sites such as former NAS Moffett Field do not have access to the recovery action funding.
- A community member said he would like to know what is going on "behind the scenes" in the removal of the siding at Hangar 1 since the Navy is moving forward even though many disagree with the Navy's plan. Mr. Hill said the Navy is not enthusiastic about moving forward on the removal action without full community support, but has been transparent. The community member believes the Navy has not explained its role in the CERLCA action at Hangar 1. Mr. Hill said that the Navy must continue forward with the Hangar 1 response action for a number of reasons. The Navy's mission at the former NAS Moffett Field is to complete the full remediation of all past Navy releases of hazardous substances and petroleum products and to bring each site to closure. NASA is the Federal Facility Owner responsible for reuse of the facility including cultural resource management. The current epoxy coating applied to Hangar 1 is exceeding its 5 year life expectancy and is not a permanent solution. Hangar 1 is an upland source of contamination to another Installation Restoration (IR) Site 25, Eastern Diked Marsh and Storm Water Retention Ponds. Any further delays in the Navy's Hangar 1 actions will delay environmental cleanup actions at IR Site 25.
- A community member said the electrical connections inside Hangar 1 will be compromised if the Navy removes the siding and leaves the skeleton exposed. He asked if the Navy's RFP requests costs on seismic retrofitting of the hangar during the removal action. Mr. Hill stated the Navy's environmental response

action does not include retrofitting the Hangar or making any other improvements. NASA will need to address applicable requirements under their reuse efforts.

- Mr. L. Siegel said he wants a meeting scheduled between the Navy and NASA supervisors who are empowered to make decisions to reach an agreement on the preservation of Hangar 1, not just a letter writing campaign. He does not want to see the Navy locked into a contract that will jeopardize the future reuse of Hangar 1.
- RAB member Arthur Schwartz explained that he was an engineer for 25 years and that if the skeleton of Hangar 1 is left exposed to the elements, crevices and pin holes will form and will compromise the integrity of the structure. The RAB was not able to provide input on the Navy's RFP to make sure all of the goals to protect the integrity of the structure are addressed. Mr. Schwartz believes the contractors that are bidding on the work are concerned mostly with pricing.
- A community member asked about the extent of deterioration in the temporary coating that the Navy applied. He asked if the temporary coating hold can last long enough for decisions on the re-siding and reuse to be made. He asked if the Navy evaluated canvassing the hangar or using other chemicals to contain the contaminants. Mr. Hill said the Navy has evaluated all reasonable alternatives. The initial EE/CA the Navy drafted evaluated five alternatives; however, with further public input the revised EE/CA was expanded to evaluate 13 alternatives. Mr. L. Siegel said that it was previously concluded that chemically treating the siding to contain the contaminants will not be an acceptable remedy.
- A community member asked if the 6,000 windows would be saved following the removal of the siding noting that the windows are part of the historical value of the hangar. Mr. Hill said he was unsure of the plan to save the windows and agreed to review the plan to provide an update at the next RAB meeting.
- Mr. Moss said that Hangar 1 is not the only source of polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) affecting IR Site 25. He said transformers are also contaminating IR Site 25 with PCBs.
- Mr. Moss said he spoke with the Akron, Ohio, hangar contractor who was asked to be a subcontractor on one bid for the removal action at Hangar 1. He stated the contractor provided him insight into the Navy's RFP, which does not have any requirements to prevent the siding contaminants from entering the air, soil, and groundwater surrounding the hangar during the removal action. There is a concern that the contamination could become airborne and blow into the surrounding communities. Mr. Moss spoke with EPA and NASA about his concerns with the Navy's RFP. The contractors the Navy asked to bid on the project are not experts in demolition of hangars. Mr. Moss said that, based on his review of the RFP, demolition of the siding will also destroy the windows on the hangar. Mr. Moss said the Navy will receive an unsolicited bid from the contractor that installed the coating on the Akron, Ohio, hangar. The coating can be installed on the inside and outside of Hangar 1, as was the case for the Akron, Ohio, hangar. Installation of the coating would take one year to complete. Mr. Moss said the airship company renting the Akron, Ohio, hangar is interested in using Hangar 1 as a west coast station. Mr. Moss said the coating used on the Akron, Ohio, hangar was approved by EPA. The contractor that installed the coating on the Akron, Ohio, hangar visited Hangar 1 and said it was in much better condition. The coating is applied in four layers and will last for 10 years. There has not been any groundwater issue surrounding the Akron, Ohio, hangar. The fire that occurred at the Akron, Ohio, hangar was caused by a contractor welding and a spark cause the exterior fabric to ignite. It did not involve the coating applied to the hangar. The coating would have to be periodically touched up, which would still cost less than the demolition and residing of the hangar that the Navy is proposing.

DRAFT

- A community member stated the historical structures inside the hangar will be destroyed and believes the historical significance of the hangar will thus be destroyed.
- A community member asked about the color of the coating Mr. Moss was discussing. Mr. Moss stated the coating can be infused with a dye of any color.
- Mr. Strauss said the coating Mr. Moss proposed (Alternative 4 in the EE/CA) has been rejected twice by the Navy. Mr. Hill said that not only was Alternative 4 excluded from further consideration by the Navy, EPA and the RAB itself concurred with the Navy's assessment of Alternative 4. Alternative 4 is not a permanent solution. Mr. Strauss requested that Alternative 4 is not recommended again. The RAB voted to remove Alternative 4 from the RAB resolution in March 2009.
- A community member asked about the cost differences between the Navy and NASA's estimates to reside the hangar. Mr. Hill said the Navy has not seen NASA's calculations. Ms. Feng explained that NASA's cost estimate differs from the Navy's because it includes using different materials for the siding and saving the historic windows.
- A community member requested the Navy post the SHPO letters on the Navy's website. Mr. Hill agreed to post the SHPO letters along with ACHP's.
- A community member suggested finding a tenant to rent space in the hangar and to help fund the renovation of the hangar. There is a significant cost benefit to leaving the hangar intact. Mr. Hill said identifying a viable reuse is not part of the Navy's CERCLA responsibilities, but encouraged NASA to continue its efforts. He also explained that there are benefits to having the Federal Facility owner responsible for the environmental restoration efforts and while the Navy and NASA had reached an agreement to transfer the Navy's ongoing environmental program to NASA, NASA remains concerned with what it believes are unfunded liabilities.
- A community member said significant costs will be associated with moving a tenant into Hangar 1 once it is re-sited. The building will need to meet fire code and other requirements, which will be costly.

SITE 27 UPDATE

Mr. Hill began by presenting an overhead graphic of IR Site 27 to re-familiarize the RAB members of the Navy's completed 2007 remedial action. He explained that in the later part of 2008, EPA approached the Navy concerning what it believes to be potential ecological concerns with selenium remaining in the clay layer within a 1100 foot in length portion of the North Patrol Road Ditch. EPA has asked the Navy to carry out the site restoration actions identified in the 2005 Record of Decision (ROD) for IR Site 27 for this portion of the North Patrol Road Ditch. The Navy agreed to carry out site restoration action by the placement of geotextile and drainage rock in this 1100 foot section of the North Patrol Road Ditch. Mr. Hill explained that in response to concerns for the protection of the western pond turtle, concerns for the protection of wetlands, and for reasons regarding design the Navy has postponed this action to further discussions with all regulatory agencies before finalizing the Addendum Number 3 to the Final Remedial Action Work Plan for IR Site 27. The Navy has and will continue consultation with the EPA, State of California (San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (Water Board) and California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG)), biologists from NASA and the Navy, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE) and is seeking a response from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to ensure the actions taken will be protective of all resources within this portion of the North Patrol Road Ditch.

- Libby Lucas (RAB member) said a biological assessment of the Northern Patrol Road Ditch was conducted in 2002, which concluded the area contains delineated wetlands. In 2004, a western pond turtle assessment was conducted and salt marsh and pickleweed were present in the Northern Patrol Road Ditch. Ms. Lucas said the Navy's proposal to spread rock over an impervious membrane will not provide habitat for the western pond turtle to burrow. Mr. Hill stated the Navy discussed these specific concerns with both Navy and NASA biologists, CDFG, EPA, Water Board, and ACOE. The regulatory agencies concluded the rock and impervious membrane will not impair the western pond turtle habitat surrounding the site. Mr. Hill said ACOE confirmed that this portion of the North Patrol Road Ditch is not designated as wetlands. Mr. Hill also stated that the CDFG, the Navy biologist, and NASA's biologist have also concluded that this portion of the North Patrol Road ditch is not western pond turtle habitat.
- Ms. Lucas said she believes that a clay material would be a sufficient barrier and would provide habitat for the western pond turtle. She noted that the previous documents that the Navy prepared supported restoration with soil. Ms. Lucas said the personnel working for the regulatory agencies may not have seen the site or do not have the necessary experience to conclude as they have. Ms. Lucas reiterated that said she is concerned with the regulatory agency agreement to use rock and a geotextile membrane. Mr. Hill responded that the Navy is not calling into question the experience of agency personnel and restates that the Navy is vetting all concerns she has expressed with the applicable agencies.
- Ms. Lucas said that ACOE referred to Northern Patrol Road Ditch as wetlands. Wilson Doctor (Navy Remedial Project Manager [RPM]) said the ACOE designated the Northern Patrol Road Ditch as "other waters of the U.S." in December 2008. Ms. Lucas said the Navy should not ignore the Remedial Design for Site 27 that calls for using soil and decide to take a different action. Mr. Hill said the Navy is comfortable with the placement of rock and a geotextile based on the conclusions of the regulatory agencies, but has asked EPA to consider using soil instead.
- Mr. Strauss asked if the Navy's remediation will disturb the sides of the ditch. Mr. Doctor said there will be placement of geotextile and rock on the sides of the ditch just above water line. The movement of the western pond turtles through this portion of the ditch will not be affected. Ms. Lucas said this rock will destroy turtle habitat. Mr. Hill restated CDFG conclusions that installation of rock and geotextile will not adversely affect western pond turtle habitat and encouraged Ms. Lucas to read CDFG's email containing this conclusion that she was copied on. Ms. Lucas said there are few turtle specialists in California. Site 27 and the Northern Patrol Road Ditch are a unique turtle habitat. During the previous construction at Site 27, 50 western pond turtles were relocated.
- A community member asked if the Navy's plan is a new development. Mr. Hill said the Navy the only change is to place rock and geotextile in lieu of soil to address EPA concerns about the permanence the barrier. Sarah Kloss (EPA) said EPA is considering the use of soil and is working with the Navy to examine the various alternatives before restoration work begins.

REGULATORY AGENCY UPDATE

Water Board

Elizabeth Wells (Water Board) said the Water Board has been working with the Navy to close another three or four petroleum program sites at former NAS Moffett Field.

EPA

Ms. Lee said EPA has begun its second 5-year review of the Middlefield-Ellis-Whisman (MEW) Site and West-side Aquifer Treatment System (WATS), which will be completed in summer 2009. Ms. Lee said EPA is

DRAFT

preparing a proposed plan (PP) for addressing vapor intrusion. The agency also plans to hold a public meeting on 23 July 2009 to accept comments on the PP.

RAB BUSINESS

Future RAB Topics

Mr. Hill announced the next RAB meeting will be held on 9 July 2009. Mr. Hill asked for suggestions for topics at future RAB meetings. He said the Navy will provide the RAB an update on any new discussions it has with NASA regarding transfer of the ER program and Hangar 1 before the next meeting. Mr. Moss suggested the Navy provide an overview of the Navy's entire ER program. Mr. Moss suggested specifically an update on the East-side Aquifer Treatment System (EATS), WATS, and Sites 1 and 2. Mr. Strauss suggested EPA provide the RAB a presentation on its vapor intrusion PP. Mr. Siegel requested an Orion Park update from the Army be added to a future RAB meeting agenda. Mr. Hill said he spoke with the Army which informed him that the Army will be preparing a fact sheet to update the community on Orion Park rather than utilizing the Navy's RAB. Mr. L. Siegel asked if EPA would provide an overview of the comments it provided to the Army on its work plan for Orion Park. Ms. Lee agreed to speak with the Army and prepare a brief update on Orion Park at the 9 July 2009 RAB meeting.

RAB Schedule

The next RAB meeting will be held from 7 to 9:45 p.m. at Building 943 in the Eagle Room at Moffett Field, California. The 2009 RAB meetings are scheduled for Thursday evening at 7 p.m. as follows:

- 9 July 2009
- 10 September 2009
- 12 November 2009

Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 9:45 p.m., and Mr. Hill thanked everyone for attending. Mr. Hill can be contacted with any comments or questions:

- Mr. John Hill
Base Closure Manager, former NAS Moffett Field, BRAC PMO West;
1455 Frazee Road, Suite 900; San Diego, CA 92108; Phone: 619-532-0985; Fax: 619-532-0940;
E-mail: john.m.hill@navy.mil

ACRONYM LIST

ACHP – Advisory Council on Historic Preservation

ACOE – Army Corps of Engineers

AM – Action Memorandum

ARAR – Applicable or relevant and appropriate requirement

BEC – BRAC Environmental Coordinator

BRAC – Base Realignment and Closure

CDFG – California Department of Fish and Game

CERCLA – Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act

EATS – East-side Aquifer Treatment System

EE/CA – Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis

EPA – U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

ER – Environmental Restoration

DRAFT

FFA – Federal Facilities Agreement

MEW – Middlefield-Ellis-Whisman

NAS – Naval Air Station

NASA – National Aeronautics and Space Administration

PCB – Polychlorinated Biphenyl

PP — Proposed Plan

RAB – Restoration Advisory Board

RFP — Request for Proposal

ROD — Record of Decision

RPM – Remedial Project Manager

SHPO – California State Historic Preservation Officer

USFWS – U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

Water Board – San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board

WATS – West-side Aquifer Treatment System

RAB meeting minutes are posted on the Navy's environmental Web page at:

<http://www.bracpmo.navy.mil/basepage.aspx?baseid=52&state=California&name=moffett>