

**FORMER NAS MOFFETT FIELD
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD
MOUNTAIN VIEW CITY HALL, FOURTH FLOOR
MOUNTAIN VIEW, CALIFORNIA 94041**

NOTE: A glossary is provided on the last page of these minutes.

Subject: RAB MEETING MINUTES

The Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) meeting for the former Naval Air Station (NAS) Moffett Field was held on Thursday, 11 May 2006 at the Mountain View City Hall, Fourth Floor, in Mountain View, California. Mr. Rick Weissenborn, Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Environmental Coordinator and RAB Co-Chair, opened the meeting at 7:16 p.m.

WELCOME

Mr. Weissenborn introduced himself, welcomed everyone in attendance, and asked for self-introductions of those present. The Moffett Field RAB meeting was attended by:

RAB Members	Regulators	Navy	Consultants & Navy Support	NASA	Public & Other
11	6	4	6	2	17

AGENDA REVIEW

Mr. Weissenborn reviewed the updated meeting agenda, noting it no longer includes the Building 88 presentation. RAB Community Co-Chair Mr. Bob Moss requested the Hangar 1 discussion begin earlier to allow more time for discussion. The agenda was approved with this modification.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The 09 March 2006 meeting minutes were approved without changes. Meeting minutes are posted on the project website at www.navybracpmo.org/bracbases/california/moffett/.

DOCUMENTS FOR REVIEW

Sign-up sheets for the following documents were circulated during the meeting:

#	<u>DOCUMENT</u>	<u>APPROXIMATE SUBMITTAL DATE</u>
1	Site 29 (Hangar 1) EE/CA	May 2006
2	Building 88 Investigation Report	May 2006
3	Draft Final Addendum to the Revised Final Station-Wide Feasibility Study Site 25	May 2006
4	Final Site 22 Landfill Post-Construction Operations, Maintenance, and Monitoring Plan Addendum. (Waiting for EPA approval of tech memo)	June 2006
5	Site 29 (Hangar 1) Action Memorandum	June 2006
6	Draft Groundwater Monitoring Well Installation and Sampling Report for Orion Park Housing Area	July 2006

RAB ELECTION

Mr. Weissenborn introduced Mr. Dan Wallace, candidate for RAB membership. Mr. Wallace was unanimously approved for RAB membership by the attending RAB members.

REGULATORY UPDATE

Mr. Weissenborn introduced Ms. Adriana Constantinescu of the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board. Ms. Constantinescu briefly presented Water Board activities relating to Moffett Field.

- The Water Board is reviewing final ecological restoration documents for Site 27, including the final remedial design report. The Water Board submitted comments on the document to the Navy and is working with them to resolve their concerns.
- The Water Board is reviewing the Navy's responses to comments on the Site 25 Draft Revised Feasibility Study and coordinating with Water Board management. A teleconference with the Navy is being scheduled to discuss the document.
- The Water Board received the Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis (EE/CA) for Hangar 1, and Ms. Judy Huang of the Water Board is reviewing the document. She will be submitting comments to the Navy and will present those comments at the Hangar 1 public meeting, scheduled for 23 May 2006.

The following questions were asked following the Water Board update.

- RAB member Mr. Peter Strauss asked if the Site 27 Draft Biological Mitigation and Restoration Measures Plan had been sent for review to the sign up list. Mr. Weissenborn explained there has already been a record of decision (ROD) and remedial design completed for the site. This document is a supplement to the remedial design and is not distributed to the public for comment. The ROD and remedial design are available in the information repository at the Mountain View Public Library.

Mr. Christopher Cora of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) stated that EPA received the Hangar 1 EE/CA and is evaluating it for consistency with EPA Non-Time-Critical Removal Action policy.

There were no questions for Mr. Cora.

SITE 27 FIELD WORK PRESENTATION

Mr. Scott Gromko, Navy remedial project manager, presented an overview of Site 27 field work activity and site background information. Remediation activities at Site 27 have started, although some scheduled activities have been delayed because of rain. The Navy is working to get field work activity back on schedule.

Mr. Gromko presented a brief history of Site 27 and presented a PowerPoint presentation with activity pictures to help explain current construction taking place at the site.

- The site was prepared for delivery of the equipment. The National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) perimeter security fences were temporarily reconfigured to consider the project area. The contractors are installing erosion control mechanisms for the project area, improving the condition of the northern berm of the Northern Channel and constructing a sediment stockpile and equipment lay down area.
- The northern berm of the Northern Channel will be graded, lined with geofabric, and a sub-base will be placed and compacted to prepare the berm for the increased truck traffic and truck weight.
- Water trucks will spread water on the Northern berm roughly every hour to control dust during the berm work.
- The sediment stockpile and equipment lay down area is under construction. The sediment stockpile area will be used to reduce the moisture in the sediment before it is transported to an EPA approved disposal facility. This will reduce the weight of the sediment and meet disposal facility requirements for

moisture content. The equipment lay down area will keep the equipment out of the way and secure when not in use.

Work on the berm haul road began at the end of April and is planned for completion by 15 May 2006. Contractors are working on the equipment storage area and stockpile area, which also has a planned completion date of 15 May 2006. De-watering of the channel will begin on 15 May 2006, and sediment removal from the Marriage Road Ditch will begin on 22 May 2006. To ensure the sediment removal for the Northern Channel is completed by the end of September, the removal of the debris pile has been rescheduled to September 2006. This decision was based on the consideration that the debris pile removal is not as weather dependent as the sediment removal. There were no questions following the presentation.

HANGAR 1 EE/CA DISCUSSION AND PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Weissenborn opened the Hangar 1 EE/CA discussion with an outline of the public review schedule and recommended alternative. The Navy issued the EE/CA for public review and comments on 05 May 2006. The Navy's recommended alternative is demolition and removal of the hangar. There is a 30-day public review and comment period. The Navy is accepting comments at this RAB meeting, at the public meeting scheduled for 23 May 2006, and in writing via postal mail and e-mail through 05 June 2006. The Navy will address the comments in a responsiveness summary appended to the action memorandum. The action memorandum is the decision document that selects the final remedy and obligates the Navy to complete the action. The action memorandum can make a different recommendation than the preferred alternative documented in the EE/CA. The action memorandum is scheduled to be released for public review in the first half of July. When the document is issued, the Navy may award the contract for whichever alternative is selected. The Navy has issued a request for proposals on the EE/CA's recommended alternative, however, the statement of work is easy to change if the action memorandum states a different cleanup remedy than the recommended alternative.

Mr. Weissenborn said the Navy is aware there is a general dislike for the recommended alternative. Any comments at tonight's RAB meeting will be included and addressed in the responsiveness summary appended to the action memorandum. At the Hangar 1 public meeting, the Navy will only be accepting comments and will not respond that evening to any comments received. Responses to all comments received at the public meeting will also be included in the responsiveness summary appended to the action memorandum.

The following questions were asked following the update.

- Mr. Lenny Siegel, RAB member, asked what the process is to get an extension of the EE/CA comment period. He stated BRAC funding should be available to use for restoring the hangar and looking for other funding sources should be enough justification for getting an extension. Mr. Weissenborn said the request for an extension should be in writing and sent to him in a timely manner. Mr. Weissenborn affirmed the RAB could make the request and suggested Mr. Moss prepare and sign the letter. Mr. Moss asked RAB members if they were in favor of him writing a letter on their behalf requesting an extension. As no RAB members were opposed, Mr. Moss stated that he will write the letter. Mr. Gabriel Diaconescu, RAB member, said while he was not opposed to an extension, he felt there was already too much delay and it was time for a decision to be made.
- Mr. Kevin Woodhouse, RAB member and city of Mountain View representative, said he supports an extension to the EE/CA comment period because it would provide an opportunity for the Mountain View City Council to review the document. The city council has a council meeting on 23 May and has limited time to review the report before the next council meeting. In addition, since the council meeting is scheduled for the same day as the public meeting, community members wishing to express their concerns about the EE/CA to the city council at that meeting wouldn't be able to do so because of the public meeting.
- Mr. Steve Sprugasci, RAB member, asked when the Navy will give a response to the extension request. Mr. Weissenborn said it would be given by Monday, 15 May 2006, if he receives it promptly. Mr. Moss said he would e-mail the letter tonight and he can provide copies by e-mail to those interested.

Public comments from RAB members and members of the public in attendance follow.

- Mr. Strauss asked if the Navy will issue a revised EE/CA if there are substantial comments that warrant the need for a revision and if the Navy would then still proceed with the action memorandum. Mr. Weissenborn said there will not be a revision to the EE/CA. The Navy has incorporated comments from regulatory agencies and the document was reviewed by the Assistant Secretary of the Navy before it was made available to the general public. Mr. Weissenborn said all comments received during the comment period will be responded to, although some comments may be clustered if they pertain to the same subject.
- Mr. Strauss asked if there will be responses to, for instance, substantive comments about environmental data, which he feels is not well represented in the document, and stated there should be more environmental data in the EE/CA. Mr. Weissenborn said environmental data has been previously distributed – that data is what led to the EE/CA. An EE/CA is developed after environmental data has been gathered and the need for an action has been identified. Mr. Cora said that from EPA’s perspective, an EE/CA is not the same as a remedial investigation document. There already is data showing the hangar has been found to be contaminated. Mr. John Chesnutt of the EPA added the EPA will be providing their comments on the EE/CA and there is data on the level of contamination. He noted in terms of public comment, an EE/CA has more flexibility over a remedial investigation/feasibility study (RI/FS). The Navy conducted an EE/CA to streamline the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) process since the hangar coating has a limited life span. The Navy is holding a public comment period and public meeting, so the EE/CA would have the equivalency of an RI/FS. Mr. Weissenborn added an EE/CA does not require public meetings, but the Navy installation restoration policy states that any decision document requires a public meeting and a 30-day review period.
- Mr. Siegel stated that the community was promised a robust EE/CA since there was not enough time to conduct an RI/FS. Mr. Siegel then asked for clarification on Alternative 6, replacement of the visual siding, and asked what the cost estimate for Alternative 10 includes. Mr. Weissenborn clarified that Alternative 6 would only be for the hangar’s exterior and said the cost estimate for Alternative 10 includes environmental action, which is about \$12 to \$15 million. The final cost is the cost of historic mitigation.
- Mr. Siegel said it seems as if Alternative 11 doesn’t include the cost for modifying NASA’s infrastructure that runs through the hangar, and that this cost would then be borne by NASA. Mr. Weissenborn said this is correct. Mr. Siegel subsequently asked whether NASA has this cost estimate. Ms. Sandy Olliges of NASA said the agency is looking into the infrastructure cost estimates, but she does not know whether the information will be available during the comment period. Mr. Siegel said the cost difference between Alternative 10 and Alternative 11 may be smaller if the cost associated with modifying NASA’s infrastructure is included in the total cost estimates for demolishing the hangar. Although this may not affect the Navy, it makes a difference for the taxpayers, according to Mr. Siegel.
- Mr. Richard Eckert, RAB member, commented he was appalled that the government wouldn’t provide the funding to save a historic artifact.
- Mr. Moss said none of the alternatives are identified as recognizing or preserving the historic nature of the site. One of the alternatives is exterior asphalt coating, which was already done in the Time-Critical Removal Action. Mr. Moss said no one complained of the exterior asphalt coating having a negative impact on the historic integrity of the site. He has doubt that the correct facts are taken into account when talking about historic integrity, and it should be considered. Mr. Moss also said he finds it strange that tearing down the hangar has the same level of historic preservation as the other alternatives. He then commented that when considering the total cost package (initial cost and maintenance cost), the dollar figure should account for inflation. The cost for maintenance in today’s dollars is significantly lower than what it would be in 30 years, for instance. The EE/CA should show the same dollar figure as of

July 1, 2006. In addition, there should be distinction between a “permanent” and “long-term” cleanup remedy.

- Mr. Woodhouse said one of the criteria for evaluating the alternatives is implementability, and one of the criteria for implementability is community acceptance. He asked how much weight will be given to community acceptance in the evaluation. Mr. Weissenborn explained that community acceptance is one of the nine criteria required for a CERCLA remedy that would be seen in a feasibility study. The EE/CA evaluation includes implementability, effectiveness and cost. Navy policy and EPA guidance includes other criteria in subcategories of these three groups. The alternative has to comply with the applicable or relevant and appropriate requirements (ARARs) and has to protect human health and the environment; these are the threshold criteria. Many of the alternatives evaluated didn't meet any or both of these threshold criteria. There are also primary balancing criteria, which include long-term effectiveness, short-term effectiveness, and reduction of toxicity, mobility or volume through treatment. The third criteria group, modifying criteria (acceptance by the state and by the public), is considered and serves the purpose of modifying the other criteria. For example, if the recommended alternative choice was between Alternative 2 and Alternative 11, then there would be more community acceptance consideration than if the choice was between Alternative 2 and Alternative 10.
- Mr. Woodhouse then asked how much community opposition equals \$12 million. Mr. Weissenborn said the Navy is evaluating the cost to address a source of environmental contamination. He further stated the Navy is aware of the historic nature of the hangar. It is difficult to balance community concern and \$12 million. Mr. Weissenborn said Alternative 10 does include replacing the siding as the historic mitigation for this alternative.* All of the alternatives have the environmental cost and the historic mitigation cost included and both costs are included in the total cost. However, none of the costs include any costs associated with making the building usable. There would be a significant expense to meet building, fire and Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) codes. Making the building usable is not part of the environmental response required of the Navy, although the Navy is aware there would be additional costs. There is also more to the environmental response that has not been analyzed yet. Ms. Olliges said NASA does not have a detailed cost estimate for bringing the building up to codes from an engineering conceptual analysis, but it is estimated between \$50 and \$100 million.

**Clarification provided by Ms. Sarah Ann Moore, Navy BRAC Program Management Office West deputy base closure manager, at 11 May 2006 RAB meeting: At this time, the Navy has not determined if the siding will be replaced as the historic mitigation option for Alternative 10. If Alternative 10 is chosen as the final remedy, the three mitigation options described in the EE/CA for Alternative 10 (Historic American Engineering Record (HAER) documentation, replacing the siding with a skin that is of similar appearance to the original hangar skin, or combination of HAER documentation and replacing the siding) will be considered.*

- Mr. Diaconescu said he is a resident within 300 yards of the hangar. He thinks that assigning weight to community acceptance is good; however, the community needs to consider the importance of human health versus a historic building. Mr. Diaconescu said health is most important when considering people that live within the immediate vicinity of the hangar or are working near the hangar for many hours of the day.
- Ms. Diane Farrar of NASA Ames said the EE/CA is the basis for public discourse, and the community has been waiting many months for it; therefore, the final cleanup remedy should be a community decision. She is concerned with the accuracy of the costs presented for alternatives 10 and 11. Ms. Farrar said a NASA Ames staff member trained by the Navy to do cost estimates feels the cost for demolition was underestimated and the cost for cleaning up the site was inflated with irrelevant costs. Mr. Weissenborn said the NASA staff member in reference is accustomed to dealing with cost estimates for bids, which is different than figuring costs for the EE/CA. Mr. Weissenborn said he is comfortable with the costs presented in the EE/CA.

- Mr. Jeff Segall, community member, said he is concerned with the cost of restoring NASA's infrastructure if the hangar is demolished and how this affects taxpayers. He said NASA's infrastructure costs should be mentioned in the EE/CA since it is a foreseeable cost. Mr. Segall said he appreciates the Navy allowing public comments if the decision is going to be made on the basis of true cost; however, the alternatives' costs cannot be compared when one alternative would leave a hangar and another would demolish it. Mr. Weissenborn said each step in the EE/CA process will present more detail, and more detailed cost information will become available. The Navy will have more information on infrastructure costs as the project proceeds.
- Mr. Mike Buhler of the National Trust for Historic Preservation asked if there were potential additional costs to make the building usable, outside the scope of the EE/CA report. Mr. Weissenborn affirmed that there are additional costs. Mr. Buhler asked about the status of Section 106 consultation under the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) and if the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) or Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) have commented on the adequacy of the mitigation included in the EE/CA. Mr. Weissenborn said Section 106 consultation has been held as a series of discussions with the SHPO. Because it's a CERCLA action, the less formal discussions serve as consultations without the timeframe associated with formal consultations. When the Navy met with SHPO in October 2005, SHPO said the historic mitigation proposals were more than adequate. Both SHPO and ACHP have the EE/CA. With ACHP, there will be a federal undertaking that will have an adverse effect, and the Navy has been in discussions with ACHP. Mr. Weissenborn said he has personally been unable to get in contact with SHPO over the last month and a half.
- Mr. Larry Shapiro, community member, said he has previously compared the hangar to other historic structures like the Golden Gate Bridge, the Empire State Building and the Statue of Liberty, which no one would think of tearing down. He said the U.S. president flew into Moffett Field and landed near the hangar. Mr. Shapiro said if the hangar is safe enough to allow the president to use Moffett Field, then it is safe for the community to continue living next to it.
- Mr. Steve Williams, community member, said NASA's cost estimate for bringing the building up to current codes to allow reuse of the hangar seems like a lot of money, but if the hangar is demolished, the opportunity to ever reuse the hangar would be lost. Although funding may not be available now to bring the structure up to codes, it may be available in the future.
- Mr. Williams further stated that infrastructure costs directly play into the community's evaluation of which of the presented alternatives is more acceptable. It is difficult for the community to make a good evaluation of the Navy's recommendation if there is no opportunity for the community to find out how the infrastructure costs will affect taxpayers.
- Mr. Williams then asked whether the cost for Alternative 10 includes replacing the siding and if the Navy would replace the siding as part of this alternative. He said the document doesn't say that this alternative includes replacement of the siding, but he understands this is because historic mitigation is in another section of the report. Mr. Weissenborn said historic mitigation for Alternative 10 is part of the total cost, and based on the EE/CA, the Navy would replace the siding.* Historic mitigation was considered as part of the ARARs. Mr. Weissenborn added, however, that the final decision will be made in Washington, D.C. Mr. Williams said he is concerned with commenting on a document that is not completely understood.

** Clarification provided by Ms. Sarah Ann Moore, Navy BRAC Program Management Office West deputy base closure manager, at 11 May 2006 RAB meeting: At this time, the Navy has not determined if the siding will be replaced as the historic mitigation option for Alternative 10. If Alternative 10 is chosen as the final remedy, the three mitigation options described in the EE/CA for Alternative 10 (HAER documentation, replacing the siding with a skin that is of similar appearance to the original hangar skin, or combination of HAER documentation and replacing the siding) will be considered.*

- Mr. Terry Terma of Space World/SETI said he is concerned about the procedure for demolishing the hangar. He said encapsulation would be necessary before the hangar can be torn down, and once the hangar is torn down, the encapsulation can no longer be mechanically supported by the hangar structure. This would result in having to stop work and the structure would only be half demolished, possibly releasing contaminants. Mr. Terma said there would be more of a risk from tearing down the hangar than a straight-forward encapsulation because of the risk of exceeding cost, time and contaminant leakage from the structure. Mr. Terma would like to see encapsulation of both the interior and exterior structure.
- Mr. Siegel clarified environmental risk and said proximity to contamination doesn't present risk; there has to be a pathway to the contamination. Contamination risk from the hangar is through breathing contamination (which is the reason NASA closed the building) and a pathway to the wetlands (where it poses an ecological risk).
- Mr. Siegel said federal officials, at the onset of BRAC in 1991, allowed the spending of federal funds through BRAC to allow communities to use closed bases as they see fit. Mr. Siegel said he believes it is the Navy's obligation to make the property available for reuse because that is the basic concept for the base closure process. He said it is the obligation of the federal government to clean up the site, and he believes that obligation is built into the base closure process.
- Mr. Strauss said the premise of the EE/CA is that the only acceptable alternative is one that will remove all of the source contaminant material. Mr. Strauss made a comparison to tearing down a house built prior to 1978 only because it was painted with lead paint. Mr. Strauss said the EE/CA's premise is not a strong enough argument; the Navy needs to state in the EE/CA that there is an environmental health risk and the EE/CA should reflect the environmental hazard more strongly to justify why the Navy wants to tear down the structure.
- Mr. Seth Shostak, Space World board member, said demolishing the hangar would be a loss in opportunity cost; once the hangar is gone, it's gone forever. He said it reminded him of Penn Station in New York that is now being rebuilt. If the hangar is used for Space World, the capital cost would be about \$400 million, and the revenue to Sunnyvale and Mountain View would be about \$30 million. He said the cost for saving the hangar is a small amount compared to the price of a helicopter and said this is the time to convince authorities in Washington, D.C. The hangar's value is enormous in terms of educating children and bringing people to the South Bay.
- Mr. Jack Gale, RAB member, said the structure cannot be rebuilt or another building be built at that site because of the proximity to the runway. Mr. Gale questioned who in the Navy approved the EE/CA because there was no approval signature. Mr. Weissenborn said guidance to evaluate opportunity cost in an engineering document does not exist; opportunity cost is subjective.
- Mr. Williams said it is not necessary to estimate opportunity cost, nor has anyone suggested it is part of the Navy's job, because opportunity cost is obviously really large on one hand, and would be lost if the hangar is demolished.
- Mr. Moss briefly described the process for eliminating alternatives and confirmed with Mr. Weissenborn that all coating options are for the hangar's exterior. Mr. Moss said Navy meetings with EPA and Water Board confirmed that the inside of the hangar also has to be addressed. Mr. Moss said the Navy should review the solutions he had previously recommended, such as epoxy coating, that are cheaper and more durable than the coatings selected in the EE/CA. Mr. Moss said his recommended coatings should be alternatives. Mr. Weissenborn said Mr. Moss' recommendations were analyzed, but given the size of the area to re-coat, they would not be effective. Mr. Moss said that this explanation of dismissal should have been provided in the EE/CA and said an explanation of why NASA's cost estimates are different than the Navy's should be made available to the public. Mr. Moss added that since NASA owns the site, it is concerned with what to do with the site after the Navy cleans it. He said the hangar's rent would bring about \$375,000 to \$400,000 per month, resulting in a rental income of about \$4.5 million per year. The

cost to restore the hangar would be recouped, and NASA would continue to earn interest and value on it. Mr. Moss suggested the community speak with NASA about opportunity costs once they get the Navy to save the hangar.

- Ms. Olliges said the estimate she mentioned earlier for bringing the hangar up to building codes cannot be published; it is a general range and not yet confirmed. NASA does not have the budget to make the hangar useable since their budget is appropriated to space exploration.
- Mr. Buhler said NASA was responsible for Section 106 consultation and he asked whether NASA or the Navy was responsible for the costs associated with historic mitigation, such as replacing the siding. Mr. Weissenborn said the cost is the Navy's responsibility.
- Ms. Sarah Ann Moore of the Navy clarified historic mitigation. In the EE/CA, each alternative has different options for historic mitigation that the Navy considered. In Alternative 10, for example, one option is HAER documentation, another is HAER documentation with siding, and a third is siding alone. These mitigation options would be considered by the Navy as part of the alternative. Mr. Weissenborn said the costs associated with the historic mitigation options are in table 5-2 of the EE/CA.
- In response to Mr. Segall's question, Mr. Cora said that although interior air monitoring shows polychlorinated biphenyl (PCB) concentrations and the exterior doesn't, it does not signify that contamination doesn't exist. EPA believes there is migration from the interior to the exterior.
- Mr. John Kaiser of the Water Board said it was unacceptable for the Navy to not address the interior of the hangar since this has been discussed through the dispute resolution process. The Water Board has other issues that will be included in their official comments. Mr. Williams said although the EE/CA doesn't address the interior, the important point is that the costs presented in the EE/CA are not useful to the community when making comments.
- Mr. Terma said if the hangar is demolished without first being encapsulated, the Navy is risking contamination.
- Mr. Strauss asked if the Navy now thought it was valid to revise the EE/CA based on the comments received tonight. He said the community deserves a better EE/CA to comment on.
- Mr. Moss said many major issues with the EE/CA have been identified and the Water Board agrees there are issues with it. Assuming a 30-day extension on the comment period, the new closing date would be 05 July 2006.
- Mr. Malkav (SP?), community member, said he is knowledgeable about the type of metal on the hangar siding, and to his knowledge, he hasn't found that this metal is salvageable. Mr. Weissenborn clarified that the Navy expects the hangar structural frame to be recyclable, but not the siding.
- Ms. Farrar questioned how the Navy could be trusted to respond to public comments if the EE/CA was not as thorough as what the public had expected or requested. Mr. Weissenborn said the Navy is legally obligated to respond to every comment and the responses will be thorough.
- Mr. Jack Nadeau, community member, asked if the hangar ever had been appraised for its intrinsic value if it were built today. Mr. Moss said government property is typically not appraised unless it is going to be sold. There is no formal appraisal because no one typically expects to sell Navy property.
- Mr. Mike Buhler asked if the Navy could proceed with the project if EPA wasn't in agreement. Mr. Cora said if Mr. Buhler was referring to the structure and PCB-containing paint, he would have to do some research to answer the question. Mr. Cora said CERCLA does have limitations when it comes to materials from design. However, when there are releases into the environment, he believes that rule no longer applies, but would need to confirm this.
- Mr. Chesnutt said the EPA's opinion is that the Navy needs to address the interior of the hangar and this will be in EPA's comments. This will heavily weigh where the EPA falls on alternatives. The EPA is

sympathetic to issues about tearing down the hangar. When there are costs involved, the EPA wants to ensure that funds are used effectively because the costs for this project affect funds available for use elsewhere.

- Mr. Buhler asked for clarification on the potential for contaminant release from the structural beams inside the hangar and if it is currently unknown whether contaminants are being released. Mr. Cora cited an example and said PCBs are in paint and on many structures, but the EPA doesn't make everyone tear down a structure simply because it contains PCB-containing paint. He said the issue of the hangar's contamination is a matter of size. The siding is highly contaminated with PCBs and it's been demonstrated that the contamination is releasing. The EPA is very concerned that the siding is releasing PCBs, asbestos and lead. Mr. Cora cited the hangar in Akron, Ohio and said the encapsulation of this 8-acre hangar is not going well – it has to be vacuumed twice per day, for example. Mr. Cora added there is a concern with ongoing maintenance for Hangar 1.
- Mr. Chesnutt said there is evidence of contamination releasing into the air, which is why NASA closed the building. He said the current process is an EE/CA and a removal action. If the Navy does anything but demolish the hangar, the Navy would have to do a remedial action. In that case, there would have to be a long-term operations plan and inspection of the re-applied coating. The hangar in Ohio has an intensive operations and maintenance plan to wipe down and control dust. Mr. Chesnutt said he was unsure whether the operations and maintenance costs were reflected in the coating options.
- Mr. Moss said the sediment basins are analyzed periodically. Tests conducted last November indicated PCBs and lead appear to be coming from the hangar. This indicates that the temporary coating may be wearing off, and the contamination could be coming from the hangar's interior, which hasn't been treated. NASA has expressed concern with the interior not being treated. If a remediation approach is taken, there will have to be ongoing observation of both inside and outside to ensure coatings are effective. This ongoing cost would be NASA's responsibility, or if NASA sells the building, it would be the buyer's responsibility. That is part of the cost the Navy has incorporated to get comparative cost estimates.

RAB BUSINESS

RAB Related Announcements

- Mr. Moss said there was discussion at the last RAB meeting of possibly having a special RAB meeting to discuss recommendations and comments on the EE/CA. He asked the RAB if there was still interest in having the special meeting. The RAB's consensus was to not hold a special meeting. Mr. Siegel said many interested members of the public have been meeting as the Save Hangar One Committee (SHOC). He thinks it is best that they meet as a community group, not a government sponsored group.
- The public meeting will be held on 23 May 2006, in Building 943 of Moffett Field, just outside the main gate on NASA Parkway. An open house will be held at 5 p.m. followed by the public meeting, from 7 to 9 p.m. The Navy will not be responding to comments at the public meeting. Mr. Weissenborn said each person making comments at the public meeting will be limited to three minutes, and the meeting will extend past 9 p.m., if needed, to accommodate all persons wishing to make a public comment.

Mr. Siegel asked if the SHOC could have a table at the open house and Mr. Weissenborn replied yes.

RAB Schedule - The next meeting is scheduled for Thursday, 13 July 2006, from 7 to 8:50 p.m., at Moffett Field, in Building 943, Eagle Room.

The RAB meeting schedule for the remainder of 2006 is as follows:

September 14, 2006

November 9, 2006

Future RAB Topics – The following topics were identified as potential agenda items:

- Hangar 1 schedule update
- Discussion of design plan for cleanup of Hangar 1
- Building 88
- Site 27 update

Adjourn – The meeting was adjourned at 9:15 p.m. and Mr. Moss thanked everyone for attending. He thanked Mr. Weissenborn for accepting public comments on the EE/CA at this meeting.

Mr. Weissenborn can be contacted with any comments or questions:

Mr. Rick Weissenborn

BRAC Environmental Coordinator, former NAS Moffett Field

BRAC Program Management Office West

1455 Frazee Road, Suite 900, San Diego, CA 92108

Phone: 619-532-0952 **Fax:** 619-532-0995 **E-mail:** richard.weissenborn@navy.mil

GLOSSARY OF TERMS USED IN THESE MINUTES

ACHP – Advisory Council on Historic Preservation

ADA – Americans with Disabilities Act

ARAR– applicable or relevant and appropriate requirement

BRAC – Base Realignment and Closure

CERCLA – Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act

EE/CA – Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis

EPA – U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

HAER – Historic American Engineering Record

NAS – Naval Air Station

NASA – National Aeronautics and Space Administration

NHPA – National Historic Preservation Act

PCBs – polychlorinated biphenyls

RAB – Restoration Advisory Board

RI/FS – Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study

ROD – Record of Decision

SHOC – Save Hangar One Committee

SHPO – State Historic Preservation Office

Water Board – San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board

***RAB meeting minutes are posted on the Navy's Environmental Web Page at:
www.navybracpmo.org/bracbases/california/moffett/***