FINAL

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 March 2010, at Building 943 in the Eagle Room at Moffett Field, California.

Community RAB Members in attendance:
Bill Berry, Gabriel Diaconescu, Patricia Guerrieri, Libby Lucas, Diane Minasian, Bob Moss, Ralph Otte, Arthur Schwartz, Jac Siegel, Lenny Siegel, Steve Sprugasci, Peter Strauss, and Dan Wallace

Regulatory Agency, City Representative, and Navy RAB Members in attendance:
Sarah Kloss (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency [EPA]), Alana Lee (EPA), Kathy Stewart (Navy), and Elizabeth Wells (San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board [Water Board])

Other Navy, Regulatory Agency, National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), and Consultant Representatives in attendance:
Lewis Braxton (NASA), Laura Caballero (Army), Lauren Cason (Sealaska Environmental), Don Chuck (NASA), Byron Clamor (Navy), Dr. Ann Clarke (NASA), Viola Cooper (EPA), Wilson Doctor (Navy), Deborah Feng (NASA), Mark Hightower (NASA), John Hill (Navy), Carolyn Hunter (Tetra Tech EM Inc.), Ken Kono (NASA), Paul Kot (Army), Angie Lind (Navy), Lisa Lockyer (NASA), Michael Mewhinney (NASA), Gary Munekan (Navy), Arthur Orth (NASA), Cheryl Orth (NASA), Penny Reddy (EPA), George Sloup (NASA), Sharon Tobias (Tetra Tech EM Inc.), Tommie Jean Valmassy (Tetra Tech EM Inc.)

Other Community Members in attendance:
Charles Allen, Roderick Bersamina (Representative from Congresswoman Eshoo's Office), Lisa Bickford, Joan Brodoosky, Beth Bunnenberg (Save Hangar 1), Peter Cuneo, Larry Ellis, Linda Ellis (Save Hangar 1), S.T. Harris, Jane Horton, Bill Hough, Georgina Hymes, Al Keicher, George Lechner, Angela Liang, J.V. McCarthy, Dean McCully (Save Hangar 1), Paul McKim, J. Morris, Jack Nadeau (Save Hangar 1), Terri Odom, Denley Rafferty, Martin Rawson, Diana Samuels (Daily News Group), R. Silva, Duncan Simmons (Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District [MROSD]), A. Sinclair, R. Starichov (City of Sunnyvale), Brian Turner (National Trust), Jim Van Pernis (Save Hangar 1), and Steve Williams

WELCOME

Bill Berry (RAB community co-chair) and Kathy Stewart (U.S. Navy Base Realignment and Closure [BRAC] Environmental Coordinator [BEC]) opened the meeting at 7:05 p.m. and welcomed everyone in attendance. Mr. Berry then reviewed the agenda for the evening.

Ms. Stewart presented Bob Moss (former RAB community co-chair) a plaque and thanked Mr. Moss for his service as the RAB community co-chair for the past 9 years.

APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

Mr. Berry asked for corrections to the 14 January 2010 meeting minutes. Mr. Moss asked for the following statement to be added on the bottom of page 5 "Mr. Moss said that although Alternative 10 was chosen in the

Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis (EE/CA) for cost saving measures, Alternative 4 should be considered since it will cost less and would preserve Hangar 1 based on its successful application to the hangar in Akron, Ohio."

Ralph Otte (RAB member) said that he reviewed the RAB charter, which mentions an election of a vice-RAB community co-chair. Ms. Stewart said that she is reviewing the RAB charter and making edits to recommend to the RAB. Ms. Stewart said that nominations for a vice-RAB community co-chair will be open until the next RAB meeting, to be held on 13 May 2010. If nominations are made for a vice-RAB community co-chair, then elections will be conducted at the 13 May 2010 meeting.

The RAB voted to finalize the 14 January 2010 meeting minutes with the comment provided. 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. Ms. Stewart asked that RAB members specify on the document signup sheets if they are interested in receiving a hard copy of a document. If a hard copy is not specified, the RAB member will receive a CD. Ms. Stewart reminded the RAB members to print clearly when they sign up for documents to expedite the delivery process.

#	DOCUMENT	APPROXIMATE SUBMITTAL DATE
1.	Revised Draft Site 27 Work Plan Addendum	March 2010
2.	Draft Final Site 28 Work Plan for In Situ Anaerobic Biotic/Abiotic Treatability Study	March 2010
3.	Draft Site 1 2009 Annual Report	March 2010
4.	Draft Site 22 2009 Annual Report	April 2010

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Ms. Stewart announced that Building 943 will be demolished at the beginning of June 2010. The Navy will be moving the RAB meetings to Building 3, which is inside the gate to former NAS Moffett Field. In order to enter the former NAS Moffett Field by vehicle, the driver will need to show a valid driver's license with a photo; vehicle passengers are not required to provide identification. Bicyclists and pedestrians must present current (non-expired) government-issued identification with a photo. Ms. Stewart stated that these requirements would be clearly stated in RAB meeting announcements and asked that anyone who felt they would have difficulty getting through the gate to contact her. Ms. Stewart said that she understands the concern that the NASA security gate may pose a chilling effect on the community. If there seems to be an issue with attendance or difficulty getting through the NASA security gate, the Navy will consider moving the meetings into Mountain View.

HANGAR 1 UPDATE

Ms. Stewart provided an update on the status of Hangar 1. Ms. Stewart said the Navy awarded the removal action contract to AMEC Earth and Environmental in late September 2009. The removal action covers the removal of the contaminated siding, demolition of interior buildings, and application of a weather-resistant epoxy coating to the structural steel frame. About the same time the contract was awarded, the Navy and NASA recognized that they could not reach agreement on the party responsible for re-siding Hangar 1. As such, the Agencies jointly requested the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) arbitrate the re-siding issue. Leadership from the Navy, NASA, and OMB met with Congresswoman Anna Eshoo on 3 March 2010 and relayed that a determination had been made regarding responsibility. The Navy is responsible for environmental cleanup actions at the former NAS Moffett Field, and NASA is responsible for reuse and re-siding of Hangar 1. The Navy and NASA are working together to determine the most appropriate path forward coordinating the Navy's cleanup activities with NASA's reuse.

Ms. Stewart stated the Navy's removal action is currently proceeding. Various work plans in support of the removal action are being developed, and the Navy is working with the regulatory agencies on incorporating responses to regulatory agency comments. The Navy anticipates mobilization in early June, at which time interior abatement and demolition will occur first. The roof and siding removal is scheduled to begin mid-December 2010, and the siding removal and coating will be complete by late summer 2011.

Ms Stewart stated now that the OMB decision has been made, she recognizes questions exist on impacts to the Navy's contract. Ms. Stewart stated the Navy is currently proceeding with the removal action contract in the interest of protection of human health and the environment. The Navy is working with NASA to determine a path forward, and many of those determinations are contingent on NASA plans and funding. Ms. Stewart stated the interim coating was placed on the Hangar in 2003, and the coating is well beyond its intended service life of 3-5 years.

- Community member Steve Williams asked if the Navy or NASA has tested the coating on the hangar to evaluate whether it is actually failing. If the coating is not failing, he asked if a decision can be made to delay the removal of the siding until the reuse has been established. Ms. Stewart stated the roofing material is beginning to come off, which is a concern.

- Mr. Moss (RAB Member) said that previous testing of storm drains and the bay did not show any release of polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs).

- Mr. Williams said that the Navy's reasoning to move forward and remove the siding from the hangar because the coating has expired is not a legitimate reason since no testing has been conducted. Ms. Stewart said she would look into testing the coating of the hangar.

- A community member said that the historical significance of Hangar 1 is not being taken into consideration with removal of the siding. The removal action work plan for Hangar 1 should include information on the historical significance of the structure. Ms. Stewart agreed that Hangar 1 is of historical significance. The Hangar is eligible for the National Register of Historic Places, a contributing element to the NAS Sunnyvale Historic District, which is listed on the National Register, a civil engineering landmark of Northern California, and listed on the National Trust for Historic Preservation's 11 most endangered places. Due to the Hangar's historical significance, the Navy is required under the National Historic Preservation Act to consider the impacts of actions and to mitigate those impacts. Prior to awarding the removal action contract, the Navy coordinated with the State Historic Preservation Office and the Advisory Council of Historic Preservation and selected 7 measures to mitigate the adverse impacts of the removal action. These include Level 1 Historic American

Engineering Record (HAER) documentation, oral histories, an interactive CD, and preservation of a man-crane, among others. Re-siding was not included as a mitigation measure.

- Arthur Schwartz (RAB member) expressed frustration that the Hangar 1 updates at the RAB meetings are general and lack significant information. Since there is no indication the coating is expiring, the removal action should be delayed to give NASA an opportunity to come up with a reuse plan for the hangar. Sarah Kloss (EPA) said that EPA does not support waiting to remove the siding until there is an uncontrolled PCB release to the environment. Mr. Schwartz said that a PCB release from the hangar would be small and in a segregated area.

Mr. Berry read a letter from Congresswoman Eshoo's office to the RAB. The letter thanked the RAB for its work to preserve and restore Hangar 1 and stated the letter's purpose was to provide an update on the meeting she hosted the previous week between the Navy, NASA, and OMB. The letter conveyed that Congresswoman Eshoo told NASA, OMB, and the Navy that they need to couple Hangar de-skinning with re-skinning. Congresswoman Eshoo's letter stated that the federal government and taxpayers would save money with this approach and that Hangar 1 would be ready for reuse purposes sooner. The letter also stated the costs of putting up and taking down scaffolding should not have to be paid for twice and that she had asked for a timeline. Mr. Berry said that he was in Congresswoman Eshoo's office on different business the previous week, and the office is engaged in making sure Hangar 1 is reused.

Lewis Braxton (NASA) said that Hangar 1 has been a meaningful landmark in the Bay Area for over 70 years. NASA remains committed to preservation and reuse of the Hangar. In the joint Navy/NASA/OMB meeting held with Congresswoman Eshoo on 3 March 2010, it was agreed by all parties that Hangar 1 needs to be preserved. It was further decided that the Navy is responsible for environmental remediation of Hangar 1 and NASA is responsible for Hangar 1 reuse. The Navy agreed to work in collaboration with NASA on this effort.

- Jac Siegel (RAB member) asked if NASA has funds accessible for re-siding the hangar. Mr. Braxton said that NASA does not have funding in its budget to re-side the hangar. NASA has presented options to OMB and Congresswoman Eshoo's office for consideration. A follow-up meeting is planned in several weeks, and Mr. Braxton stated NASA will have more information after this meeting is held.

- Mr. Moss said that NASA should issue a request for information (RFI) and ask organizations to bid on preservation of the hangar. Mr. Moss said that the contractor from the hangar in Akron, Ohio, may be interested in providing NASA a bid to re-side the hangar. Mr. Braxton said that NASA has received numerous suggestions on reuse of the hangar but no offers of funding to re-side the hangar. NASA is aggressively talking to a few groups but has encountered issues on gathering capital for the project. Mr. Braxton said that Congresswoman Eshoo's support has been a catalyst to generate interest in Hangar 1. NASA spoke to a group in Richmond, California, who may be interested in the reuse of the hangar. However, no capital is available to involve the group from Richmond at this time.

- Peter Strauss (RAB member) asked if any of the stimulus money would be available for NASA for re-siding the hangar. Mr. Braxton said stimulus funding could be a possibility, but he is reluctant to request stimulus funds because of the difficult reporting structure. Mr. Braxton said he will look into the type of stimulus funds that may be available for the reuse of the hangar.

- Mr. Moss said EPA Region 5 oversaw the Alternative 4 coating of the hangar in Akron, Ohio, and that it was an effective and acceptable action. Since NASA does not have funding in place to re-side the hangar, it should consider different methods such as coating the existing structure as a way to make the reuse process move forward. Mr. Braxton said that NASA must consider the best action for the long-

term reuse of the hangar. Coating the surface would not be a long-term solution. NASA is identifying options for reuse.

- Gabriel Diaconescu (RAB member) said the RAB will need to wait and see about the collaboration among the Navy, OMB, Congresswoman Eshoo's office, and NASA for reuse of Hangar 1. Mr. Diaconescu suggested that a graph outlining the activities and sequence of events will help show a path forward for the collaboration between the Navy and NASA. Mr. Braxton said that NASA will make sure the collaboration with the Navy is a transparent process to the community.

- A community member suggested that NASA approach the Smithsonian Air and Space Museum for potential reuse of Hangar 1. Mr. Braxton said that the Smithsonian Air and Space Museum approached NASA to express interest in Hangar 1. NASA has been approached by many different organizations with suggestions for reuse of the hangar. However, there is no commitment of funding to re-side the hangar by any of these organizations.

- Mr. Berry said that the Navy is moving ahead and that removal of the hangar siding will begin in December 2010. That leaves 9 months to devise a plan for re-siding and reusing the hangar. Mr. Berry asked how the RAB can support NASA in the reuse of Hangar 1. Mr. Berry suggested that a RAB subcommittee be developed to discuss the path forward for the hangar.

- Mr. Berry asked if NASA provided a list of items from the hangar that the Navy will preserve. Ms. Stewart said that NASA is drafting the list and will provide it to the Navy. Once the Navy receives the list from NASA, it will be shared with the RAB.

- A community member asked that the Navy and NASA take the following message back to their respective management: that a comprehensive plan for removing and re-siding the hangar be established before the siding removal begins in December 2010. And Alternative 4, the option to recoat the hangar, should be considered when determining the best reuse of the hangar.

- Mr. Strauss asked if any data are available for the storm drains surrounding the hangar and if PCBs are present. Don Chuck (NASA) said that NASA sampled the storm drains and there were no PCB detections that he remembered. Mr. Chuck said he would review the storm drain data and let Mr. Strauss know if PCBs were present.

- Community member JV McCarthy said the hangar is a significant industrial asset for NASA. If there was a need for a shelter in place during an emergency on site, NASA could use Hangar 1 in the future.

Ms. Stewart said that the Navy and NASA are working together closely to determine the path forward for the hangar. A significant amount of information is required in order to arrive at determinations on how to proceed. Some of these include plans, specifications, and funding for re-siding from NASA.

- A community member asked if there was a known cost for re-siding the hangar. Ms. Stewart said different levels of cost associated with re-siding the hangar. It will be determined by the material used and the future reuse. Currently, the estimated cost for re-siding the hangar ranges from $14 million to $40 million.

- A community member asked if anyone has taken up a collection to help with the cost of re-siding the hangar and offered to write a check with the first private donation. Many community members may be interested in providing donations to re-side the hangar.

- A community member suggested that to help fund the re-siding of the hangar, portions of the siding that is being removed can be auctioned off.

Mr. Braxton said that NASA has not disclosed NASA's estimated costs to re-side the hangar explaining that doing so may influence any potential bids. Mr. Braxton acknowledged the grass roots and creative efforts via private donations and fundraising efforts to help partially pay for the re-siding. He indicated there will be discussions on a path forward within the next few months. Once more information is available, NASA will inform the community about reuse of the hangar.

- Community member Georgina Hymes said that no active bases remain in California. The community should let the Navy and the President of the United States know they want to make sure there are active bases in California. Ms. Hymes suggested that former NAS Moffett Field, Treasure Island, and Alameda need to be reopened for future military use.

- Mr. Williams said he would like the coating of the hangar tested to see if it is releasing PCBs. Mr. William said that NASA should consider requesting stimulus funds for re-siding the hangar.

- Mr. Berry suggested that a member of the RAB be present at the discussions between OMB, the Navy, NASA, and Congresswoman Eshoo's office. The RAB should be involved with the future decisions on reuse of the hangar. The RAB voted in favor of forming a subcommittee to address future activities for Hangar 1, be involved in discussions, and provide input to OMB, the Navy, NASA, and Congresswoman Eshoo's office. Mr. L. Siegel agreed to be the Hangar 1 Subcommittee chair. Anyone interested in participating in the RAB Hangar 1 Subcommittee should contact Mr. L. Siegel. Once the first Hangar 1 Subcommittee meeting is scheduled, information will be sent to the RAB members.

NASA GROUNDWATER REUSE PROJECT

Ken Kono (NASA) introduced himself and said he has been employed by NASA for the past 24 years. Mr. Kono presented NASA's fiscal year 2011 industrial wastewater utilization and treatment facility refurbishment and upgrade. Mr. Kono said that NASA's goal is to use available groundwater discharges to meet all industrial water needs of the NASA Ames Arc Jet Complex. The NASA Ames Arc Jet Complex consumes 110,000 gallons per day of potable water to operate the steam vacuum system and 60,000 gallons of potable water in the unitary plan wind tunnels to meet the facility cooling requirements. Both systems are assumed to operate approximately 170 days per calendar year. Mr. Kono said that this program was funded after NASA's environmental development team wrote a proposal for the project. During the preliminary phase of the project, NASA will assess water quality and quantity and define the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System requirements. NASA will test the groundwater at treatment facilities on site. NASA has assessed that 296,000 gallons per day or more than 180 million gallons of water per year can be treated and recycled and released to Stevens Creek. NASA has assessed in past practices that it has treated approximately 7 million gallons of water per year, which can be substantially increased.

- Mr. Moss asked if NASA has checked the salt content of the water it is recycling. Mr. Kono said that NASA has checked the salt content, and additional filters will need to be installed to reduce the salt content. The current system will need to be updated. It is 10 years old and is working at a 50 percent of operation capacity. Mr. Moss asked if the non-potable water could be used in current and future NASA buildings air conditioning units and sanitary use. Mr. Kono said that NASA will have to determine storage and delivery to the various buildings to use the non-potable water.

- Mr. Strauss asked who is paying for this groundwater reuse project. Mr. Kono said the NASA infrastructure, investment, construction, and facility management departments are funding this study. Mr. Strauss suggested that the Middlefield-Ellis-Whisman (MEW) group and the Navy should be approached to assist NASA in funding this project since the contaminated groundwater plume passes through the NASA Ames Complex. Alana Lee (EPA) said that EPA's Record of Decision (ROD) for the MEW Site, which includes the regional groundwater contamination plume on Moffett Field, lists 100 percent reuse as the goal of the treated groundwater. The responsible parties are required to assess reuse options for the treated groundwater. However, the ROD does not assign responsibility for funding the infrastructure to access the treated groundwater.

- Libby Lucas (RAB member) said that Stevens Creek is home of the steelhead trout population, which requires a specific water temperature. She asked whether the treated water is being released into Stevens Creek at the correct temperature. Elizabeth Wells (Water Board) said that NASA will be required by Water Board permits to make sure the temperature and flow rate of the treated water that is released into Stevens Creek are within the appropriate levels. Ms. Lucas said she wants to make sure the steelhead trout population is maintained in Stevens Creek.

ORION PARK UPDATE – ARMY

Paul Kot (Army) provided an update on the Army's activities at Orion Park. The Army is currently developing a statement of work for additional investigation of potential on-site sources of the trichloroethene (TCE) groundwater plume at Orion Park with work planned for later this year. Last year, the Army conducted a geophysical survey and investigation of a former septic tank system, but the septic tank could not be found and may have already been removed many years ago. Mr. L. Siegel asked about mitigation for vapor intrusion. Ms. Lee said that the Army designed an active sub-slab ventilation system for the new buildings at Orion Park.

- Mr. L. Siegel asked if the piles of excavated material near Stevens Creek were contaminated. Mr. Kot said that he will check on the excavated material but is confident the pile is not contaminated since he has not signed any manifests recently. All the asbestos has been removed from the site during the remedial action conducted in the housing area.

- Mr. L. Siegel asked if the Army has considered solar panels for the Army building. Companies will lease space with solar panels to sell the energy. Mr. Kot was not aware of solar panel use at the housing area.

- Mr. Strauss asked if lead-based paint (LBP) was been abated on site. Ms. Lee said that she thinks LBP was abated historically but is unsure when.

As a result of time constraints, the planned topics on the Navy and EPA's Five-Year Reviews were not presented. Mr. Moss suggested the Five-Year Review presentation be placed first on the agenda at the next meeting since Navy RPM Wilson Doctor's presentation has been postponed twice.

REGULATORY AGENCY UPDATE

Ms. Kloss said that she has been reviewing the Hangar 1 sampling and analysis plan (SAP), and that Peter Strauss, the Technical Assistance Grant advisor, raised concerns related to 1) the ecological risk receptors, and 2) the extent of the soil samples in the draft SAP with EPA and the Water Board. The EPA and the Water Board will submit their comments on the Hangar 1 SAP, which will include comments received from Mr. Strauss.

RAB BUSINESS

The RAB invited Mr. Williams to become a member of the group. Mr. Williams accepted the RAB nomination. The RAB took a vote and approved Mr. Williams as a new member of the RAB.

Future RAB Topics

Ms. Stewart announced the next RAB meeting will be held on 13 May 2010. The RAB discussed the following items as potential topics for future meetings:

- Hangar 1 Update
    - RAB Hangar 1 Subcommittee Update
- Update on Sites 26 and 28
- Navy Basewide Five-Year Review
- EPA Five-Year Review

Public Comment

Ms. Stewart opened the floor to public comment. No public comments were provided.

RAB Schedule

The RAB meetings are held from 7:00 to 9:00 p.m. at NASA Building 3.

Tentatively scheduled RAB meetings for 2010 are:

- May 13, 2010
- July 8, 2010
- September 9, 2010
- November 4, 2010

Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 9:10 p.m., and Ms. Stewart thanked everyone for attending. Ms. Stewart can be contacted with any comments or questions:

- Ms. Kathy Stewart
  BRAC Environmental Coordinator, former NAS Moffett Field, BRAC PMO West;
  1 Avenue of the Palms, Suite 161; San Francisco, CA 9403; Phone: 415-743-4715; Fax: 415-743-4700;
  E-mail: Kathryn.Stewart@navy.mil

ACRONYM LIST

ACHP – Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
BEC – BRAC Environmental Coordinator
BRAC – Base Realignment and Closure
EE/CA – Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis
EPA – U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
HAER – Historic American Engineering Record
LBP – Lead Based Paint
MEW – Middlefield-Ellis-Whisman
NAS – Naval Air Station
NASA – National Aeronautics and Space Administration
OMB – Office of Management and Budget
PCB – Polychlorinated Biphenyl
RAB – Restoration Advisory Board
RFI – Request for Information
ROD – Record of Decision
SAP – Sampling and Analysis Plan
TCE – Trichloroethene
UST – Underground Storage Tank
Water Board – San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board

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

Respectfully Submitted,

KA Stewart

Kathryn A. Stewart
Navy Co-Chair,
Former NAS Moffett Field RAB