

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

NOTE: A glossary 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, 08 March 2007, at Building 943, World Room, Moffett Field, Calif. Mr. Rick Weissenborn, Navy Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) environmental coordinator and RAB co-chair, opened the meeting at 7:10 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
13	4	2	2	2	17

AGENDA REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Weissenborn reviewed the meeting agenda. The Orion Park presentation by the Army has been cancelled and may be rescheduled. The RAB community co-chair election will be rescheduled to the May meeting since current community co-chair Mr. Bob Moss was absent.

The 11 Jan 2007 meeting minutes were reviewed and were approved without changes. Meeting minutes are posted on the project website at www.bracpmo.navy.mil/bracbases/california/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>DOCUMENT</u>	<u>APPROXIMATE SUBMITTAL DATE</u>
1	Draft Final Addendum to the Revised Final Station-Wide Feasibility Study Site 25	November 2006
2	Final Groundwater Monitoring Well Installation and Sampling Report Orion Park Housing Area	January 2007
3	Draft Final East-Side Aquifer Treatment System Evaluation Completion Report	April 2007
4	Draft Site 27 Remedial Action Report	April 2007
5	Draft Phase III Basewide Tank Closure Further Assessment Sites Report	May 2007
6	Final Work Plan for Additional Fuel System Components at Building 29	June 2007

7	Draft Work Plan for Site 14 South	June 2007
8	Final Former Building 88 Investigation Report	Four weeks after comments are received
9	Site 29 (Hangar 1) Action Memorandum	TBA

REGULATORY UPDATE

Mr. Devender Narala of the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (Water Board) provided an update on recent Water Board activities.

- Effective March 1, 2007, Ms. Elizabeth Wells became the new project manager, replacing Mr. Narala. However, Mr. Narala will be available for support if needed. Ms. Agnes Farres is also part of the project team and supports biological issues.
- The Water Board submitted a letter to the Navy agreeing on Site 25 cleanup levels for polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs). The Navy will proceed with the final feasibility study.

Ms. Alana Lee of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) provided an update on recent EPA activities.

- EPA will be holding an open house on 15 March 2007, from 4 p.m. to 8 p.m., at Moffett Field's Building 943, Eagle Room. The open house will provide basic information about the Middlefield-Ellis-Whisman (MEW) site and EPA's proposal for vapor intrusion including the Superfund process, trichloroethylene (TCE), air sampling, and groundwater cleanup. Navy and National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) representatives also will be available to speak with the public. EPA distributed a fact sheet and flyer announcing the meeting.

NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. Chris Alderete, wildlife biologist contracted with NASA, presented an overview of wildlife management activities that were in place during cleanup of Site 27, the Northern Channel. These management activities, including surveys and mitigation, were created to lessen risk to certain species during construction activities. Mr. Alderete described the species identified as being at risk and described management practices for each of these species. Species initially identified as at risk included the western burrowing owl, western pond turtle, salt marsh harvest mouse, and California clapper rail. However, surveys conducted prior to construction determined that the salt marsh harvest mouse and California clapper rail were not at risk as previously assumed.

The Northern Channel and associated ditches were drained to remove contaminated sediment. During this time, native fish species at the site were caught and transported to a mitigation pond. Thousands of fish were moved, but most were unable to be caught because of physical constraints, such as being too small for the nets. Fish species (native and nonnative) found at Site 27 include the prickly sculpin, riffle sculpin, three-spined stickleback, inland silversides, rainwater killifish, and carp. The Chinese mitten crab was also found throughout the Northern Channel.

Following are questions and comments about the presentation:

- RAB member Ms. Libby Lucas asked when the banks are expected to re-vegetate. Mr. Alderete said the banks have been hydro-seeded, but the cold weather that followed may have affected germination. Mr. Scott Gromko, Navy remedial project manager, said the banks will be hydro-seeded again if there is no growth by April. Prior to hydro-seeding, soil tests were conducted to insure seed growth would be sustained. A biodegradable mat also was placed over the seeds to protect them from erosion. The Navy consulted with California Department of Fish and Game and NASA to select a California native seed. This seed will grow in brackish water.

- Ms. Lucas asked whether the western pond turtle feeds on Chinese mitten crab and asked where the crabs were relocated to. Mr. Alderete said the Chinese mitten crab is a nonnative species, therefore, crabs found on the banks or in traps were euthanized. Crabs located in the sediment were taken within the sediment to the landfill and did not survive. Mr. Gromko added that none of the sediment had enough crabs in it to deter the facilities from accepting (due to odor) the sediment.
- A community member asked if the western pond turtle population was healthy because nonnative turtles (and other species) have not been introduced into the environment by the public. Mr. Alderete agreed and said methods to prevent the introduction of nonnative species is something to consider, especially since the area may soon be open to public access through the proposed trail. Mr. Alderete said the area is one of the few places that has experienced minimal human impact because there has been minimal access to the area over the years. Mr. Alderete said he has noticed differences between areas like this one and areas that are heavily used by the public. He said with public access, a change to the area's environment will be expected; however, there is the opportunity to manage the challenge of allowing public access and keeping native species and habitats protected. The community member suggested posting signs promoting good environmental stewardship. Mr. Kran Kilpatrick of NASA said NASA is working on signage for the trail.
- Ms. Lucas asked whether the trail could be set farther away from the sensitive areas and a fence added for further protection. Mr. Alderete described various locations for the proposed trail that have been considered.
- RAB member Mr. Arthur Schwartz said he recommends using boardwalks because they present the least long-term cost, especially if using a synthetic board. He said using boardwalks also keeps the public off the wetlands, minimizing restoration needs. Mr. Alderete said impacts to wildlife are a concern, and it is difficult to determine what impacts boardwalks will have.
- RAB member Mr. Kevin Woodhouse, city of Mountain View representative, said the comment period for the South Bay Salt Pond Restoration Project environmental impact statement/report (EIS/R) is open through 28 April 2007. The attendees' comments regarding the turtles and trail are pertinent to this EIS/R and written comments should be submitted.

Mr. Alderete concluded the presentation.

HANGAR 1 REVISED EE/CA SCHEDULE UPDATE

The cancellation of the Orion Park presentation permitted time to answer questions regarding the status of the Hangar 1 revised engineering evaluation/cost analysis (EE/CA). Following are questions and comments.

- In response to a community member's question regarding comments made for the original EE/CA, Mr. Weissenborn said all comments received for the original EE/CA are being incorporated into the revised EE/CA. There will be a response to each comment. The comments received on the original document played a role in the decision to revise the EE/CA.
- A community member asked for a status update on the revised EE/CA. Mr. Weissenborn said the EE/CA is being rewritten; the contractor is getting more detailed cost estimates and studying new alternatives, such as using fabric for the siding (similar to the roof at Denver International Airport) once the siding has been removed and the frame cleaned.
- In response to a community member's question about whether the Hangar's appearance is supposed to be preserved, Mr. Weissenborn said there are no requirements for that; however, an analysis of the impacts to the historic character of the Hangar must be presented. For each alternative's environmental response there would be accompanying documentation, such as Historic American Engineering Record (HAER), which would include such records as photos of the structure and history of the Hangar's use. A copy of the HAER documentation will be sent to the Office of Historic Preservation and a local university. The State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) will be involved with the review of historical documentation. Furthermore, the cost range for historical restoration must be

considered; however, no action has to be taken, although the Navy, SHPO and ACHP prefer that an action be taken.

- Mr. Weissenborn said he understands the public's desire to keep and use the Hangar. Although the Navy will clean up the contamination, the Navy will not make the Hangar useable (i.e., bring it up to code).
- Mr. Weissenborn said the revised draft EE/CA will not be released in May as anticipated, but is expected to be released this year (the contract for this work ends this year and cannot be extended).
- A community member inquired whether a contractor is being used to prepare the EE/CA. The Navy said a contractor is preparing the report, and a second contractor will review the report as a third party; the Navy will also review the report.
- A community member asked whether bid costs were being obtained. Mr. Weissenborn said the contractor preparing the revised EE/CA is getting cost estimates that would be valid for about a six-month period. These aren't bid costs since those are only valid for about 90 days. The costs being obtained will be more accurate than the original EE/CA.
- In response to a community member's question about whether the revised EE/CA will have a table of contents, Mr. Weissenborn said the table of contents will be similar to the original EE/CA, but easier to follow. There will probably be an extra section(s) since the revised EE/CA is expected to be more robust. It will be longer and more robust than a typical feasibility study report.
- Mr. Woodhouse asked what level of cost analysis detail will be presented in the revised EE/CA. For the original EE/CA, the city of Mountain View commented they would have liked to see the cost details at the bid level. Mr. Weissenborn said presenting costs at such a detailed level poses proprietary conflicts since it would include such information as labor rates and vendor cost quotes in a detailed manner.
- Mr. Woodhouse asked whether the costs would be presented in such a way that the community would be able to analyze them. Mr. Weissenborn said the cost detail will be included in the text and should be easier to understand for the community.
- A community member asked how the costs for the actual work to be done will interplay. Mr. Weissenborn said the third party contractor that is reviewing the EE/CA will prepare a statement of work for the alternative recommended in the revised EE/CA. Mr. Weissenborn said there could be a surprise to the cost estimates, but it's not anticipated to be at the level seen in the original EE/CA.
- A community member asked about the status of the temporary coating since it is now reaching the end of its five-year lifespan and asked about the ongoing monitoring. Mr. Weissenborn said there is urgency since the coating is nearing the end of its lifespan. The asphalt coating is an option in the revised EE/CA, but would not be done as a time-critical removal action. Mr. Weissenborn said chemical data has shown there is no evidence of massive failure of the coating, however visual evidence shows rust is appearing and some of the coating is starting to look like it is peeling. These visual inspections are being documented and forwarded up the chain of command.

Mr. Weissenborn concluded the update.

RAB BUSINESS

RAB Related Announcements

- RAB member Mr. Lenny Siegel said the Center for Public Environmental Oversight (CPEO) is seeking proposals for a consultant to provide independent technical assistance for the MEW Superfund Study Area. This is sponsored by the EPA's Technical Assistance Grant (TAG). Mr. Siegel has copies of the request for proposals if anyone would like one.
- A site tour may tentatively be scheduled for September. There will be more discussion at the May RAB meeting.

RAB Schedule - The next meeting is scheduled for Thursday, 10 May 2007, from 7 to 9:10 p.m., at Building 943, World Room, Moffett Field, Calif.

The RAB meeting schedule for the remainder of 2007 is as follows:

- 12 July 2007
- 13 Sept 2007
- 8 Nov 2007

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

- Army presentation on Orion Park
- Proposed Plan for Site 25
- Hangar 1 revised EE/CA progress

Adjourn – The meeting was adjourned at 8:30 p.m., and Mr. Weissenborn thanked everyone for attending.

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

BRAC – Base Realignment and Closure

CPEO – Center for Public Environmental Oversight

EE/CA – Engineering evaluation/cost analysis

EIS/R – Environmental impact statement/report

EPA – U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

HAER – Historic American Engineering Record

MEW – Middlefield-Ellis-Whisman

NAS – Naval Air Station

NASA – National Aeronautics and Space Administration

PCBs – Polychlorinated biphenyls

RAB – Restoration Advisory Board

SHPO – State Historic Preservation Office

TAG – Technical Assistance Grant

TCE – Trichloroethylene

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/bracbases/california/moffett/>***