

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

*NOTE: Glossary 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, 12 May 2005, at the Mountain View City Hall, fourth floor gallery, in Mountain View, California. Due to the site tour held earlier in the day, the RAB meeting was abbreviated. Mr. Rick Weissenborn, the Lead Remedial Project Manager for Moffett Field, opened the meeting at 5:45 p.m.

**WELCOME**

Mr. Weissenborn introduced himself. He explained that during the March RAB meeting he told the RAB that Ms. Andrea Espinoza, Base Realignment and Closure Environmental Coordinator and Navy RAB Co-chair, would be back for the May RAB meeting. He explained that she had since accepted a new position within the Navy. Therefore, he would be taking over her position as Navy RAB Co-chair.

He welcomed everyone in attendance and introduced the RAB Community Co-Chair, Mr. Bob Moss. Mr. Moss explained there would be no formal presentations during the meeting. Instead, meeting attendees could have their questions answered that may have come up about any of the sites visited during the site tour.

The Moffett Field RAB meeting was attended by:

RAB Members	Regulators	Navy	Consultants & Navy Support	NASA	Public & Other
10	3	6	6	6	31

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Mr. Moss referred attendees to page 6 of the draft 10 March 2005 RAB meeting minutes. He pointed out a comment by RAB member Lenny Siegel regarding a section in the proposed Department of Defense (DOD) RAB procedures, which establishes a formal process by which DOD can dissolve RABs it believes - and can show - are not fulfilling their intended purposes. Mr. Siegel's biggest concern is the provision that a RAB may be adjourned if the "installation has been transferred out of DOD control and DOD is no longer responsible for making restoration response decisions." Mr. Moss asked if the proposed RAB procedures had been changed or taken effect.

Mr. Weissenborn responded that the proposed RAB procedures had not yet been established. He said he would push to keep the RAB at Moffett Field as long as the Navy is fulfilling its environmental obligations. A RAB member asked for a motion to approve the 10 March 2005 meeting minutes; the minutes were approved, noting Mr. Moss' expansion on Mr. Siegel's comment.

## DOCUMENTS FOR REVIEW

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

#	DOCUMENT	APPROXIMATE SUBMITTAL DATE
1	Final Groundwater Work Plan for Orion Park Housing Area	June 2005
2	Draft Site 1 Landfill 2004 Annual Report	June 2005
3	2004 Annual Groundwater Report for West-Side Aquifers Treatment System and East-Side Aquifer Treatment System	June 2005
4	Draft Site 22 Operation & Maintenance Plan Addendum	June 2005

Mr. Weissenborn explained that the Navy could no longer distribute hard copies of documents, due to contractual changes. The Navy will now distribute documents in CD format. People who want to view hard copies can view them in the Moffett Field information repository, located in the Mountain View Public Library.

Community member George Cook said the Santa Clara Valley Water District Web site, [www.lustop.com](http://www.lustop.com), has documents related to the Moffett Field environmental cleanup work posted on it and can be found using a "Moffett Field" key word search.

Mr. Moss explained that, last July, members from RABs worldwide met for three days in Salt Lake City, Utah to learn more about how other RABs operate. A number of individuals indicated they would like to have a way to maintain a dialogue with members of other RABs. In response, the Navy is setting up a Web site so RAB members and community co-chairs can communicate. He said it is not expected to be operational for several months, and he will announce when it occurs. He also expects that through the new RAB Web site, he will be able to forward documents electronically to requesting individuals.

## SITE STATUS UPDATE

Mr. Weissenborn provided the following update on several sites visited on the tour:

- The Draft Final Record of Decision for Site 27, the Northern Channel, is scheduled for submittal for a 30-day agency and public review period on 16 May 2005.
- Information is currently being collected for the Site 27 remedial design for the selected remedy. The final design is expected to be completed in late November 2005.
- The Site 25 Draft Final Remedial Investigation (RI) Addendum is scheduled for submittal 05 May 2005.
- The Draft Feasibility Study Addendum Report is scheduled for submittal 30 May 2005.

## REGULATORY UPDATE

Mr. Weissenborn introduced Ms. Adriana Constantinescu, project manager for the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). Ms. Constantinescu explained that several questions related to the environmental cleanup came up during the tour regarding Site 22, Golf Course Landfill No. 2, and Site 1, another landfill. She said that RWQCB, as a state agency, is ensuring California regulations are being followed during the environmental cleanup at Moffett Field. At Site 22 and Site 1, the RWQCB is ensuring that California Code of

Regulations, Title 27 requirements are being followed and this is why a groundwater monitoring plan is currently in place at these sites. It is also why groundwater monitoring will continue for 30 years.

Ms. Constantinescu said other questions asked during the tour related to the Site 25, the Stormwater Retention Pond and Eastern Diked Marsh, cleanup. A few years ago, the public manifested strong interest in the cleanup of Site 25, and the Navy learned about another property owner of the site, the Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District (MROSD). Now, the Navy has all of the stakeholders at the negotiation table. The Navy released the Draft RI Addendum. During a public meeting in 2001, the MROSD reaffirmed its desire to restore its portion of Site 25, which is hydraulically connected to the rest of the site, to a tidal marsh by connecting it to the San Francisco Bay. In a recent meeting at the RWQCB office, the preliminary remedial goals were evaluated for the three proposed land use scenarios at the site: tidal marsh; managed pond, which would be on the western portion of the site where NASA discharges stormwater; and seasonal wetland, which would be on the southern portion of the site around the stormwater settling basin.

In March, project managers from several state and federal agencies working on wetland restoration met at the RWQCB office. Some of the agencies in attendance included the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, California Department of Fish and Game, and the Navy. The Navy presented the ecological receptors at the site and the three proposed land use scenarios.

With regard to another site, Ms. Constantinescu noted that Orion Park Housing Area is located on the southern portion of Moffett Field, and noted that a groundwater plume was detected in that area. Currently, the source of groundwater contamination is not known. The Navy sent a Proposed Plan to the RWQCB and EPA; two separate technical meetings and a site inspection (on 07 April 2005) were held to determine where to place groundwater monitoring wells.

Also on 07 April 2005, EPA, the RWQCB and the Navy met with aides of local elected officials, Congresswoman Anna Eshoo and Senators Barbara Boxer and Diane Feinstein. The Navy presented its cleanup activities at Site 25 and several ongoing issues at Site 29 (Hangar 1).

RAB member Richard Eckert said that Site 29 (Hangar 1) is an extremely historic building. He requested NASA make a commitment that it will preserve and restore Hangar 1. Ms. Constantinescu said RWQCB, EPA and the Navy are currently working on this issue. The Navy presented some alternatives during the Base Closure Team meeting earlier in the day. The Navy is currently preparing an Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis (EE/CA), which will be available for agency and public review for a 45-day review period. It is known there are hazardous materials associated with the hangar and the RWQCB, EPA and the Navy are concerned. The RWQCB and EPA entered into a dispute resolution process with the Navy related to the cleanup of Site 29 (Hangar 1). The agencies and the Navy reached a resolution and are now considering cleanup alternatives.

Ms. Sandy Olliges, NASA representative, noted that she placed cards on the sign-in table for interested parties to complete to be included on NASA's mailing list and learn more about Site 29 (Hangar 1).

Ms. Constantinescu introduced Ms. Lida Tan, EPA project manager. Ms. Tan noted that her colleague, Ms. Alana Lee, responsible for overseeing the groundwater monitoring for Orion Park Housing Area, was not able to attend the meeting.

Ms. Tan said that in the last few weeks EPA has been finalizing the cleanup levels for Site 25.

## **SITE 29 (HANGAR 1) DISCUSSION**

Mr. Weissenborn said the Navy will not do a full RI of Site 29 (Hangar 1); it is not going to calculate the risk. The contamination numbers for polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) the Navy has seen on the hangar siding are much higher than what is considered to be a “healthy,” acceptable PCB level for humans. The EE/CA will come out on 03 August 2005. It is roughly equivalent to a streamlined version of a feasibility study. Ms. Olliges added that there is PCB dust inside the hangar and in the surrounding environment and wetlands.

The Navy has already started developing a list of alternatives for ways to address contamination at the hangar. One alternative currently being considered is whether it can be encapsulated again. Encapsulation originally occurred in October 2003. The current schedule for the work is aggressive because in April the coating will have reached a year and a half of service life. The coating has a service life of three to five years. There are indications from NASA that it is breaking down and is not fully effective. The goal is to remove the source of contamination before the three year service life expires.

The Navy is also evaluating whether it can remove the coating via sandblasting. NASA has done some research on dual metal extraction, in which a metal serves as a catalyst to degrade the PCBs. The Navy is also looking at physical encapsulation – putting a structure over the existing Hangar 1 structure. Finally, the Navy is looking at demolition. Historical mitigation requirements are being addressed, and demolition has the most historical mitigation requirements, which makes demolition a worst-case scenario.

On 13 June 2005, the Navy will host an open house to discuss the EE/CA. The public will have an opportunity to speak one-on-one with the project team. Another open house will take place in August. On 22 September 2005, there will also be a formal public hearing. A court reporter will be present, so the public’s comments can go on record. The Navy will accept oral, written and mailed comments. After the EE/CA is completed, the Navy will award the contract for the removal action, which it hopes will begin by December 2005 or January 2006. Dust control is an important part of the fieldwork because of the nature of the contamination, and since this time of year is very wet, it is an optimal time to begin fieldwork.

## **Questions and Comments**

- Community member Larry Shapiro, who has his own air show business in Palo Alto, said that he loves Hangar 1. He looks at Hangar 1 the same way he looks at the Statue of Liberty. There are very few like it. When the Statue of Liberty needed to be fixed, it got fixed; it was not torn down. He said Hangar 1 is the community’s Statue of Liberty. The hangar has been a part of his entire life. He said that while driving up Highway 101, he cannot help but notice the hangar. He said he almost tries to embrace it, and thinks it would be the most unbelievable sacrifice to lose something filled with so many memories. Mr. Weissenborn said the Navy’s number one job is to make the hangar environmentally safe. The Navy is doing all it can to address contamination at the hangar and preserve it. Ms. Olliges added that NASA is working with the Office of Historic Preservation in California and will ensure it complies with the National Historic Preservation Act, which encourages the preservation of buildings. Mr. Weissenborn said the Navy recently met with an official from the Office of Historic Preservation in California. One option is to take the shell off of the hangar and replace it with something else. If the shell is replaced, however, then the hangar will not be

considered historical anymore, and there are different requirements for historical structures than for structures that are not historical.

- One community member said he feels that demolition of Hangar 1 should not be an option whatsoever. Mr. Weissenborn said that demolition is an option because of the high concentration of PCBs contamination inside and outside of the hangar. If the Navy can do something to preserve the hangar, it will certainly do it. One option the Navy does not have is that of no action.
- Community member Carl Honaker, former executive officer at Moffett Field and director of the Santa Clara County Airports, said that he is concerned that accelerating the process might leave people behind without having the opportunity to comment. He appreciates the fact that the Navy is having additional meetings to give the community additional opportunities to voice their concerns. He said that because Hangar 1 is so unique and was built at the same time as the San Francisco Bay Bridge and Golden Gate Bridge, it is part-and-parcel of the history of the area and should be preserved at all costs. He would really like to see an out-of-the-box thought process on Hangar 1. The creation of Moffett Field was a solution outside of the box. The chambers of commerce within Silicon Valley collected money, so that Moffett Field could be built and the Navy would be encouraged to have a jobs program here. The hangar was built, and people from several states came out to watch the U.S.S. Macon show up, which was better than any air show today. Silicon Valley is full of out-of-the-box solutions. Partnering with local businesses, organizations and others to find the right solution to restore the hangar and address the contamination might mean spending more time on the process, but this should be considered. Mr. Weissenborn agreed with Mr. Honaker about the benefits of out-of-the-box solutions and asked that if anyone has an idea about a solution, to let the Navy know. Mr. Honaker asked if it would be possible to extend the deadline beyond October 2006 if no solution is found by that time. Mr. Weissenborn said it is not possible because of the time limitation on the existing remedy (the coating) and the risk PCB contamination poses on human health and the environment.
- RAB members Steve Williams and William James agreed the Navy should try not to have a fast-tracked schedule for the cleanup work if a solution is not in sight for preserving the hangar. Mr. Williams said the Navy should do all it can to ensure the best technologies for cleaning up the hangar are explored. Technology changes rapidly, and a better, more permanent solution may come out after October 2006. Mr. Weissenborn said the Navy is actively seeking and regularly receiving proposals from universities and corporations encouraging the Navy to try their new, state-of-the-art technologies.
- Mr. Shapiro said that if the Navy bought the coating with the understanding it would last three to five years, and the material is the bigger part of the expense and has not been fully effective, the Navy should be entitled to receive some of the money back, which could then be reapplied to the hangar.
- Mr. Moss said he strongly supports saving Hangar 1, but on a technical and administrative level, demolition should be considered as an option. He is concerned about the speed in which a solution needs to be found. More time might allow for the best solution, as well as funding, to be found in order to preserve the hangar.

## **RAB BUSINESS**

**RAB Schedule** – The next meeting is scheduled for **Thursday, 14 July 2005**, from **7 to 9 p.m.** at the Mountain View City Hall, fourth floor gallery. The RAB meeting schedule for the remainder of 2005 is as follows:

- 15 September 2005
- 17 November 2005

**Future RAB Topics** – The following topic was identified as a potential agenda item for the next RAB meeting:

- Site 29 (Hangar 1)

**Adjourn** – Mr. Weissenborn adjourned the meeting at 6:45 p.m. and thanked everyone for attending. Mr. Weissenborn can be contacted with any comments or questions:

**Mr. Rick Weissenborn**

Lead Remedial Project Manager, former NAS Moffett Field  
BRAC Program Management Office West  
1230 Columbia Street, Suite 1100  
San Diego, CA 92101

**Phone:** (619) 532-0952   **Fax:** (619) 532-0995

**E-mail:** [richard.weissenborn@navy.mil](mailto:richard.weissenborn@navy.mil)

## **GLOSSARY OF TERMS USED IN THESE MINUTES**

DOD – Department of Defense

EE/CA – Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis

EPA – U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

MROSD – Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District

NAS – Naval Air Station

PCBs – polychlorinated biphenyls

RAB – Restoration Advisory Board

RI – Remedial Investigation

RWQCB – California Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Francisco Region

***RAB meeting minutes are located on the Navy's Environmental Web Page at:  
[www.navybracpmo.org/bracbases/california/moffett/](http://www.navybracpmo.org/bracbases/california/moffett/)***