

**FORMER NAVAL AIR STATION MOFFETT FIELD
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD
BUILDING 943, EAGLE 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, 11 September 2008, at Building 943, Eagle Room, Moffett Field, California. Bob Moss, RAB community co-chair, and Darren Newton, U.S. Navy Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Environmental Coordinator (BEC) and RAB co-chair, opened the meeting at 7:00 p.m.

WELCOME

Mr. Newton and Mr. Moss welcomed everyone in attendance. Mr. Moss asked for self-introductions of those present and provided a brief agenda overview. Mr. Moss stated there is a modification to the RAB agenda. The Navy postponed the Site 8 and Site 25 update for a future RAB meeting. The Navy will provide an update presentation on Site 29 (Hangar 1).

The Moffett Field RAB meeting was attended by:

RAB Members	Regulators	Navy	Consultants & Navy Support	NASA	Public & Other
11	5	2	5	4	22

ANNOUNCEMENTS

- Mr. Moss announced that comments are due on the Hangar 1 Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis (EE/CA) by 13 September 2008. The public can provide comments on the Hangar 1 EE/CA by e-mail or by United States Post Office with the post mark on or before 13 September 2008.
- Mr. Moss announced that the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) is holding a public meeting to take comments on Hangar 1 prior to issuing their comment to the Navy. The ACHP public meeting will take place at the Computer History Museum in Mountain View, California on 17 September 2008. ACHP is taking public comments on the historic impact of Hangar 1. The Cities of Mountain View, Sunnyvale, and Palo Alto and additional community organization collaborating to make comments at the ACHP public meeting.
- Mr. Newton stated that ACHP issued a public announcement for their meeting on 17 September 2008. All of the public comments received at the ACHP meeting will be considered when drafting a letter to the Secretary of the Navy. Written comments for ACHP to consider should be submitted to Kelly Fanizzo, Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, 1100 Pennsylvania Avenue NW, Room 803, Washington, DC 20004 or kfanizzo@achp.gov. Public comments on the Hangar 1 EE/CA should be submitted to Mr. Newton. All of the public comments received by the Navy on the Hangar 1 EE/CA will be addressed in the Responsiveness Summary which is an attachment to the Hangar 1 Action Memorandum. Mr. Newton stated if anyone wants to reserve time to speak at the ACHP public meeting to contact Ms. Fanizzo. The Navy will be present at the ACHP public meeting for support.

FINAL

- Mr. Moss stated he has been in communication with the owners of the Akron, Ohio hangar. There is a private company that builds airships in the Akron, Ohio hangar. There is interest in stationing one of the airships at Hangar 1.
- Mr. Newton stated the Navy went to Akron, Ohio with National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) in December 2004. Hangar 1 has different structural stresses than the Akron, Ohio hangar. Mr. Newton stated that during the site visit in 2004, the Navy toured the hangar and there was substantial dust inside the hangar from the acrylic coating used. The Navy has to assess costs for structural upgrades and seismic retrofitting when determining a remedial alternative. Jac Siegel (City of Mountain View Council Member) asked if the Navy is considering electrical upgrades to Hangar 1 as part of the structural updates. Mr. Newton stated the Navy is not considering electrical upgrades to Hangar 1 as part of the structural updates.
- Mr. Moss stated that Lockheed estimated \$13 Million for the Akron, Ohio hangar interior sanding and coating. Mr. Moss stated his concern is the Navy has put \$800,000 for water costs for cleanup of the interior construction which could be completed for less money by using sanding and dust removal. Mr. Moss stated a coating that binds the polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) with an acrylic coating on top would sufficiently contain the PCBs at Hangar 1. Mr. Moss stated that Lockheed quoted \$27 Million for remediation the interior and exterior of the Akron, Ohio hangar which is not much more substantial than what the Navy is quoting for Hangar 1 just to leave the structure in place. Mr. Moss stated his concern with the Navy refusing access to Hangar 1 for the Akron, Ohio hangar contractor to make an assessment for the total cost of remediating the PCBs, and residing the hangar. Mr. Newton stated the Navy is not soliciting bids from contractors for Hangar 1. The Navy is looking at a similar solution to the Akron, Ohio hangar. The Navy is looking at a material that is similar to fiberglass to coat Hangar 1 once the PCBs are remediated. A community member, Steve Williams stated the community wanted the contractor from the Akron, Ohio hangar to come out and assess Hangar 1 in order to have a separate assessment to compare to the Navy's.
- Mr. Newton stated the Navy is still on track for work being done at Site 25. There has been discussion between the Navy and the regulatory agencies on Site 8. There is a possibility that work at Site 8 will be put on hold and the Site 25 Proposed Plan (PP) will move forward.
- Mr. Newton stated the Navy is updating their BRAC website to make it user friendly.
- Mr. Newton reviewed Moffett Field points-of-contact information, including the information repository and administrative record locations, and the 2009 RAB meeting schedule. A handout listing Moffett Field points-of-contact information was made available at the sign-in table.
- Mr. Newton reminded RAB members to call him or Mr. Moss for an excused absence if they are unable to attend a RAB meeting.

APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

Mr. Moss asked for corrections to the 17 July 2008 meeting minutes. RAB member, Lenny Siegel requested a couple changes to the meeting minutes. On page 3, Mr. Siegel requested the word "Environmental" be added to Peter Strauss' tile. Mr. Strauss affiliation is the Center for Public Environmental Oversight. On page 6, Mr. Siegel requested the word California be replaced with New York in the discussion regarding the chemical dry cleaning industry.

Alana Lee, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) stated that she provided comments on the 17 July 2008 RAB meeting minutes electronically to the Navy for incorporation into the final version.

FINAL

The 17 July 2008 meeting minutes were approved as corrected. Meeting minutes are posted to the Moffett Field project website at <http://www.bracpmo.navy.mil/bracbases/california/moffett/>.

DOCUMENTS FOR REVIEW

There were no documents coming up for review in the September through November 2008 timeframe for the RAB members to sign up to receive.

HANGAR 1 PROGRESS REVIEW

Mr. Newton stated the Navy has spent over 6,500 hours evaluating costs for remediating Hangar 1. The Navy has worked with NASA and the regulatory agencies to develop the EE/CA. NASA has been working with the community to address their concerns for future use and ACHP is coming out to take public comments on Hangar 1. Mr. Newton stated the Navy looked into leaving the PCBs in place but the long term operation (O&M) and maintenance costs were significant. Each alternative the Navy assessed had O&M costs included.

Kevin Kramer (Tetra Tech EC Inc.) went over how an EE/CA is developed. The Navy developed detailed scopes of work, conducted site walks, historic pricing, vendor costs, tested some coatings for suitability, and conducted a site visit to Akron, Ohio. There are four steps in cost estimating including defining the scope in terms of quantities, developing unit rate costs for each alternative, developing costs for each work break down structure which includes all of the subcontractor and vendor costs, and develop the total project costs. The Navy went through all four steps for each alternative proposed in the EE/CA. Mr. Kramer went over the activities that are common for each alternative developed in the EE/CA which includes the level of effort it takes to prepare the site and mobilize to conduct work, interior building abatement and demolition, environmental sampling and monitoring, demobilization once the work is complete, schedules, and 30 years of O&M.

Mr. Kramer went over Alternatives 2 (cover with rubberized material), 4 (coat with acrylic material), 6 (cover with new visually similar siding), 10 (remove siding and coat exposed surfaces), and 11 (demolish and remove hangar).

- Mr. Strauss asked if the Navy added contingency costs to their estimates on each alternative. Mr. Kramer stated that 20% was added to each alternative cost for contingencies. Mr. Strauss stated that the initial EE/CA had estimated 25% for each alternative for contingencies.
- Mr. Strauss asked if the Navy anticipated historic mitigation costs with Alternative 10. Mr. Kramer stated the Navy included reinstallation of a coating to the exterior of Hangar 1 to be visually similar to the current siding. Mr. Strauss asked if the Navy addressed retrofitting costs in each alternative proposed. Mr. Kramer stated retrofitting costs of Hangar 1 were prepared by a subcontractor and added to the costs of each alternative. Mr. Newton stated that the retrofitting costs for each alternative will vary. If the Navy moves forward with Alternative 10 to remove siding and coat exposed surfaces, the retrofitting costs would be less than putting siding on Hangar 1. Residing Hangar 1 would require additional bracing due to the added weight of the material used. Even if the Navy decides to go with a rubber or acrylic exterior coating, the weight of the material is a factor in the retrofitting Hangar 1.
- Mr. Moss stated the Akron, Ohio hangar was designed to hold 2 feet of snow. The one concern that had to be addressed for the Akron, Ohio hangar was the negative air pressure inside when the door was opened to the outside. Mr. Moss stated that based on the Akron, Ohio hangar being able to withstand 2 feet of snow on the frame, it is not necessary to reinforce Hangar 1. Mr. Strauss stated Hangar 1 currently has an asphalt emulsion on the frame. Retrofitting the structure was not a consideration prior to placing the asphalt on Hangar 1. Mr. Newton stated that the asphalt emulsion was a temporary

remedy. Mr. Newton stated the soil that Hangar 1 is on is different than what the Akron, Ohio hangar is placed on which causes varied considerations for retrofitting.

- Community member Linda Ellis stated in her estimate, that residing Hangar 1 will cost the Navy approximately \$12 Million.
- A community member stated that materials recommended in the EE/CA for Alternative 6 to cover Hangar 1 with visually similar siding was based on subcontracting costs from the makers of Quonset Huts. The curved panels proposed for Hangar 1 by the makers of Quonset Huts will not fit the shape of the hangar. The EE/CA has a huge range of costs for the alternatives. It does not show that care was taken when the EE/CA alternatives were developed. Mr. Kramer stated the Navy used U.S. EPA guidance when determining the alternatives for the EE/CA. Mr. Kramer stated that the Navy will meet all regulatory standards when an alternative is chosen for Hangar 1.
- Mr. J. Siegel asked what the period of performance for the remediation of Hangar 1 is. Is there concern that the estimated costs will be out of date when the remediation begins. Mr. Kramer stated the alternative costs were developed on 2007 in order to determine the cost difference of each alternative proposed. Mr. Newton stated the Navy will anticipate the standard 4% to 5% cost escalation per year for the alternatives.
- Mr. J. Siegel asked what the Navy plans to do with hazardous waste from the PCB remediation at the Hangar. Mr. Kramer stated that depending on the class of hazardous waste, will determine which type of landfill the material will be deposited. Dr. Ann Clarke (NASA) stated there are different types of landfills to accommodate the different classes of waste generated. Hazardous waste does not go to a regular household waste landfill.
- A community member asked if the Navy will be able to recycle the steel plates that are the current siding of Hangar 1. Mr. Kramer stated the steel siding has PCBs and asbestos which will need to be removed and deposited in a hazardous landfill.
- A community member asked if the remedial activities for Hangar 1 could be cheaper if it was completed by the Navy instead of using private contractors. Mr. Newton stated that all work even related to ships is contracted out by the Navy.
- Mr. L. Siegel stated in 2005, approximately 2,000 community member signed a petition to ask the Navy to reside Hangar 1. The Navy never provided any response to the community member petition. Mr. L. Siegel stated that ACHP may require the Navy to reside Hangar 1 as part of the National Preservation Act. The Revised EE/CA should have provided a detailed analysis why it is too expensive for the Navy to reside Hangar 1. Mr. L. Siegel stated the Navy has an obligation to reconstruct and restore Hangar 1.

Mr. Newton stated the Navy is looking at Alternative 10, remove the siding and coat the surfaces not because of the cost, but what is appropriate to remediate PCBs. The Navy is responsible to remediate the PCBs as a Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA) action. Historic mitigation of Hangar 1 is up to the reuse of the site. The Navy is in compliance with Historical Regulation 106.

- Mr. L. Siegel stated that the Navy's estimate to do the removal and demobilize after the PCB cleanup, there will be significant cost to remobilize to reside Hangar 1.
- A community member asked what the \$300,000 outlined in the Navy's EE/CA for historic mitigation will be used for. Mr. Newton stated the Navy has \$300,000 in the EE/CA which would be sufficient to address historic mitigation costs. Mr. L. Siegel asked what the Navy would do if ACHP comes back and says that \$300,000 is not enough to complete historic mitigation at Hangar 1. Mr. Newton stated the Navy will address that if ACHP provides that comment.

FINAL

- Brian Turner (Nation Trust for Historic Preservation) stated that ACHP is a Federal Organization and this is a rare occurrence for them to host a public meeting to receive feedback. ACHP's comments to the Navy will be instrumental in developing a path forward for Hangar 1. This is a special occasion when a CERCLA action and historic preservation occurring at the same time.
- A community member stated they grew up in North East Ohio which is extremely windy. If the Akron, Ohio hangar did not need retrofitting and is not affected by the extreme winds, it is difficult to see why Hangar 1 has these considerations. The winds around Former NAS Moffett Field are not stronger than those in Ohio.
- A community member stated the revised EE/CA does not have much new information in it. The EE/CA has all of the previous alternatives listed, just now are in a different order.
- Gabriel Diaconescu (RAB member) stated that the cleanup of Hangar 1 is a large project with a large budget. The Navy should look at the tasks that are critical to the success of the project. Mr. Diaconescu stated that the remediation of Hangar 1 is similar to a surgical procedure. Leaving Hangar 1 without siding it like not closing a body after a surgery. Mr. Diaconescu requested the Navy reside the Hangar 1 to complete the surgery.
- Mr. Diaconescu stated the reuse of Hangar 1 needs to be assessed. The reuse of Hangar 1 is related to taking care of the future of Former NAS Moffett Field as well as the surrounding community. The history of Hangar 1 needs to be integrated with its future use. Finally, Mr. Diaconescu said that the future use of Hangar 1 can be the first ever Meta Technical Museum.
- Arthur Schwartz (RAB member) stated that the responsibility of the RAB is to restore land and advise the Navy on projects. Hangar 1 needs to be restored.
- Mr. L. Siegel stated the Navy will listen to direction from the Secretary of the Navy. NASA needs to get involved with communicating with the Secretary of the Navy to assist with the consideration of reuse of Hangar 1.
- A community member asked what activities will be associated with 30 years of O&M at Hangar 1. Mr. Newton stated that touch ups to the frame will occur every 5 years and recoating of Hangar 1 will occur every 10 years.
- Mr. Strauss stated that stripping the siding off Hangar 1 may have a negative impact on NASA's reuse plan. It may be difficult for NASA to get private grants for reuse Hangar 1 if it is not resided. Mr. Newton stated that adverse impacts are assessed in an document which NASA has been involved in reviewing. Dr. Clarke suggested that Mr. Strauss contact the NASA research department for their assessment of the adverse impact document. Mr. Strauss stated that the adverse impact information should be detailed in the EE/CA and Action Memorandum.
- Mr. Moss stated that Alternatives 2, 4, and 6 all protect human health. Mr. Moss stated that there was air monitoring conducted inside the Akron, Ohio hangar to determine safety. Alternative 10 is not the only solution to comply with human health goals. Mr. Moss stated that regardless of the path forward for Hangar 1, one federal agency is dropping a problem on another federal agency to deal with.
- Mr. Moss stated if the Navy spends \$27-\$30 Million to have a useable structure that would escalate its reuse value. The reuse value for a resided hangar could make \$7.00 a square foot which could pay for the additional cost back in the long run and benefit NASA and the community.
- A community member stated that if Hangar 1 is not resided, it will become a bird sanctuary. Additional birds flocking toward Hangar 1 could cause detriments to planes and pilots that fly in the area. There has been a history of the Navy come and going at Former NAS Moffett Field. Has the Navy assessed

the cost of reopening Former NAS Moffett Field for future military activities. Mr. Newton stated the Navy does not have plans to reopen Former NAS Moffett Field for future military activities.

- A community member mentioned the costs for Alternative 10 to remove the siding and coat the exposed surfaces is not accurate. There are two other hangars at Former NAS Moffett Field that are currently being leased. The Navy needs to look into the cost benefit of leasing space inside Hangar 1 if it is resided. Mr. Newton stated that NASA is responsible for the reuse of Hangar 1. The Navy would not see any revenue associated with leasing Hangar 1 in the future. Richard Eckert (RAB member) stated that when Hangar 1 is reused the community and the tax payers would see the revenue.
- Mr. Moss stated that leasing Hangar 1 at \$3.00 a square foot would gross about \$7.2 Million a year. NASA could agree to pay a portion of the residing costs which will be returned once Hangar 1 is leased. There is plenty of community interest in using Hangar 1 for NASA and the Navy to get a return on residing Hangar 1.
- A community member requested the coating and/or residing of Hangar 1 be silver with a black top so it looks the same as it does currently.
- A community member asked if water running off of Hangar 1 showed high concentrations of PCBs. Would there be a higher concentration of PCBs inside Hangar 1 that would cause human health concerns. The community member recommended leaving the doors to Hangar 1 open in order to alleviate any PCB build up inside from water run off.
- Mr. Eckert stated that he is ashamed of the Navy's recommendation not to reside Hangar 1. Mr. Eckert hopes the Navy will do the right thing and reside Hangar 1 to complete the sites cleanup and restoration.
- Mr. Williams stated the community does not feel the Navy has addressed their questions and concerns with the Revised Hangar 1 EE/CA. The community is asking for an opportunity to evaluate the Hangar 1 EE/CA and the alternatives and costs associated with them separate of what the Navy has done.
- Mr. Schwartz asked how Hangar 1 in the past couple of years has become a hazardous site the Navy and EPA do not want community members to enter. Thousands of people have been through Hangar 1 in the past and to Mr. Schwartz' knowledge have not turned up ill. Mr. Newton stated that once the Navy determined there was PCB contamination, action needed to be taken to address it which included limiting the amount of people going inside Hangar 1.
- A community member asked if EPA would agree to have community members visit Hangar 1. Ms. Lee stated that EPA is interested in making sure that health and safety concerns are met at Hangar 1. The Navy is responsible for determining who can go into Hangar 1. Mr. Newton stated that each person who goes into Hangar 1 must complete health and safety training. When ACHP comes out for a tour of Hangar 1, they will all need to complete the health and safety training.

RAB BUSINESS

Future RAB Topics

Mr. Newton announced the next RAB meeting will be held on 13 November 2008. The location of the RAB meeting is unknown. NASA has a new contractor to coordinate the meeting rooms in Building 943. The current policy is the meeting space will not be available after 5:00 p.m. The Navy is discussing this with NASA and also the City of Mountain View to determine future RAB meeting locations. As soon as the location for future RAB meetings is determined, the Navy will notify the RAB. Mr. Newton suggested potential presentation topics for future RAB meetings could include updates on the Site 8 and Site 25 PP, the Focused FS for groundwater remediation at Site 27, and a Building 88 update.

FINAL

Mr. Newton asked for topic suggestions for future RAB meetings.

Regulator Update

EPA

Ms. Lee stated the Navy is proceeding with the Draft Work Plan for the Pilot Test at Site 26 which is scheduled to come out in December 2008. While the Navy is drafting the work plan, East-Side Aquifer Treatment System (EATS) has not been turned on. The Navy is in the process of getting EATS operational.

- Mr. L. Siegel thanked the Navy and regulatory agencies for the development of innovative technologies for Site 26.

Ms. Lee stated the Navy will issue a white paper discussing the pilot study for Site 26 on December 18, 2008.

Ms. Lee stated that EPA submitted a letter to the Navy regarding the West-Side Aquifer Treatment System (WATS) at Building 88. The path forward for Building 88 and Site 28 will be discussed at a management meeting which will be held on September 23, 2008.

RAB Schedule

The next RAB meeting will be held from 7 to 9:30 p.m. at a location TBA. The RAB meeting schedule for the next year is as follows:

- 13 November 2008
- 8 January 2009
- 12 March 2009
- 14 May 2009
- 9 July 2009
- 10 September 2009
- 12 November 2009

Adjourn

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

- Mr. Darren Newton
BRAC Environmental Coordinator, Former NAS Moffett Field, BRAC Program Management Office West;
1455 Frazee Road, Suite 900; San Diego, CA 92108; Phone: 619-532-0963; Fax: 619-532-0940;
E-mail: darren.newton@navy.mil

FINAL

GLOSSARY OF TERMS USED IN THESE MINUTES

BRAC – Base Realignment and Closure

DoD – Department of Defense

EATS – East-Side Aquifer Treatment System

EE/CA – Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis

EPA – U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

NAS – Naval Air Station

NASA – National Aeronautics and Space
Administration

PCB – Polychlorinated biphenyl

PP – Proposed Plan

RAB – Restoration Advisory Board

RPM – Remedial Project Manager

TBA – To Be Announced

TCE – Trichloroethylene

TtEC – Tetra Tech EC, Inc.

WATS – West-Side Aquifers Treatment System

RAB meeting minutes are posted on the Navy's environmental Web page at:
<http://www.bracpmo.navy.mil/bracbases/california/moffett/>.