

**FORMER NAS MOFFETT FIELD
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD
MOUNTAIN VIEW CITY HALL, FOURTH FLOOR GALLERY
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, 15 September 2005 at the Mountain View City Hall, Fourth Floor Gallery, in Mountain View, California. Mr. Rick Weissenborn, the Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Environmental Coordinator for Moffett Field and RAB Co-Chair, opened the meeting at 7:10 p.m.

WELCOME

Mr. Weissenborn introduced himself and welcomed everyone in attendance, then 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	3	4	4	3	14

Mr. Weissenborn said the regulatory update agenda item will be moved to the beginning of the meeting.

Mr. Bob Moss, RAB Community Co-Chair, said community members interested in becoming a RAB member may submit the RAB application for membership. Mr. Moss also announced the public meeting scheduled for 18 October 2005 is cancelled.

DOCUMENTS FOR REVIEW

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

#	DOCUMENT	APPROXIMATE SUBMITTAL DATE
1	Site 29 (Hangar 1) EE/CA Report	October 2005
2	Site 25 Revised Draft Feasibility Study Report Addendum	October 2005
3	Final Site 22 Landfill Post-Construction Operations, Maintenance, and Monitoring Plan Addendum	November 2005
4	Site 27 Draft Final Remedial Design	December 2005

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mrs. Patricia Guerrieri said her courtesy title should be Mrs., not Ms., in the 14 July 2005 meeting minutes. Mr. Steve Sprugasci, RAB member, moved to adopt the 14 July 2005 meeting minutes as corrected; the motion was seconded.

REGULATORY UPDATE

Ms. Lida Tan, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Remedial Project Manager, gave the following update on EPA activities occurring at Moffett Field:

- Hangar 1: EPA has been working with the Navy, National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) and Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Francisco Region (RWQCB) to resolve issues related to the Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis (EE/CA) report. The report's public release date has been delayed to allow more time for the Navy and regulatory agencies to resolve certain issues.
- Site 25: EPA has received all public comments on the Draft Feasibility Study and is in the process of reviewing them.
- Site 27, the Northern Channel: The Remedial Design will be completed the week of 19 September 2005 and cleanup is scheduled for 2006.
- Site 22, Golf Course Landfill No. 2: Groundwater issues were discussed at the 15 September 2005 BRAC Cleanup Team (BCT) meeting. The project is ongoing.

Attendees had no questions on the EPA regulatory update.

Ms. Adriana Constantinescu, engineering geologist in the Department of Defense (DOD) section of the RWQCB, gave the following update on RWQCB activities occurring at Moffett Field:

- Site 25: The RWQCB and EPA reviewed the Site 25 Draft Addendum to the Station-Wide Feasibility Study. The RWQCB had a meeting with the Santa Clara Valley Toxics Coalition and the Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District (MROSD) to clarify legal issues regarding potential migration of contaminants from the uplands area towards Site 25. The RWQCB sent a comment letter on 19 August 2005 to NASA and NASA is performing soil quality tests in the uplands.
- The RWQCB met with NASA and the Navy in early September 2005 to decommission/close groundwater monitoring wells not currently in use. The Navy agreed to sample selected wells prior to deciding whether to decommission these wells.

The following questions and concerns followed the RWQCB regulatory update:

- Mr. Peter Strauss, technical advisor to the Silicon Valley Toxics Coalition, asked if there could be an update at the next RAB meeting about the results found from the groundwater quality tests and asked when wells will be closed. Ms. Constantinescu said this information would have to be provided by the Navy. The Navy has groundwater sampling scheduled into the end of September 2005. Mr. Weissenborn said there are 80 wells proposed for closing and 12 will be sampled before abandoned. Most of the wells are 10 years or older. Some will be resampled primarily for petroleum products; three or four of the wells already have documented groundwater samples. Results will be presented in either hard copy form or in a presentation at a future RAB meeting. Results may not be available in time for the November RAB meeting since the availability of results depends on the time frame needed to validate the results.
- Ms. Constantinescu said the RWQCB had a meeting with NASA, the Navy and EPA regarding groundwater quality issues and hydrocarbon chemical compounds detected in the West-Side Aquifers Treatment System (WATS). NASA presented evaluation of their data and the RWQCB will review and evaluate it.
- Mr. Weissenborn said there is additional groundwater sampling in the area adjacent to Hangar 1, where a dry cleaner was located at Building 88. This site had previously undergone cleanup by the Navy, but there is still groundwater contamination from that source and the Navy is the responsible party. Data will be presented and discussed at the next BCT meeting. The contaminant found is trichloroethene (TCE). The presence of TCE is sporadic. The next probable step will be an EE/CA, which will state where the contamination is located and will recommend alternatives for remediation.

ORION PARK HOUSING PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION

Mr. Wilson Doctor, Project Manager for Orion Park Housing, presented an update on activities occurring at the site. The following questions and concerns were expressed:

- Mr. Strauss asked the Navy to share results for the volatile organic compounds (VOCs) found in groundwater samples. Mr. Doctor said there were up to 500 micrograms/liter of TCE in the upper aquifer. In the lower aquifer, TCE ranged up to 5000 micrograms/liter.
- Mr. Richard Eckert, RAB member, asked what was deemed a safe level. Mr. Doctor said 5 micrograms/liter is the Maximum Contaminant Level (MCL). Results are still being analyzed.
- Mr. Lenny Siegel, RAB member, asked if the isotope ratio method has been used successfully elsewhere and asked how reliable the method was. Mr. Doctor said the technology, although new, has been previously used at Moffett Field. Mr. Siegel asked if other potentially responsible parties (PRPs) agreed that the isotope ratio method was reliable. Mr. Doctor said he had not heard any feedback from other PRPs.
- Ms. Jane Turnbull, RAB member, asked if chlorine isotopes were being measured to determine the presence of perchlorate. Mr. Doctor said chlorine isotopes are an indication to the presence of TCE and the type of plume. Mr. Siegel said the mix of the two existing isotopes will identify any particular source and added there is chlorine in TCE.

SITE 25 FEASIBILITY STUDY REPORT ADDENDUM PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION

Mr. Scott Gromko, Remedial Project Manager for Site 25, presented an update on the Site 25 Feasibility Study Report Addendum. He said there will be a Revised Draft Addendum to the Feasibility Study. RAB members and community attendees expressed the following questions and concerns:

- Mr. Kevin Woodhouse, RAB member, asked how long the comment period will be for the Revised Draft Addendum to the Feasibility Study. Mr. Gromko said the comment period will be 60 days.
- Mr. Strauss referred to the remediation action goals chart and said the presentation glosses over detailed elements. He and Mr. Siegel, on behalf of Silicon Valley Toxics Coalition, have had a discussion with Mr. Gromko, Mr. Weissenborn, Ms. Constantinescu and Ms. Tan. Mr. Strauss said there are three parts for the RAB to consider: (1) Polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) at 210 parts per billion (ppb) is the “do not exceed limit” at any point in the saltwater retention pond. Mr. Gromko said that was correct; if sediment at the site was found to exceed 210 ppb, the contamination would be removed. (2) Mr. Strauss said this value was based on a high toxicity reference value. He said a low toxicity reference value exists, which is 58 ppb as an average throughout the pond. (3) Mr. Strauss said the Navy uses “background,” which masks all of the low toxicity values. If the results are 210 ppb, the background is 200 ppb. Based on his opinion and knowledge of the site, only the Navy has contributed PCBs to the stormwater retention pond, therefore, background is irrelevant. Mr. Strauss said the Navy should use a low toxicity reference value and believes the RWQCB is in concurrence with that point. Mr. Siegel said the use of background allows for the use of less treatment and excavation in a cleanup alternative. Mr. Gromko said the issue is being addressed by the Navy and the Navy will have a response. Ms. Constantinescu added she would want to see the Navy’s evaluation.
- A community member asked how many sampling monitoring stations are present at the perimeter of Site 25 to ensure contamination does not mobilize. Mr. Gromko said contamination is completely contained; sediment does not leave the site. The contaminants of concern, PCBs, are in the sediment and do not dissolve easily in water; they are hydrophobic.
- Mr. Siegel said there doesn’t seem to be any hydraulic connectivity between the adjacent ponds since the water levels are different. Mr. Gromko concurred and said Site 25 is below sea level.

HANGAR 1 UPDATE AND DISCUSSION

Mr. Weissenborn said the public release date of the Hangar 1 EE/CA was postponed from September 2 because the Navy, RWQCB, EPA and NASA are in discussions to resolve issues raised at the Hangar 1 Alternatives Workshop on 18 August 2005. Mr. Weissenborn apologized for not being able to provide a new release date, which has not yet been determined, but said the community and RAB members will be notified of the release

date. He said a mailer was sent on 12 September 2005 to roughly 2,500 community members and interested parties notifying the postponement of the EE/CA release.

Mr. Weissenborn said the Navy is required to comply with applicable or relevant and appropriate requirements (ARARs) for Hangar 1. Important ARARs include the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) and the National Register of Historic Places. NASA has been working to meet those requirements for Hangar 1.

Ms. Sandy Olliges, NASA Deputy Director for Safety, Environmental and Mission Assurance, presented steps NASA is taking to comply with Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) and NHPA requirements for Hangar 1. RAB members and attendees expressed the following concerns during and after the presentation:

- A community member asked if Hangar 1 was considered a federal building. Ms. Olliges said it is and added NHPA states if a building has to be demolished or the appearance changes, documentation must be provided and certain actions must be taken.
- Mr. Siegel asked what are the NHPA requirements for demolishing the structure. Ms. Olliges said NHPA requires that Navy and NASA analyze the alternatives stated in the EE/CA, describe the effect on the historic property and provide public, State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and RAB involvement opportunities. He further inquired if SHPO needs to approve demolition. Ms. Olliges said it does not, but SHPO would be interested in ensuring that procedures regarding the NHPA were followed, such as documentation and community involvement. She said if the site was not a CERCLA site, the process would only require a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) with SHPO and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation. Because Moffett Field is a Superfund site, the overriding concern is protection of human health and the environment. Ms. Olliges emphasized PCB levels are very high and the contamination exists throughout the structure. PCB levels are at approximately 120,000 parts per million (ppm). Every sample taken has shown that PCB levels are above EPA's acceptable level. Indoor, PCB levels are at approximately 1 miligram/100 square centimeters. An ambient air sample had results of .0034 micrograms/cubic meter. PCBs have also been detected outdoors, adjacent to the hangar. Ms. Olliges said that although PCBs may not always be detected, this does not mean that the contamination does not exist since PCBs may be below the detection level. She said PCBs are biocummulative and enter biologic systems, causing liver and neurological damage. Because the site is a CERCLA action site, the Navy will write an Action Memorandum, rather than a MOA, stating it has complied with the law.
- A community member said the community is aware of the high level of PCBs present, but the community feels it can be a win-win situation by removing PCBs and keeping the hangar.
- Mr. Strauss said Hangar 1 is listed on the National Register of Historic Places. He asked if there was another designation under federal or state law that would provide additional protections for the hangar. Ms. Olliges said a National Historic Landmark designation would provide additional preservation requirements. If a site is designated a Landmark, then a federal agency has greater requirement to find alternatives or adaptive uses for the structure. Mr. Strauss asked if NASA would be opposed to the idea of a RAB member contacting the congressional delegation or the National Park Service (NPS) to get the hangar nominated for National Historic Landmark designation. Ms. Olliges said this circumstance/issue would be handled at a higher level within NASA. Mr. Weissenborn explained the nomination process is not simple. Compliance with Section 106 of the NHPA, as part of a CERCLA action, is a two to three year process. If the hangar were a Landmark, it would have to go through a longer procedural path.
- Ms. Libby Lucas, RAB member, asked if the hangar's structural design was capable of withstanding an earthquake. Ms. Olliges said a detailed seismic study has not been done. NASA has looked into costs for bringing the structure up to current building and fire codes, which would cost an additional \$50 to \$100 million. Ms. Lucas asked if government funding could be obtained to bring the facility up to code in case of emergency, such as an earthquake since there may be cleanup funding available that would not normally be considered. Ms. Olliges stated NASA would inquire about this.

- Mr. Eckert said he would like a commitment in writing from the Navy that Hangar 1 will not be demolished. Ms. Olliges commented she does not believe the commitment will be forthcoming. Mr. Eckert, an ex-Navy pilot, wants to see the hangar remain and feels the Navy is not listening to the community. Mr. Moss suggested members of the community wait until the EE/CA is available for public comment and take appropriate action at that time.
- A community member inquired if the ad placed by NASA regarding the photovoltaic power system project was only for energy companies interested in developing the photovoltaic system or if a foundation could express their interest in other uses for the hangar. Ms. Olliges said if other parties were interested, they could contact the energy companies that have expressed interest. She explained an energy company would lease the property from NASA, own the generating system and sell power. The community member said he would like to see a foundation be responsible for the hangar and assume the long-term risks so the interior could be used for a museum or something similar. Ms. Olliges said organizations, such as Space World One, have been contacted and she is hopeful using the hangar's interior may happen. The community member asked if there were other foundations that could use the interior. Ms. Olliges said they could as no agreements have been signed. The community member asked if a foundation could be responsible for the whole hangar and lease the exterior to an energy company, or if NASA would retain responsibility. Ms. Olliges said it was too early to go into that level of detail. She said currently, NASA would own the outer side and would lease it to the energy company. If a foundation came forward and wanted to use the inside of the hangar, NASA would entertain that. She said there is some indication that interested foundations are trying to contact the Save Hangar One Committee.
- A community member asked if NASA's mid October deadline for energy companies to express their interest in the photovoltaic project was too soon if partnerships need to be formed and not all the money is allocated yet. He asked if NASA could postpone the deadline so that partnerships could form. Ms. Olliges said the 14 October 2005 deadline is only meant for companies to express their interest in the project; details don't have to be worked out.
- A community member asked if there has been any discussion of tax breaks for the interested parties. Ms. Olliges said she is not aware that there has been any discussion. However, there may be tax breaks and/or credits available for using photovoltaic energy. The community member asked if a tax benefit, such as one for developing new energy sources, could be brought back to the community, which might make this more financially feasible for some of the interested parties. Ms. Olliges said NASA will look into what would be a win-win situation.
- A community member asked if there was any information from the interested energy companies regarding the economic benefit/loss of the photovoltaic project. Ms. Olliges said the interested companies have not shared that information with NASA.
- Mr. Seth Shostak, Space World One board member, said Space World One is interested in using the hangar. He referred to an Op-Ed article for the Mercury News he authored on 28 August 2005. Mr. Shostak provided the names of the Space World One board members and a community member asked if any of the board members live in Mountain View or have a personal connection to the hangar. Mr. Shostak said he lives in Mountain View and the board's connection to the hangar is that they want to use it. He said Space World One wants to put \$40,000 worth of exhibitions in the hangar. He noted a study estimates one million people per year would visit the museum. A community member asked what type of exhibits would be displayed. Mr. Shostak said Space World One would have no aircraft history exhibits since there are already two museums for this purpose. He expressed a willingness to work with the community and other organizations, and noted that Space World One needs \$20 million for its proposed use.
- A community member asked if the Navy would consider encapsulation of the hangar if a credible foundation contributed a significant amount of money and assumed long-term risk for the hangar,

including stormwater treatment. Mr. Weissenborn answered that the Navy is responsible for the environmental work. Ms. Olliges observed that a credible foundation with the amount of money needed to encapsulate the hangar and assume risk would have enough money to replace the siding.

- A community member asked if relative costs for each alternative would be included in the EE/CA. Mr. Weissenborn said it will provide a better estimate than is required for a Feasibility Study.
- Mr. Moss asked what the new EE/CA release date was. Mr. Weissenborn said the Navy is trying to make it available to the public in October, however, he cannot guarantee that. If the October timeline is not met, the EE/CA may be available to the public early next year.
- Mr. Strauss asked if the comment period for the EE/CA will be 30 days. Mr. Weissenborn said it would since 30 days are required. Mrs. Guerrieri said she was concerned with the public comment period falling during the holiday season and asked if that would extend the comment period. Mr. Weissenborn said if the EE/CA is made available in November, the public meeting would be in January with a default extension because of the holidays. He noted there will be about a week or two after the public meeting to comment. Mr. Strauss asked if there is some flexibility on the dates and comment period as he felt a RAB meeting should be held after the EE/CA release, but before the public meeting. Mr. Weissenborn said that a meeting similar to the Alternatives Workshop held on 18 August 2005 could be arranged and Mr. Strauss agreed this would be a good opportunity for discussion.
- Mr. Siegel said his concern is the length of time between the release of data in the EE/CA and the Action Memorandum. He said it may not provide enough time to form partnerships and gather the large amounts of additional funding needed.
- Mr. Siegel also said the Navy has mentioned before it is not authorized to spend BRAC money to rebuild the hangar and asked the basis for that assertion. His research indicates the Navy could spend cleanup money on any CERCLA remedial action, but was not sure about removal actions. Mr. Siegel gave the following examples: when underground storage tanks are removed, part of the remedial/removal action is filling the hole left in the ground; when wetlands are restored, part of the remedial/removal action is replanting the wetlands. Mr. Siegel wanted to know why the Navy was ruling out reconstruction as a valid expense under CERCLA and BRAC environmental funding for the goal of preserving the hangar. He said it may turn out that the cost of reconstruction after removing the siding might be less than the cost for demolition and disposal. If this were the case, he said the Navy would benefit by spending some of its money to reconstruct the hangar. Mr. Weissenborn said the Navy would not participate in bringing the structure up to existing building codes and compliance since it does not own the structure, but the Navy will look into the BRAC funding issue. Mr. Siegel said this is a potential area where the congressional delegation could take action to make sure interpretation of the law is clear. He said it is very hard to find new money, but perhaps the law could be interpreted to save money and all parties could work together on this.
- Mr. Moss said he sees three considerable segments for the Hangar 1 process: (1) remediation – analyzing the proposed alternative for cost effectiveness and community acceptance; (2) making the structure usable; (3) finding an organization to use it. Mr. Moss said it is possible to make organizations and agencies cooperate and use BRAC funding as seed money for other uses.
- A community member said NASA's ownership of Hangar 1 should not affect the Navy's remedial responsibility because the contamination occurred during the Navy's tenure. Cleanup should include rebuilding the hangar because it is listed on the National Register of Historic Places.
- A community member described the history of how the Navy obtained the base: \$400,000 was collected from communities in the 1930s and they invested in the property and sold it to the Navy as a community. This is the reason for the community's strong emotional tie to the site and why they want the Navy to work with them on the issue.

- A community member, Stanley Chernack, retired Naval officer representing the Lighter-than-Air Society, made a presentation to the group. He shared some Hangar 1 history and said the hangar should be used for housing airships, its initial purpose, not a museum. He said NASA should build airships to fight fires in California and be housed in the hangar.
- Mr. Siegel announced, on RAB member Kevin Woodhouse's behalf, that the Mountain View City Council will discuss Hangar 1 at their next meeting on Tuesday, 20 September, at 6:30 p.m.

RAB BUSINESS

RAB Schedule – The next meeting is scheduled for Thursday, 17 November 2005, from 7 to 9:30 p.m. at the Mountain View City Hall, Fourth Floor Gallery.

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

- Hangar 1

Adjourn - Mr. Moss adjourned the meeting at 9:30 p.m. and thanked everyone for attending.

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

Mr. Rick Weissenborn

BRAC Environmental Coordinator, former NAS Moffett Field

Department of the Navy

BRAC Program Management Office West

1455 Frazee Road, Suite 900

San Diego, CA 92108-4310

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

E-mail: richard.weissenborn@navy.mil

GLOSSARY OF TERMS USED IN THESE MINUTES

ARAR – Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirements

BCT – BRAC Cleanup Team

BRAC – Base Realignment and Closure

CERCLA – Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act

DOD – Department of Defense

EE/CA – Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis

EPA – U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

MCL – Maximum Contaminant Level

MOA – Memorandum of Agreement

MROSD – Midpeninsula Open Space District

NAS – Naval Air Station

NASA – National Aeronautics and Space Administration

NHPA – National Historic Preservation Act

NPS – National Park Service

PCBs – polychlorinated biphenyls

PPB – parts per billion

PPM – parts per million

PRP – potentially responsible party

RAB – Restoration Advisory Board

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

SHPO – State Historic Preservation Office

TCE – trichloroethene

VOC – volatile organic compound

WATS – West-Side Aquifers Treatment System

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