FINAL

FORMER NAVAL AIR STATION MOFFETT FIELD
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING
MOUNTAIN VIEW SENIOR CENTER
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, 13 May 2010, at the Senior Center in Mountain View, California.

Community RAB Members in attendance:
Bill Berry, Gabriel Diaconescu, Patricia Guerrieri, Stewart McGee, Diane Minasian, Bob Moss, Ralph Otte, Jac Siegel, Lenny Siegel, Peter Strauss, Dan Wallace, and Steve Williams

Regulatory Agency 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:
Don Chuck (NASA), Wilson Doctor (Navy), Deborah Feng (NASA), Valerie Harris (Navy), Mark Hightower (NASA),Carolyn Hunter (Tetra Tech EM Inc.), Daniel Leigh (The Shaw Group Inc.), Angie Lind (Navy), Lisa Lockyer (NASA), Roberto Rodriguez (EPA), George Sloup (NASA), Keith Suida (NASA), Tommie Jean Valmassy (Tetra Tech EM Inc.)

Other Community Members in attendance:
Charles Allen, Roderick Bersamina (Representative from Congresswoman Eshoo's Office), David Eller (California Preservation Foundation), Larry Ellis, Georgina Hymes, Kyota Kuwsawa, Otto Lee, Angela Liang, Jack Nadeau (Save Hangar 1), Steve Raby, Duncan Simmons (Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District [MROSD]), Terry Terman, Greg Unangst, Jim Van Pernis (Save Hangar 1), and Bill Wissell

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 7:10 p.m. and welcomed everyone in attendance. Ms. Stewart reviewed the agenda for the evening. Ms. Stewart welcomed everyone to the new location at the Mountain View Senior Center. She stated the Navy was unable to reserve NASA's Building 3 for the RAB more than a month in advance, and as such, the Senior Center would be tried out. She welcomed any comments or suggestions on the new location after the meeting. Ms. Stewart also stated that some changes had been made to the format of the meeting in response to RAB members concerns about running the meetings more efficiently and concerns about the inability to discuss other restoration work at the former NAS Moffett Field besides Hangar 1. Ms. Stewart stated that in response to these concerns, a public comment period after all presentations and RAB discussion has been added to the agenda. RAB members would have an opportunity to ask questions and engage in dialogue during the presentations, and the public would have an opportunity to comment on any of the presentations or issues at the end of the meeting. Ms. Stewart stated the Hangar 1 update had been moved to the latter part of the agenda in order to complete two presentations that had been scheduled for previous meetings.

APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

Ms. Stewart asked for corrections to the 11 March 2010 meeting minutes. The RAB voted to finalize the 11 March 2010 meeting minutes. 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 to the RAB members.

#	DOCUMENT	APPROXIMATE SUBMITTAL DATE
1.	Site 28 Draft Westside Aquifers Treatment System (WATS) Pilot Test Summary Report	May 2010
2.	Site 28 Draft WATS Treatability Study (TS) Update	May 2010
3.	Site 28 Final WATS 2009 Groundwater Annual Report	June 2010
4.	Site 25 Final Work Plan and Sampling and Analysis Plan	June 2010
5.	Site 1 Landfill Final 2009 Annual Report	July 2010
6.	Site 22 Landfill Final 2009 Annual Report	July 2010

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Ms. Stewart announced that she received a RAB application from Linda Ellis (Save Hangar 1 Committee). Ms. Ellis was unable to make the RAB meeting. Mr. Berry spoke on Ms. Ellis' behalf and stated Ms. Ellis was unable to attend because she was attending a California Historic Committee Meeting. The Save Hangar 1 Committee is receiving an award from the California Historic Committee, and the award was a testament to the hard work of Save Hangar 1. Mr. Berry said that Ms. Ellis' work on the Save Hangar 1 Committee is impressive and she would be a great addition to the RAB. The RAB voted and approved Ms. Ellis' RAB application.

RAB member Ralph Otte requested that the RAB vote to approve a community vice co-chair. Mr. Otte nominated RAB member Bob Moss as community vice co-chair. The RAB voted and approved Mr. Moss as community vice co-chair.

REGULATORY AGENCY UPDATE

Sarah Kloss (EPA) said that she will be unable to attend the 8 July 2010 RAB meeting.

Elizabeth Wells (Water Board) said that she has been working with Wilson Doctor (Navy Remedial Project Manager [RPM]) on closing groundwater monitoring wells in the petroleum program.

EPA/NAVY 5-YEAR REVIEW UPDATES

Alana Lee (EPA) began the presentation with an overview of EPA's Five-year Review process. EPA conducts a Five-year Review to evaluate whether the site remedy is or when it is complete will be protective of human health and the environment. Ms. Lee said that the 2009 Five-Year review is the second conducted on the Middlefield-Ellis-Whisman (MEW) Site, which includes portions of the former NAS Moffett Field Site.

Ms. Lee said that the Navy is the lead agency for the Navy's portion of the cleanup. EPA reviews reports and provides comments, including recommendations for follow-up actions. Ms. Lee said that EPA maintains the authority to determine protectiveness statements of all sites at former NAS Moffett Field regardless of whether the Navy is the lead agency.

Ms. Lee said that the process to conduct a Five-Year Review is to first notify the community by public notice that the process is beginning and then interview a variety of people who may have information on the site. The interviews assist in identifying issues at the site. Interviews and data review will identify if any issues exist and if the remedy continues to be protective of human health and the environment. Both short-term and long-term protectiveness are assessed. Ms. Lee then turned the presentation over to Mr. Doctor to provide an overview of the Navy's current Five-Year Review.

Mr. Doctor stated that the Navy used to conduct Five-Year Reviews for individual sites. This Five-Year Review is a comprehensive evaluation of Sites 1 (Landfill), 22 (Landfill), 26 (Eastside Aquifer Treatment System [EATS]), and Site 28 (WATS). The Navy submitted the Draft Five-Year Review on October 15, 2009. The Navy received regulatory agency comments on the Draft Five-Year Review in December 2009 and finalized the document on February 12, 2010.

Mr. Doctor said that the Navy issued the Site 1 Record of Decision (ROD) in 1997 and for Site 22 in 2002. The Site 1 and 22 remedies documented in the RODs include construction and maintenance of the landfill covers, groundwater and landfill gas monitoring, and institutional controls (ICs). The Five-Year Review concluded that the landfill remedies are currently protective of human health and the environment. The Navy is working with NASA to implement the ICs at Sites 1 and 22. NASA will need to incorporate ICs for Sites 1 and 22 into its land use planning documents.

Mr. Doctor said the Site 26 ROD was issued in 1996 and included the remedy of groundwater extraction and treatment, groundwater monitoring, and ICs. The Five-Year Review found that although EATS was turned off in 2003 to evaluate alternative groundwater cleanup technologies, the groundwater contaminant plumes are stable or decreasing. The Navy is working with NASA to implement ICs at Site 26 and currently evaluating more efficient and effective methods for groundwater cleanup. NASA will need to incorporate ICs for Site 26 into its land use planning documents.

Mr. Doctor said in 1993, the Navy adopted EPA's 1989 MEW ROD for the west-side aquifers. The remedy includes groundwater extraction and treatment, cleanup of unsaturated soil and groundwater monitoring. WATS has been operating from 1998 to present. The Navy is currently evaluating alternative treatment methods to WATS and conducting a pilot study this summer. The Five-Year Review found that the Site 28 remedy is currently protective. WATS is functioning as intended, and the groundwater contaminant plumes are stable or decreasing. A new concern with vapor intrusion is being addressed by NASA. Actions may need to be taken to address long-term protectiveness from vapor intrusion. Mr. Doctor said another challenge is treating volatile organic compounds (VOCs) in on-site and upgradient groundwater. The Navy will continue to

implement the pilot study, and ICs related to vapor intrusion at Site 28 will be incorporated into NASA Ames internal directive.

Ms. Lee said EPA recognizes that the vapor intrusion pathway has not been evaluated in all commercial buildings within the vapor intrusion study area and that buildings on Moffett Field that are currently occupied or will be occupied and have not yet been sampled will need to be sampled. EPA is working with NASA and the Navy in regards to the vapor intrusion pathway and sampling buildings. Ms. Lee said that EPA is close to finalizing the ROD Amendment for the vapor intrusion pathway. Ms. Lee said that EPA does not agree with the Navy that the remedy for Site 28 is protective of human health and the environment because the existing pump and treat remedy is not adequately addressing the vapor intrusion pathway. EPA expects the Navy and NASA to address the vapor intrusion pathway at Moffett Field.

- Mr. Berry said that he works in Building 19 at former NAS Moffett Field and asked if there is a vapor intrusion concern for all buildings basewide. Ms. Lee said that Building 19 was sampled, and no action was required for vapor intrusion. Buildings 16, N210, 15, and 20 required action to lower TCE indoor air concentrations and interim actions were implemented. Don Chuck (NASA) said that NASA is working on Buildings 107 and 126. NASA has held town hall meetings to discuss vapor intrusion with the tenants at NASA Research Park.

- RAB member Jac Siegel asked if sea level rise is being considered in the Five-Year Reviews. The creek level rise may also be a concern when there is severe weather in Mountain View. Mr. Doctor said that the Navy is considering how to address sea level rise on a program-wide basis for all of the bases it manages. A path forward has not been determined. RAB member Peter Strauss said that, regardless of whether the Navy is working on addressing sea level rise on a program-wide basis, the response does not answer the question of what is being done specifically for former NAS Moffett Field. Ms. Stewart said the Navy has been communicating with the Water Board and collecting information on determining an appropriate manner in which to address sea level rise concerns.

- Mr. J. Siegel said he is aware of a number of buildings in the area affected by vapor intrusion. Mr. J. Siegel asked if there are new criteria for vapor intrusion. RAB member Lenny Siegel said EPA proposed new trichloroethene (TCE) indoor air levels for vapor intrusion but they are currently in draft form. Mr. J. Siegel asked if vapor intrusion is also an outdoor concern. Ms. Stewart said that vapor intrusion is a concern only inside buildings. There is not a concern for vapor intrusion outdoors.

- Mr. L. Siegel said that EPA did not agree with the Navy's determination that the remedy for Site 28 is protective. Ms. Stewart stated that EPA Guidance specifically states that even if there is a need to conduct further response actions, it does not necessarily mean a remedy is not protective. Based on EPA Guidance, one of four conditions must be met in order to render a remedy not protective, and these conditions are not met at Site 28. Ms. Stewart stated that the remedy can be protective even if EPA's ROD for vapor intrusion has not been issued. NASA has been taking steps to mitigate vapor intrusion, which include vapor intrusion sampling and adjusting or retrofitting heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) systems where warranted. Ms. Stewart pointed out that NASA has not sampled unoccupied buildings or buildings slated for demolition. Ms. Lee addressed groundwater and stated that EPA, Navy, NASA, and the MEW Companies are evaluating the bigger picture for Site 28 and the regional groundwater contamination. The Site-wide Groundwater Feasibility Study will evaluate alternative cleanup technologies that can more effectively and expeditiously clean up the groundwater contamination plume. Because the source of the vapor intrusion pathway is predominantly the shallow groundwater contamination, a more expeditious and effective groundwater cleanup will also address the vapor intrusion pathway.

- Mr. Berry said that the RAB members are concerned that the Navy's position on vapor intrusion is not protective of human health. Mr. L. Siegel proposed that the RAB vote to recommend the Navy revise its protectiveness statement to indicate the remedy is currently not protective of human health and that the vapor intrusion pathway be addressed. The RAB approved the recommendation. RAB member Gabriel Diaconescu suggested that the Navy be systematic in integrating time and space in its assessment of vapor intrusion.

- Mr. Moss said that in the past some buildings had elevated levels of TCE based on EPA's proposed indoor air screening levels. Ms. Lee said that EPA has not finalized EPA's draft TCE toxicity values that Dan Stralka presented at the 11 January 2010 RAB meeting. EPA is using TCE indoor air cleanup levels of 5 micrograms per cubic meter for commercial buildings and 1 microgram per cubic meter for residential buildings for the MEW Site. Ms. Lee indicated that EPA received numerous public comments on its proposed vapor intrusion remedy (Proposed Plan) and the property/building owners were generally opposed to requiring and relying on the use of the building ventilation (e.g., HVAC) systems as the remedy to mitigate vapor intrusion. EPA expects to finalize the ROD Amendment in the next few months. EPA will inform the community by public notice and e-mail once the ROD Amendment is signed. Mr. Chuck said that NASA has mitigated vapor intrusion in Buildings 15, 16, 20 and N210 and a coating has been spread on the floor of Building 126. Mr. Moss said that EPA should recognize NASA's effort in mitigating vapor intrusion. Mr. Chuck said NASA is evaluating a long-term solution for vapor intrusion at the site. NASA will continue to host town hall meetings to update the community on vapor intrusion in NASA's buildings at former NAS Moffett Field.

ABIOTIC/BIOTIC TREATABILITY STUDY (TS) FOR SITES 26 AND 28

Dan Leigh (The Shaw Group Inc.) said the Navy is conducting a Treatability Study (TS) at Sites 26 and 28 to evaluate whether abiotic/biotic treatment will clean up the remaining VOC contamination in the groundwater. The biotic treatment utilizes hydrogen, produced by naturally occurring microorganisms consuming various injected substrates organic substrates, to reduce the relatively oxidized chlorinated compounds to non- toxic chemicals.. The abiotic process accomplishes the degradation of the VOCs in a similar process, reducing the relatively oxidized VOCS to less oxidizes and more benign compounds such as ethene and ethane. The TS was conducted within a relatively high concentration portion of the groundwater plume at Site 26. Mr. Leigh said that the EHC™ looks like mud that is injected under pressure into the ground. Following injection of the EHC™ the concentrations of chlorinated contaminants in treated areas was reduced substantially with only very low concentrations remaining. Mr. Leigh went through the chemical breakdown of TCE to ethane. Notably, there has not been a dichloroethene (DCE) stall at the site, which had occurred with similar treatment methods. Mr. Leigh said that the Navy conducted a membrane interface probe (MIP), soils borings and FLUTe™ sampling at Site 28 to evaluate whether chlorinated solvents or dense nonaqueous phase liquids (DNAPLs) are present. DNAPLs were not identified at Site 28. Once the evaluation concludes, monitoring wells will be installed and the substrate material will be injected. The Site 28 work plan was finalized in February 2010.

- Mr. Strauss asked if other chemicals reacted similar to TCE with the EHC™ injection and if any of the intermediate chemicals should be a concern if they do not degrade fully into ethane. Mr. Leigh said that some of the intermediate chemicals, such as vinyl chloride are toxic and could accumulate although the data indicate that vinyl chloride is being degraded. Many of the abiotic intermediate products, such as dichloroactylene and chloroacetylene are unstable. Mr. Strauss asked if the Navy is using both biotic and abiotic treatments in the same location. Mr. Leigh confirmed that both biotic and abiotic treatments are used together at Site 26.

- Mr. L. Siegel said that he is impressed with the results of the TS at Site 26 and hopes it is used to treat a larger area. He inquired whether any conditions may lead to rebound. Mr. Leigh said that rebound is a possibility. However, rebound does not seem to be significantly occurring at Site 26. Bacteria like to ingest the rebound material. The Navy will be monitoring for rebound throughout the TS.

- Mr. Chuck asked about next steps if the TS is not successful at Site 26 noting that the Site 26 ROD indicates that EATS is the remedy and would need to be turned back on. Valerie Harris (Navy RPM) said the Navy would evaluate the optimization of EATS in its Evaluation Report Adding wells, turning EATS back on, or considering a new technology will be discussed. Ms Lee clarified that the Navy's Site 26 Evaluation Report will need to evaluate optimization of the pump and treatment system and compare it to

HANGAR 1 UPDATE

Ms. Stewart provided an update on the status of Hangar 1. Ms. Stewart provided a history of Hangar 1 and reviewed the schedule for the removal action. The removal action work plans are in the process of being approved. The contractor is scheduled to mobilize in early June 2010, and interior abatement and demolition will be the first activities to occur. The Navy will begin removing the siding in winter 2010. The siding removal and coating will be completed in fall 2011. The confirmation samples will then be collected, and the final report will be submitted in winter 2012. The removal action will be conducted in six phases, starting in the southern portion of the hangar and ending in the northern portion because of prevailing wind direction on the site. The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) arbitration for Hangar 1 concluded in March 2010. The arbitration process concluded the Navy is responsible for the environmental cleanup at Hangar 1, and NASA is responsible for reuse and re-siding. The Navy and NASA are working together to determine the most appropriate path forward and coordinate on Hangar 1 on a daily basis. Additionally, biweekly Navy and NASA management meetings are being held. Meetings have also occurred between the Navy and NASA at the headquarters level.

Ms. Stewart then addressed public concern over deterioration, decay, and bird roosting related to the Hangar's structural frame after removal of the siding. Ms. Stewart stated an evaluation was completed of the structure, and it was determined to be in safe and structurally sound condition. Further, the removal action contractor was specifically selected based on their proposed coating, among other factors. The coating that will be used has a service life over 20 years and has been proven to work in similar marine environments, such as at the Vandenberg launch tower. As part of the contract, the contractor is also preparing a bird airstrike (BASH) mitigation plan for the hangar that will include both temporary and permanent mitigation measures.

Ms. Stewart stated biological concerns also exist that the Navy is addressing. The Navy is working in compliance with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, and the contractor completed a biological survey of the Hangar. One active Raven's nest was found, and the contractor will be avoiding the nest until the eggs hatch and fledglings leave the nest. Other inactive nests were removed. A pair of burrowing owls has also been found outside the south end of the Hangar in the grassy area, and the contractor has moved the construction fence line and will be utilizing a biological monitor to assess and avoid any potential impacts to the owls.

Ms. Stewart stated the removal action contract allows for decontamination and turn over to NASA of items within the Hangar. NASA is the decision-maker regarding the items to be decontaminated and has provided the Navy a list of desired items in priority order. Ms. Stewart said that the Navy allotted $75,000 within the removal action contract for decontamination of interior items, and any costs above $75,000 would be paid for by NASA. Ms. Stewart pointed out some of the items on the list, including window panels, a mural, the Coast Guard bell, and the Civil Engineering plaque.

- RAB member Steve Williams asked whether signs of failure in the temporary coating on the Hangar are resulting in an increase in the contaminants in the sediment basin. Ms. Stewart said the Navy tasked the removal action contractor with assessing the condition of the coating based on RAB member requests at the March 2010 RAB meeting. The contractor found areas of delaminated coating on the black mansard roofing and siding as well as areas of chipping and peeling on the lower silver part of the Hangar. Increased wear is observed at the top black mansard portions, where the concentrations of polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) are lower (119 parts per million [ppm]) than concentrations found on the silver siding areas (36,000 ppm).

- Community member David Eller said that he was on site and looked for spots on the hangar that were deteriorating. He did not see as many spots that need immediate attention, as the Navy is claiming. He believes the RAB needs to continue to fight to keep the hangar intact until a reuse plan is determined.

HANGAR 1 SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

Mr. L. Siegel said that he hosted a subcommittee meeting to discuss Hangar 1. Currently, NASA does not have funding for reuse of the hangar. NASA said that the hangar structure may be bare for some time until a reuse is determined.

Mr. Strauss described the materials that make up the hangar siding as metal covered with horsehair felt material that was injected with Aroclor 1260 and 1268. The hangar has a drainage system that conveys stormwater 0.5 mile into the stormwater retention pond. PCBs were found in the settling basin for the stormwater retention pond and in the storm drains around Hangar 1. The runoff water from the hangar has PCBs. Some delamination on the roof of the hangar has occurred. The samples from the roof, window putty, dust, and indoor air show Aroclor 1260 and 1268 are present. Because PCBs are present in Hangar 1, other buildings on the base may also contain PCBs that contribute to the high levels in the settling basin.

Mr. Strauss said that if a way to remove the original and re-side the hangar at once existed, $394,000 could be saved in mobilization costs. The Navy could delay the removal action for some time, perhaps a year but not more, to provide time for determining a reuse plan and acquiring funding.

- Mr. Chuck said that NASA already conducted a PCB removal action in upland areas to remediate potential PCB sources to the settling basin and stormwater retention pond. The Navy is completing its upland PCB sources removal action. Mr. Otte asked where the information on NASA's PCB removal action could be found. Mr. Chuck replied the document was released several years ago.

- Mr. Siegel said that Ms. Ellis is working on a list of historical items to preserve from inside the hangar and that the list can be issued to the RAB for its input at the next meeting. Ms. Ellis needs questions addressed to complete her list:

    1. Is $75,000 an estimate and does any flexibility exists in that budget? Ms. Stewart responded that any funds above the $75,000 will need to be provided by NASA. Deborah Feng (NASA) said that NASA does not have a budget for decontamination of historical items in the hangar.

    2. Is there a building at NASA Ames where items could be stored? The Moffett Historical Museum stated they limited requests for items from the hangar due to limited storage space available. Mr. L. Siegel said that local veterans are concerned that historical items will not be preserved as a result of budget or space limitations. Ms. Feng stated that if there are items that need to be housed in a building on base, NASA can find an area to accommodate them.

- Mr. Berry said there are interior buildings inside the Hangar and asked about plans for these buildings. Ms. Lind said that the buildings inside the Hangar were built in the 1950s. The terra cotta walls of the buildings are also contaminated with PCBs and will be removed. All that will be left after the removal action will be the steel superstructure and six concrete vaults. A section of the cork room will also be preserved.

- Mr. L. Siegel asked for additional time at the 8 July 2010 RAB meeting to discuss the historical items list. Ms. Stewart stated that NASA had already provided a list of items to be decontaminated to the Navy, and NASA had been requested to provide any changes to the Navy by 15 May 2010 due to the upcoming mobilization in order to avoid impacts to the schedule. Mr. L. Siegel said that he is concerned that a budget may stand in the way of preserving historical items. The RAB has not had an opportunity to review the list before it was finalized. The RAB needs time to provide input on the historical items. The schedule should be delayed to make sure that all of the artifacts that should be preserved are addressed before the action moves forward. Mr. Berry asked if there is a contingency fund in the contract. Ms. Stewart said that there is no contingency fund in the contract. Mr. L. Siegel requested that NASA's list be provided to the Hangar 1 subcommittee as soon as possible. Ms. Stewart stated the Navy's understanding was that NASA had been working with the subcommittee on the list, and that she would provide the list as soon as possible.

- Mr. Williams said that he is concerned with demolition beginning in June 2010 because artifacts may be destroyed before input is obtained on the list of historical items to be preserved.

- Mr. L. Siegel said the next Hangar 1 subcommittee meeting has not been scheduled. He will inform the RAB once a date and time are selected for the next Hangar 1 subcommittee meeting.

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

Ms. Stewart opened the meeting for questions or comments from the members of the public.

- A community member asked about the color of the new coating on the hangar. Ms. Stewart said the new coating will be a color similar to the existing color on the current structure. This was one of the historical mitigation measures selected to mitigate effects of the removal action on the Hangar.

- A community member asked if there is public access to the inside of the hangar if a historian wants to make sure that no artifacts will be destroyed during the removal action. Ms. Stewart said the hangar is a construction zone and an environmental cleanup site; therefore, no public access to the site is possible.

- A community member said that an outside party needs to oversee the work because the Navy does not care whether historical items are destroyed. Ms. Stewart said the Navy will work with NASA and the Hangar 1 subcommittee to ensure the public's concerns are addressed. Ms. Lind said that NASA has a historic preservation expert who has been working closely with the Navy throughout the process. If questions arise, the NASA historic preservation expert will be consulted throughout the removal action.

- Mr. Williams asked if NASA's historical preservation expert will be on site during the removal action. Ms. Lind said that the historical preservation expert has been invited to be involved during the removal action. If a question arises, the Navy will contact the expert immediately.

- A community member said that Ron Blackman is producing a 1-hour special on Hangar 1 that will air on KQED in about 6 months. The Navy, NASA, and EPA should contact Mr. Blackman to provide views on the hangar.

- A community member agreed that an independent reviewer should participate during the removal action to oversee preservation of historical items in the hangar. This commenter asked whether the Navy has designated operations and maintenance (O&M) funds once the coating is applied to the hangar. Ms. Stewart said the Navy has funds for O&M for Hangar 1.

- Mr. Eller said that he is concerned about the hangar and the PCB runoff in stormwater. Mr. Eller said he spoke with the Santa Clara Valley Water District representative who used to regularly attend the RAB meetings. The Santa Clara Valley Water District is concerned that the stormwater is not properly addressed. Mr. Eller spoke with Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory and a granulated carbon fiber filtration system can be installed to treat stormwater runoff from the hangar. He said the Navy and EPA want to "wash their hands" of this project and move on. Mr. Eller stated that the RAB should not accept the Navy's selected action for remediation of the Hangar. Mr. Eller said that he went on to former NAS Moffett Field and spoke with the Navy's contractor for the removal action at Hangar 1. Mr. Eller said that he does not agree that the Navy will continue to provide O&M at Hangar 1. If a granulated carbon fiber filtration system is installed, the stormwater will not be a concern.

- Community member Georgina Hymes said that the Navy's promises have not been met since former NAS Moffett Field was closed. There are billions of dollars being sent from the U.S. for war efforts that should be used to keep bases open in California. Former NAS Moffett Field should be saved as a military base. The University of California should find another place in the area to rent.

Ms. Stewart said that community member J.V. McCarthy sent a public comment to be read at the RAB meeting since he was unable to attend:

> "Since my statement at the last RAB meeting (11 March 2010, minutes page # 5)* was published as incomplete and distorted, this statement will suffice. The continued value of Hangar 1 as an industrially designed facility would seem most appropriate as a research and development asset. Not only could there be need for long term mega shelter space accessible to NASA related programs and activity, access could be to emergency programs.* Given the historic reality that NASA has been subject to a continual stream of changes for programs and funds, the existing facility assets become all the more important for its basic missions.* If events of public assembly and notoriety are allowed to displace the importance of basic missions, the future of NASA could be further in doubt. Coming research proposed for automation systems, robotics, environments, life support, construction, and hazards would seem more than an abundant source of mega shelter facility requirements sufficient to fund reuse. My demonstrated interest in Hangar 1 reuse is since 1993, as a veteran of 129 ARG and a UCSC student." - J.V. McCarthy (USAR Retired)

Future RAB Topics

Ms. Stewart announced the next RAB meeting will be held on 8 July 2010. The RAB discussed the following items as potential topics for future meetings:

- Hangar 1 Removal Action Update
    - RAB Hangar 1 Subcommittee Update
- EPA Vapor Intrusion Study Update

RAB Schedule

The RAB meetings are held from 7:00 to 9:00 p.m. tentatively at the Mountain View Senior Center.

Tentatively scheduled RAB meetings for 2010 are:

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

Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 9:40 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

AMEC – AMEC Earth and Environmental
ARG – Air Rescue Group
BASH - Bird Airstrike Mitigation Plan
BEC – BRAC Environmental Coordinator
BRAC – Base Realignment and Closure
DCE – Dichloroethane
EATS – Eastside Aquifer Treatment System
EPA – U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
HVAC – Heating, Ventilation, and Air Conditioning
IC – Institutional Control
MEW – Middlefield-Ellis-Whisman
MIP – Membrane Interface Probe
MROSD – Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District
NAS – Naval Air Station
NASA – National Aeronautics and Space Administration
OMB – Office of Management and Budget
O&M – Operations and Maintenance
PCB – Polychlorinated Biphenyl
PMO – Program Management Office
PPM – Parts Per Million
RAB – Restoration Advisory Board
ROD – Record of Decision
RPM –Remedial Project Manager
TCE – Trichloroethene
TS – Treatability Study
UCSC – University of California, Santa Cruz
USAR – U.S. Army Reserve
VOC – Volatile Organic Compound
Water Board – San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board
WATS – Westside Aquifers Treatment System

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