

**FORMER NAVAL AIR STATION MOFFETT FIELD
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING
BUILDING 943, EAGLE ROOM
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, 9 July 2009, at Building 943 in the Eagle Room at Moffett Field, California. Bob Moss, 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.

Community RAB Members in attendance:

Gabriel Diaconescu, Stewart McGee, Diane Minasian, Bob Moss, Ralph Otte, Arthur Schwartz, Jac Siegel, Lenny Siegel, Steve Sprugasci, Peter Strauss, and Dan Wallace

Regulatory Agency, City Representative, and Navy RAB Members in attendance:

Sarah Kloss (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency [EPA]), Alana Lee (EPA), Kathy Stewart (Navy), Elizabeth Wells (San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board [Water Board]), and Kevin Woodhouse (City of Mountain View Assistant to the City Manager)

Other Navy, Regulatory Agency, National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), and Consultant Representatives in attendance:

Don Chuck (NASA), Dr. Ann Clarke (NASA), Lauren Cason (Sealaska Environmental), Deborah Feng (NASA), Evrydik Fekka (Haley & Aldrich), Mark Hightower (NASA), Carolyn Hunter (Tetra Tech EM Inc.), Jenny Ledesma (CH2M HILL), Paul Kot (U.S. Army), Angie Lind (Navy), Hiro Mirua (NASA), Lili Pirbazan (NASA), George Sloup (NASA), Susan Skoe (Haley & Aldrich), and Jessica Watkins (Water Board)

Other Community Members in attendance:

Steve George (Former Naval Dependent), Robert Hobbs, Jane Horton (Save Hangar 1), Helen Hymes, Jack Nadeau (Save Hangar 1), Jeff Segall, Duncan Simmons (Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District [MROSD])

WELCOME

Ms. Stewart and Mr. Moss welcomed everyone in attendance. Mr. Moss asked those present to introduce themselves after he provided a brief overview of the agenda for the meeting. Mr. Moss said the Navy will provide an update on Site 29 (Hangar 1) and Site 27 during the meeting.

Ms. Stewart introduced herself and summarized her background. Ms. Stewart has been involved in environmental work for the Navy for 16 years and most recently served as BEC at various installations in the Southeast region of the U.S. Ms. Stewart said she appreciates the level of interest from the community in the environmental restoration (ER) of former NAS Moffett Field. Ms. Stewart looks forward to working with the RAB.

FINAL

APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

Mr. Moss asked for corrections to the 11 June 2009 meeting minutes. RAB member Lenny Siegel said the word “pint” should be changed to “point” on page 3 of the 11 June 2009 meeting minutes. Mr. Moss said that on the statement page 3, “The Navy has involved the California State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) which provided final comment pursuant to the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA),” should be prefaced with “Mr. Hill said” to make it an accurate statement.

The 11 June 2009 meeting minutes were approved as corrected. 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.

<u>#</u>	<u>DOCUMENT</u>	<u>APPROXIMATE SUBMITTAL DATE</u>
1.	Final Site 1 Landfill – 2008 Annual Groundwater Report	September 2009
2.	Final Site 22 Landfill – 2008 Annual Groundwater Report	September 2009
3.	Final Work Plan for Petroleum Sites	September 2009
4.	Draft Petroleum Site 14 Work Plan	September 2009
5.	Draft Basewide Five-Year Review	October 2009

HANGAR 1 PROGRESS UPDATE

Ms. Stewart provided an update on the Navy’s progress on Hangar 1 since the 11 June 2009 RAB meeting. Senior leadership from the Navy is engaged in developing responses to the letter submitted by Congresswoman Anna Eshoo’s office.

Ms. Stewart followed up on a question from the June 11 2009 RAB meeting concerning the “point of no return,” for the Hangar 1 contract award, i.e., the point at which the Navy would be legally bound to proceed with the removal action. Ms. Stewart stated the Navy can elect to terminate a contract at any time. However, the Navy would be obligated to reimburse the contractor for any expenses incurred, which would be determined through negotiations with the contractor.

Ms. Stewart updated the RAB on the remediation schedule for Hangar 1. Based on the current schedule, work plans will be complete in the second quarter of fiscal year 2010, and the remedial action is scheduled for completion in the second quarter of fiscal year 2012. Ms. Stewart stated that concerns exist regarding residing the hangar simultaneously with removal of the hangar siding due to cross contamination issues, and the 30 month period of performance allows time for the Navy and National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) to continue to negotiate to meet their respective obligations.

FINAL

Ms. Stewart followed up on a question from the June 11 2009 RAB meeting concerning the Hangar 1 windows. The Hangar 1 removal action contract includes an option for removal and decontamination and storage of the window panes for NASA's follow-on reuse. Further, the window frames are to be removed without damage to the structure. If they are removed intact, they are to be decontaminated and stored for NASA's follow-on reuse.

Ms. Stewart also followed up on a request from the June 11 2009 RAB meeting regarding a request for a senior-level meeting between NASA and the Navy. She stated senior Navy leadership has been engaged on the request.

- RAB member Jac Siegel said the Navy should consider the cost implications of proceeding with the Hangar 1 award and subsequently terminating the contract.
- RAB member Peter Strauss said the intent of having a plan in place for residing the hangar prior to awarding the contract was to save costs associated with demobilization and remobilization of the crews, equipment, and scaffolding during the removal action and installation of new siding.
- Mr. Moss said he has had extensive conversations with a contractor in Akron, Ohio, that considered providing an unsolicited bid to the Navy to coat the inside and the outside of Hangar 1. The contractor in Akron has a schedule and bid available that is said to be 10 percent less than what the Navy's proposed removal action would cost. The proposed coating has a minimum 10-year warranty and is estimated to cost less than \$22 million. Maintenance after the ten year warranty on the external coating would be about 10% of the initial cost of application or about \$1 to \$1.2 million, Mr. Moss explained that a potential tenant in Hangar 1 would help pay for the cost of coating the hangar within 10 years. Mr. Moss said that coating the inside and outside of Hangar 1 would speed up the ultimate goal of reusing the hangar. Mr. Moss said the Navy is concerned that the coating would not be a permanent solution and would have to be maintained over the years. However the maintenance cost could easily be covered by increasing rent for space inside Hangar 1 by less than 9 cents per square foot per month. The community has been asking the Navy to re-side Hangar 1 since 2004. Mr. Moss said Navy policy was stated as is it will clean up a site to the minimum requirement and transfer the property and future responsibility to another party. Ms. Stewart said senior management from Navy and NASA are aware of the community concerns to reuse Hangar 1 and will discuss the path forward.
- Don Chuck, NASA, said the siding of Hangar 1 leaks. During the winter, storm water will leak into the hangar and pond on the floor.
- Sarah Kloss, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), noted that the Navy applied the temporary coating to the hangar in 2003. She stated that EPA is concerned that the temporary coating is beyond its useful life.
- RAB member Arthur Schwartz said that although the lifespan of the temporary coating that the Navy installed on Hangar 1 will expire, it does not mean that contaminants will begin leaking into the soil or groundwater at the site as soon as the lifespan expires. The lifespan of 5 years for the coating is a conservative value.
- Mr. Schwartz said he has been coordinating with his brother, who is in contact with Navy Admiral Keating. Admiral Keating has discussed the Hangar 1 re-siding concerns with Admiral Vitale. Mr. Schwartz provided approximately 30 pages of documentation for Admiral Vitale to review on Hangar 1. Mr. Schwartz said he will be kept apprised of the Navy's position on re-siding the hangar from Admirals Keating and Vitale.

FINAL

- Mr. Segall said the Mountain View City Council received a briefing on 30 June 2009 regarding Hangar 1. The Mountain View City Council voted and will make every effort to save Hangar 1. The Mountain View city legal counsel is considering the possibility of issuing a civil injunction to stop the Navy's plan of removing the siding until a plan is put into place to re-side Hangar 1. Mr. Segall said the City of Mountain View has contacted the Cities of Sunnyvale and of Palo Alto to inform them of its concerns with the Navy's plan to continue with the removal action without a plan in place to re-side the hangar.
- Mr. Moss said the concerns of the City of Mountain View regarding the Navy's removal action were mentioned on the CBS morning and evening local news broadcasts that week.

SITE 27 UPDATE

Ms. Stewart provided an update on the planned Site 27 restoration work. She stated the Navy is evaluating the use of soil as a natural cover instead of the proposed geotextile liner at Site 27 based on concerns raised over the effects of additional site restoration on the western pond turtle by a RAB member. The Navy should complete the evaluation of implementing a soil barrier at Site 27 in mid-July 2009. Once the Navy has assessed implementation of a soil barrier at Site 27, it will meet with the regulatory agencies to discuss the path forward for Site 27.

- Mr. Moss asked if the geotextile material can be installed at Site 27 once the western pond turtle breeding period in June and July ends. Ms. Stewart said the concern is not only the breeding period but the inability of the western pond turtle to burrow into the geotextile material.

ER PROGRAM UPDATE

Angie Lind, Navy Lead Remedial Project Manager (RPM), provided a presentation on the Navy's ER program at former NAS Moffett Field. Ms. Lind broke the presentation into three segments, including basewide activities, Installation Restoration (IR) site updates, and a petroleum program update.

Basewide Activities: Ms. Lind said the Navy is drafting a basewide 5-year review. The draft version of the document is due to the agencies for review in October 2009. The Navy formerly conducted 5-year reviews on a site-by-site basis. Recent changes in the Department of Defense's (DoD) 5-year review policy align with EPA guidance that a 5-year review include all sites on the base. The 5-year review will be prepared by an independent party who conducts interviews, site walks, and assessments to ensure that the remedies implemented at the site are functioning as intended.

Ms. Lind said the Navy is assessing the basewide groundwater levels by conducting elevation measurements in March and November of each year. Ms. Lind said the Navy is conducting basewide groundwater sampling on an annual basis.

- Mr. Strauss asked if the Navy is assessing innovative technologies to accelerate cleanup at any of the ER sites. Ms. Lind said the Navy is constantly looking for innovative technologies to make the ER process more efficient.
- RAB member Lenny Siegel asked if the Navy's basewide 5-year review will include the former Orion Park Housing Area. Ms. Lind said the Army would be responsible for conducting a 5-year review of the former Orion Park Housing Area. EPA is working with the Army on investigating the potential source areas in the former Orion Park Housing Area.

IR Site Updates: Ms. Lind stated there were originally three landfills at former NAS Moffett Field: Sites 1, 2, and 22. The contents of Site 2 were moved and consolidated with Site 1. Site 22 remained separate. Sites 1

and 22 landfills are all capped, and Site 2 is clean closed. Site 22 covers approximately 10 acres of the northeastern portion of the golf course. The remedy at Site 22 included a biotic barrier and institutional controls.

- Mr. Strauss asked if the Navy has considered sea level rise for the landfills. Ms. Lind said the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (Water Board) brought up this concern on sea level rise at the BRAC Cleanup Team meeting. The Navy will work with the Water Board to assess sea level rise in conjunction with the Site 1 and 22 landfills.

Ms. Lind said the Navy is completing a record of decision (ROD) for Site 25. The regulatory agencies are currently reviewing the Draft Site 25 ROD. Agency comments are due back to the Navy by the end of July 2009. The Navy's goal is to issue the Draft Final Site 25 ROD in October 2009. The ROD includes the Navy's proposal to treat the lead and zinc in the sediment to stabilize it and dispose of it as nonhazardous waste. The Navy will backfill and re-vegetate Site 25 once the sediment treatment and removal action has been completed.

Ms. Lind said the Navy has completed the EHC[®] injection at Site 26 (East-side Aquifer Treatment System [EATS] area). The Navy will monitor the EHC[®] treatment by monitoring the groundwater through 2010.

She also said the Navy is determining the path forward for Site 27. The Navy has asked its contractor to assess the implementability of a soil barrier at Site 27.

Ms. Lind said the Navy is responsible for the Site 28/Building 88 area, which is within a portion of the Middlefield Ellis Whisman (MEW) groundwater plume. The Navy is working with EPA and the Water Board on a pilot test to inject EHC[®] into the MEW plume.

In addition, Ms. Lind said the Navy has received and is reviewing the proposals submitted on the removal action at Hangar 1. The Navy plans to award the removal action contract by the end of July 2009. The first 6 months of the contract will be used to prepare schedules and work plans for the removal action at Hangar 1.

- Mr. Schwartz said that it is too late to change the Navy's course of action on the removal action at Hangar 1. Mr. Schwartz was concerned that the RAB was not able to provide input on the Navy's request for proposal (RFP). Ms. Lind said the Navy followed the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) in developing and issuing the RFP for the removal action for Hangar 1.
- Mr. Moss said that EPA and NASA were not consulted before the Navy issued the RFP, which causes a gap in the environmental oversight of the removal action at Hangar 1. Ms. Lind said the Navy worked with NASA on the scope of work included in the RFP for the removal action. She added EPA was not included in development of the RFP for the removal action. The Navy included in the RFP the following evaluation factors: on how to deal with environmental releases, community relations, details on types of coatings that are proposed, and a description of past experience on similar removal actions.
- Mr. Schwartz said the Navy should have consulted with a corrosion engineer in developing the RFP for the removal action at Hangar 1. The Navy should also include a corrosion engineer on the technical review team to review the proposals on the removal action at Hangar 1.
- Ms. Kloss said the regulatory agencies will be involved with evaluating the work plans and schedules for the removal action at Hangar 1 once the Navy awards a contract. The Navy followed the government-wide standard process for preparing the RFP and awarding a contract for the removal action at Hangar 1. The Navy will be held accountable to all of the laws and standards throughout the removal action at Hangar 1.
- Mr. Schwartz said that he wants to make sure that the Navy considered all of the issues regarding Hangar 1 in the RFP.

FINAL

- Elizabeth Wells (Water Board) said the regulatory agencies and RAB will have the opportunity to review the removal action work plan once it has been developed. The Navy will review all of the comments provided on the work plan before it moves forward with the removal action at Hangar 1.
- Mr. L. Siegel said that the Navy used a performance based contract mechanism to release the RFP, which is a good way to complete the removal action at Hangar 1.

Petroleum Program: Ms. Lind said the Navy and Water Board have been working on closing petroleum program sites. Out of 131 petroleum program sites, 91 have been addressed. There are 39 sites that require remediation prior to closure.

ORION PARK UPDATE

Paul Kot, U.S. Army, provided an update on the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE) scope of work prepared for the Orion Park site. The Army is waiting for comments on the Orion Park Work Plan from the regulatory agencies. There will be follow-up investigation on the Orion Park site as required by the regulatory agencies.

- Mr. Strauss asked who is financially responsible for the cleanup of Orion Park. Mr. Kot answered that the Army's Environmental Command is financially responsible for Orion Park.
- Mr. L. Siegel said he is pleased that the Army attended the RAB meeting and provided an update on Orion Park. Mr. L. Siegel asked that the Army continue to provide the RAB updates on work at Orion Park.
- Mr. L. Siegel asked about actions if contamination from Orion Park migrates onto NASA property. Mr. Kot said that if the contamination is from Orion Park, the responsibility is the Army's Environmental Command.
- Ms. Wells said that if the state cannot identify the point of discharge and the discharger, the property owner of a contaminated site can be held accountable.
- Mr. Moss asked if the Army agrees with EPA's comment letter that discusses a barrier method to address potential vapor intrusion at Orion Park. Mr. Moss said EPA's comment letter outlines a monitoring program for Orion Park as well as the vapor barrier and vapor mitigation system. Mr. Kot said that Army is working out the details of the indoor air monitoring program and subsequent groundwater investigation for Orion Park with EPA.
- Mr. Schwartz asked if the Army has considered any of the semiconductor companies located around Orion Park as sources for the contamination. Mr. Kot clarified that the Army is looking into the sources of contamination on Orion Park. Mr. Kot indicated that the Army does not believe that a septic tank is the contamination source at Orion Park. Ms. Wells added that she does not know of any semiconductor companies upgradient of Orion Park. The Water Board and EPA are working with the Army on additional investigation activities at Orion Park.
- Ms. Lee said the MEW Site area needs to be distinguished as a Site separate from Orion Park. Mr. L. Siegel asked if the MEW Site includes the Wescoat Housing area. Ms. Lee indicated that no data has been provided to EPA linking the MEW Site as the source of shallow groundwater contamination at Orion Park. Ms. Lee confirmed that a portion of the Wescoat Housing area is part of the MEW Study Area.

REGULATORY AGENCY UPDATE

Water Board

Ms. Wells said that due to the additional furlough day, which results in a total work-time reduction of 15 percent or 3 days each month, the Navy may be asked to prioritize the NAS Moffett Field sites for the Water Board.

EPA VAPOR INTRUSION PROPOSED PLAN FOR THE MEW STUDY AREA

Ms. Lee said that EPA is holding a public meeting to accept comments on EPA's PP for the vapor intrusion pathway at the MEW Study Area on 23 July 2009 at the Mountain View City Hall. Ms. Lee said the PP was issued to the community on 9 July 2009. The public comment period is from 10 July 2009 through 9 August 2009. Ms. Lee provided an overview of EPA's proposed vapor intrusion remedy for the MEW Study Area, which includes addressing existing and future buildings overlying portions of the shallow regional VOC groundwater contamination plume. The groundwater plumes passes beneath more than 100 buildings at former NAS Moffett Field, which raises a potential vapor intrusion concern for indoor air.

- RAB member Ralph Otte asked about the depth to the groundwater table. Ms. Lee said the groundwater is between 5 and 10 feet below the surface at former NAS Moffett Field.

Ms. Lee said that over 2,800 indoor and outdoor air samples were collected between 2003 and 2008 at 47 commercial buildings and 31 residences. Several residences and commercial buildings had TCE indoor air concentrations exceeding EPA's trichloroethene (TCE) indoor air action level for long-term exposure. The MEW parties and NASA have taken interim measures to lower the TCE indoor air concentrations and developers have installed sub-slab ventilation systems to help prevent or minimize vapor intrusion into new buildings. Interim actions included sealing potential conduits, installing air purifiers in utility rooms, improving ventilation, modifying heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) systems, and installing sub-slab ventilation systems in some buildings. Confirmation indoor air samples were collected to ensure that the vapor intrusion mitigation measures were effective and the TCE concentrations were below the TCE action level.

- Mr. Strauss asked about the number of air purifiers installed. Ms. Lee said five air purifiers were installed in various utility rooms where TCE was found at elevated concentrations. Air purifiers are not a stand-alone remedy. The HVAC system also needs to be used.
- Kevin Woodhouse (City of Mountain View Assistant to the City Manager) asked if EPA's commercial building TCE action level of 5 micrograms per cubic meter ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$) was used to determine if action was necessary. Ms. Lee confirmed that EPA is currently using a TCE action level of $5 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$, but that during the Supplemental Remedial Investigation, EPA's interim TCE action level was $2.7 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$. Stan Smucker, EPA toxicologist, presented to the RAB last year the reasons for the changes in Superfund Risk Assessment guidance for the inhalation pathway. Mr. Moss asked if the vapor barrier and mitigation systems will also cover the entire footprint of the buildings. Ms. Lee confirmed the vapor barrier and mitigation systems will be installed within the entire footprint of the buildings.
- Mr. Moss asked how EPA will ensure that the HVAC systems will be used at each building. Ms. Lee clarified that individual building operations, maintenance, and monitoring plans would be developed as part of the Remedial Design phase, but that EPA is evaluating how to monitor the operations of the HVAC systems.
- Mr. Strauss asked if the HVAC systems will run 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. Ms. Lee said the HVAC systems will be used only when people are in the building, but not necessarily 24 hours, 7 days a

FINAL

week. The assumptions in the Supplemental Feasibility Study indicate the HVAC systems run about 10 hours a day.

- Lili Pirbazan, NASA, suggested the HVAC system be used in conjunction with sub-slab depressurization.
- Mr. L. Siegel said an HVAC system working in a properly sealed building presents a significant reduction of contaminants. Mr. L. Siegel said that EPA has learned a great deal about the project since the work plan was developed in 2003. Mr. L. Siegel said he appreciated the level of detail in the vapor intrusion documents.
- Ms. Lee said EPA believes the potential vapor intrusion pathway into buildings needs to be addressed now, whereas cleanup of the groundwater plume will take much longer to address. EPA will continue to assess all the existing buildings and future buildings overlying the shallow groundwater contamination. Ms. Lee invited everyone to provide comments to EPA on the PP and attend the public meeting on 23 July 2009. EPA anticipates completing the MEW Study Area ROD Amendment after considering all of the public's comments. EPA is looking forward to implement the final vapor intrusion remedy over the next few years. Ms. Lee said she is available to answer any questions on the MEW Study Area and encouraged the RAB to view EPA's MEW website: www.epa.gov/region09/MEW. Ms. Lee can be reached at 415-972-3141 or via e-mail at Lee.Alana@epa.gov.

RAB BUSINESS

Future RAB Topics

Ms. Stewart announced the next RAB meeting will be held on 10 September 2009. Ms. Stewart asked for suggestions for topics at future RAB meetings. The RAB discussed the following items as potential topics for future meetings:

- Hangar 1 Update
- Site 27 Update
- Basewide 5-Year Review Update
- Groundwater Report Update

Public Comment

Community member, Helen Hymes, provided comments on behalf of her mother, Georgina Hymes which include the following:

- The Navy should provide NASA \$63 million to reskin Hangar 1.
- NASA should not destroy any of the homes that surround former NAS Moffett Field.
- Presidential flights to the airstrip at former NAS Moffett Field should be reinstated.

RAB Schedule

The RAB meetings are held from 7 to 9:00 p.m. at Building 943 in the Eagle Room at Moffett Field, California. The upcoming 2009 RAB meetings are as follows:

- 10 September 2009

FINAL

- 12 November 2009

Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 9:45 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 94130; Phone: 415-743-4715; Fax: 415-743-4700;
E-mail: Kathryn.stewart@navy.mil

ACRONYM LIST

ACHP – Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
ACOE – Army Corps of Engineers
BEC – BRAC Environmental Coordinator
BRAC – Base Realignment and Closure
DoD – Department of Defense
EATS – East-side Aquifer Treatment System
EPA – U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
ER – Environmental Restoration
FAR – Federal Acquisition Regulation
HVAC – Heating, ventilation, and air conditioning
IR – Installation Restoration
MEW – Middlefield-Ellis-Whisman
NAS – Naval Air Station
NASA – National Aeronautics and Space Administration
NHPA - National Historic Preservation Act
PP — Proposed Plan
RAB – Restoration Advisory Board
RFP — Request for Proposal
ROD — Record of Decision
RPM – Remedial Project Manager
SHPO – California State Historic Preservation Officer
TCE – Trichloroethene
Water Board – San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board
WATS – West-side 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>