

These meeting minutes have been approved as corrected. Please see corrections on page 4.

**FORMER NAVAL AIR STATION MOFFETT FIELD  
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD  
BUILDING 943, WORLD 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, 12 July 2007, at Building 943, World Room, Moffett Field, California. Mr. Bob Moss, RAB community co-chair, opened the meeting at 7:10 p.m.

**WELCOME**

Mr. Moss introduced himself, welcomed everyone in attendance, and 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
12	3	2	2	2	30

**AGENDA REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Mr. Moss reviewed the meeting agenda and provided the following changes: (1) At the 10 May 2007 RAB meeting, the RAB requested that a letter of appreciation be presented to Dr. James McClure for his service on the RAB. Mr. Moss said Dr. McClure is not present at tonight's meeting, but he will be invited to the next meeting to receive the letter of appreciation. (2) The RAB has been interested in the U.S. Army's development at Orion Park. Mr. Moss will provide an update at tonight's meeting.

Mr. Moss asked for a round of self introductions. Mr. Darren Newton, Navy Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Environmental Coordinator (BEC), introduced himself and explained he has replaced Mr. Rick Weissenborn as the BEC for the Moffett Field and Concord projects.

Mr. Moss asked for corrections to the 10 May 2007 meeting minutes. RAB member Mr. Lenny Siegel said that in the discussion of requesting a letter of appreciation for Dr. McClure, the RAB had also requested that Mr. Weissenborn be recognized for his service to the RAB. The 10 May 2007 meeting minutes have been corrected as follows:

- Page 8, RAB Related Announcements: To honor Dr. McClure's and Mr. Weissenborn's service on the RAB, Mr. L. Siegel moved to commend Dr. McClure and Mr. Weissenborn for their service and present a certificate of appreciation at the next RAB meeting. Mr. Schwartz seconded the motion. A certificate of appreciation will be presented to Dr. McClure and Mr. Weissenborn; Mr. Moss will email the text for the certificate.

Mr. Moss provided clarifications for two comments that followed the Site 25 presentation. The 10 May 2007 meeting minutes have been corrected as follows:

- Page 5, bullet 3: Mr. Moss asked who would pay for preventing intermixing of the water from the two sites if MROSD converted the site to tidal marsh and the Navy still wanted to have the site retained as a wetland or other water source. Mr. Gromko replied this would be the responsibility of the property owners (NASA or MROSD).

*These meeting minutes have been approved as corrected. Please see corrections on page 4.*

- Page 5, bullet 4: Mr. Don Chuck, NASA, said the Army Corps of Engineers and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service are looking at constructing a levy to separate the two properties for tidal restoration.

The 10 May 2007 RAB meeting minutes were approved as corrected. Corrected meeting minutes are posted on the project Web site at [www.bracpmo.navy.mil/bracbases/california/moffett/rab\\_mm.aspx](http://www.bracpmo.navy.mil/bracbases/california/moffett/rab_mm.aspx).

#### **ANNOUNCEMENTS/REVIEW OF ACTION ITEMS**

- Site Status Update. Mr. Newton said a current site status update handout is available and can be found at the reception table.
- Letter of Appreciation for Dr. McClure. Mr. Moss displayed a copy of the letter of appreciation for Dr. McClure and read the letter aloud. Dr. McClure will be invited to the next RAB meeting to formally receive the letter of appreciation.
- Army's EA and FONSI. Mr. Moss announced the availability of the Environmental Assessment (EA) and Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) for the Army's proposed Armed Forces Reserve Center on Orion Park. Mr. Moss read aloud some of the Army's plans for the site and said the EA and FONSI are available for review at the Mountain View Public Library. Mr. Moss said the deadline for public comments is 12 Aug 2007.

Mr. Siegel said the plume of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) at Orion Park is a concern for the project. Mr. Siegel also observed that a positive aspect of the project is that the peak use of the facilities occurs on the weekends, which will help mitigate traffic issues. Mr. Moss said that it should be noted that the document does not explicitly state the number of employees that will be present on the weekends or weekdays.

RAB member Mr. Arthur Schwartz asked if it was possible to request that a copy of all documents from various organizations be available at the Sunnyvale Public Library. Mr. Moss said that traditionally all documents have been placed at the Mountain View Public Library and the decision to send documents to the Sunnyvale library would need to be on an organization-by-organization basis. After some discussion, it was concluded that Mr. Schwartz would ask the Sunnyvale library if it would be able to house the documents and will provide an update at the next RAB meeting.

- Contact Information. Mr. Newton provided project contact information for the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (Water Board), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), and local planning commissions.
- Hangar 1. Mr. Newton said a Hangar 1 update will be provided at each RAB meeting. Currently, the revised Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis (EE/CA) is being prepared. The Navy has been working with the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) during the development of the revised EE/CA. The revised EE/CA, expected to be available for public review in fall 2007, will evaluate 13 alternatives and their associated costs.

Mr. Siegel asked if the revised EE/CA will be available to the public before or after the 08 Nov 2007 RAB meeting. Mr. Scott Gromko, Navy remedial project manager, said the release date is uncertain at this time.

RAB member Mr. Kevin Woodhouse asked how long the public review and comment period would be. Mr. Gromko said the public will have the standard 30-day period to review the document and provide comments to the Navy; however, the public review for the EE/CA issued in May 2006 was granted a 15-day extension to the standard 30-day review period. In reply to Mr. Woodhouse, Mr. Gromko said the Navy will take into account the holiday season when scheduling the public review period.

These meeting minutes have been approved as corrected. Please see corrections on page 4.

**DOCUMENTS FOR REVIEW**

Documents are available in CD-ROM format. Sign-up sheets for the documents listed below were circulated during the meeting:

#	DOCUMENT	APPROXIMATE SUBMITTAL DATE
1.	Draft East-Side Aquifer Treatment System Evaluation Report	June 2007
2.	Final Work Plan for Additional Fuel System Components at Building 29	July 2007
3.	Draft Work Plan for Site 14 South	July 2007
4.	Final Former Building 88 Investigation Report	July 2007
5.	Draft Phase III Basewide Tank Closure Further Assessment Sites Report	July 2007
6.	Draft Site 1 Landfill 5-Year Review Report	July 2007
7.	Draft Work Plan for Building 55 Sump Area	August 2007
8.	Final 2006 Site 1 Landfill Annual Report	August 2007
9.	Final Groundwater Monitoring Well Installation and Sampling Report Orion Park Housing Area	August 2007
10.	Draft 2006 Annual Groundwater Report for WATS and EATS	August 2007
11.	Draft Site 27 Remedial Action Report	September 2007
12.	Site 29 (Hangar 1) Action Memorandum	TBD

**REGULATORY UPDATE**

Ms. Elizabeth Wells of the Water Board provided an update on recent Water Board activities:

- The Water Board provided comments on the 2006 Site 1 Landfill Annual Report.
- The Water Board participated in conference calls with the Navy to discuss responses to comments on the Draft 2006 Site 22 Landfill Annual Report and Site 25 Draft Final Addendum to the Revised Final Station-Wide Feasibility Study.
- The Water Board reviewed responses to comments on the Draft Work Plan for the fuel components pipeline near Building 29. The Water Board is moving forward to close open petroleum sites.

There were no questions following the Water Board update.

Ms. Yvonne Fong of EPA provided an update on recent EPA activities.

- The EPA participated in a conference call with the Navy to review EPA comments on the Site 25 Draft Final Addendum to the Revised Final Station-Wide Feasibility Study. Among the comments the Navy will address in the final document are editing the document to improve labeling for image clarity and adding more detailed explanations for how areas were selected for cleanup.
- EPA’s Technical Assistance Grant (TAG) will be awarded soon to the Pacific Institute.

There were no questions following the EPA update.

**EAST-SIDE AQUIFER TREATMENT SYSTEM EVALUATION REPORT AND STATUS**

Mr. Newton made a presentation on the East-Side Aquifer Treatment System (EATS) evaluation report and status. The presentation included information on the site background; evaluation objectives for Phase I and Phase II of the Work Plan; results, conclusions, and recommendations of the evaluation; and the upcoming

schedule. The Navy submitted a draft completion report in June 2007 and the final completion report is scheduled for fall/winter 2007.

Summary:

- ~~1,2-dichloroethylene (DCE)~~ remained below the Record of Decision (ROD) cleanup goal of 0.5 micrograms per liter ( $\mu\text{g/L}$ ), except at two wells.
- 1,1-DCE remained below the ROD cleanup goal of 6  $\mu\text{g/L}$ , except at one well.
- Other contaminants of concern (COCs) were generally at low concentrations.
- Natural attenuation is taking place; native bacteria for dechlorination are present.
- Hydrogen Release Compound® (HRC) reduced total VOC concentrations to less than 50  $\mu\text{g/L}$  in pilot test areas. HRC was not effective when concentrations of total VOCs were less than 50  $\mu\text{g/L}$ .

Deleted: 1,2-dichloroethylene (DCA)

Deleted: dichloroethylene (

Deleted: )

Conclusions:

- Very low VOC concentrations are remaining.
- There is no VOC rebound.
- The VOC plume is stable.
- There is low potential risk.

Recommendations:

Based on the plume stability, no contaminant rebound and low potential risk, the Navy recommends that EATS remain turned off and on standby. The Navy also recommends Monitored Natural Attenuation (MNA) implementation for completing groundwater remediation at the site.

Following are questions about the presentation.

- A community member asked for clarification on the conclusion that HRC was not effective when concentrations of VOCs were less than 50  $\mu\text{g/L}$ . The community member said that the graph displayed for Well 7-10, Within Plume Stability-1 Area, contradicts this; the contamination concentrations are shown to be below 40  $\mu\text{g/L}$ . Mr. Newton explained that the concentration figures are for the total VOC mass number. The community member said that the degradation of contaminants is a net benefit. Mr. Newton agreed; however the degradation of total VOCs does not decrease below 50  $\mu\text{g/L}$ .
- A community member asked whether the HRC injections were widespread across the site. Mr. Newton said the injections were done over two "hot spots." The community member asked whether the contamination would have decreased more if the injections were done more widely throughout the site. Mr. Newton said he did not know.
- A community member asked if it was possible to inject steam into one well site at a time and pump from the other wells if the EATS system was running. The community member said that steam would provide a higher volatility, and although the plume is stable now, the steam injections would probably bring more material to the surface. Mr. Newton said the ROD signed in 1996 was for groundwater pump and treat and that the Navy would look into steam injection as part of the EATS evaluation.
- Mr. Siegel said he was in support of the Navy's plan when the Navy first announced it was going to shut down the pump and treat system and conduct the pilot test. However, he expressed disappointment because he believes the pilot test, or nutrient enhancement, worked – it accelerated the degradation of VOCs – and now the Navy doesn't want to do the nutrient enhancement. Mr. Siegel stated there is strong evidence that the injections worked, so the Navy's conclusion to go to natural attenuation is not supported. He also asked why he didn't see any comparison in timeframe of using natural attenuation versus injections in the

evaluation report. Mr. Siegel said that if the Navy chooses natural attenuation, it must show that natural attenuation is equal to, or more timely than, the other alternatives. Mr. Siegel does not feel the Navy's work justifies the conclusions. He also said the graphs in the report provide no evidence that monitored natural attenuation would decrease vinyl chloride, which has been shown to be just as toxic as trichloroethylene (TCE). Mr. Siegel will be providing these comments in written form to the Navy.

- A community member asked whether the Navy uses different microbes. Mr. Newton said there are naturally occurring microbes. The Navy is simply adding natural nutrients to enhance the microbes.

Mr. Newton concluded the presentation.

## **SITE 27 REMEDIAL ACTION COMPLETION REPORT**

Mr. Gromko made a presentation on the Site 27 Remedial Action Completion Report. The presentation included an overview of the site background, recently completed actions, upcoming actions, the Remedial Action Completion Report, and the project schedule.

Recently Completed Actions: Recently completed actions include a property survey and the re-asphalting of some roads on Moffett Field that were used by the construction trucks. The re-asphalting resulted in an overall improvement of the roads.

Upcoming Actions: Upcoming project actions include hydro-seeding areas of the Northern Channel where the initial hydro-seeding did not germinate. The Navy looked at different irrigation options and may use a water truck since it is more cost effective.

Remedial Action Completion Report: The Remedial Action Completion Report will describe activities of the remedial action, such as pre-construction, construction, and demobilization activities; biological mitigation; and waste management; site restoration; as well as include as-built drawings. The draft Remedial Action Completion Report is scheduled for completion September 2007. The Navy is expected to respond to comments in November 2007 and the draft final document will be available in December 2007. The final document and site close out is scheduled for January 2008. The Navy is recommending the site closed and available for unrestricted reuse.

The following questions followed the presentation.

- A community member asked whether the vegetation would take over the Channel. Mr. Gromko said it would not because the Channel is about seven to 10 feet deep. During construction, the crews removed about five feet of sediment, so the Channel is deeper now than it was before remediation. He also commented that because the mustard plant is an opportunistic species, it may start growing on the bank.
- Mr. Woodhouse asked for an update on the western pond turtles. Mr. Gromko said the turtles are still in the golf course pond and will be transferred back to the Channel once the vegetation has grown in since the vegetation provides protection against predators. A pump moves water into the golf course pond to control the water level for the turtles.
- A community member asked when the Navy will be hydro-seeding again. Mr. Gromko said the hydro-seeding will most likely occur within the next two weeks. Approximately 7,000 linear feet need to be hydroseeded again, which takes two to three days to complete. Mr. Gromko said the watering schedule will be every day for the first four weeks and then will decrease to three or four times per week. A hose will be set up to lightly spray the seeds with water so as not to flush the seeds down the embankment.
- A community member said the Navy should remove the dead grass first before replanting the seeds. Mr. Gromko briefly explained the process of hydro-seeding.
- A community member asked whether the U.S. Geological Survey is involved with the Site 27 remediation. Mr. Gromko said he has not worked with them. Mr. Newton said he believes they are not part of the

*These meeting minutes have been approved as corrected. Please see corrections on page 4.*

environmental program. RAB member Ms. Libby Lucas asked Mr. Don Chuck of NASA whether the U.S. Geological Survey has worked with NASA. Mr. Chuck said the U.S. Geological Survey generally does not work with Moffett Field. They have, however, evaluated the Site 25 storm water retention pond.

Mr. Gromko concluded the presentation.

## **MEETING EVALUATION AND TOPIC SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE MEETINGS**

### **Meeting Evaluation**

Mr. Newton asked for evaluations of the meeting. No comments were provided.

**RAB Schedule** - The next meeting is scheduled for Thursday, 13 Sept 2007, from 7 to 9:30 p.m., at Building 943, World Room, Moffett Field, CA.

The RAB meeting schedule for the remainder of 2007 is as follows:

- 13 Sept 2007
- 08 Nov 2007

**Future RAB Topics** – The following topics were identified as potential agenda items:

- Army presentation on Orion Park.
  - There was a discussion about whether the RAB meeting is the appropriate forum for land reuse issues. Mr. Newton observed that although the reuse of the land is not directly related to the Moffett Field environmental program, he will ask the Army if they are willing to present about Orion Park at an upcoming RAB meeting.
- Map/handout or brief presentation discussing Site 27 property lines.
  - In response to Ms. Lucas, Mr. Gromko said Cargill owns most of the land and Lockheed Martin and the Santa Clara Valley Water District own small portions of the land. The Navy is responsible for cleaning the contamination regardless of the property lines. Mr. Gromko said property access agreements were obtained prior to any remediation activities. Ms. Lucas requested handouts of the Site 27 property lines. Mr. Newton suggested including this information on one of the poster board maps of Moffett Field.
- Site 27 update.
- Presentation on the schedule and plans for the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) restoration of the tidal marsh that is adjacent to Moffett Field, near Site 25.
  - Mr. Gromko said the Navy has been in contact with USFWS. The Navy is not aware of their schedule or whether Site 25 is part of their plans.
  - Ms. Ann Clarke of NASA said there are two environmental reviews, which can be confused: one from USFWS and one from the Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE), which is a feasibility study on the levies. Mr. Duncan Simmons, assistant general counsel to the Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District (MROSD) said Site 25 is outside the study area of ACOE planning.
  - Mr. Woodhouse said the review period for Phase 1 of the South Bay Salt Pond Restoration Project is now closed. Phase 1 is relevant to Moffett Field because it includes an extension of the bay trail onto Moffett Field property. The South Bay Salt Pond Restoration Project Web site is a good resource for more information. Mr. Woodhouse said there are no actions to extend the bay trail in the near future. Activities would most likely not start until next year.

*These meeting minutes have been approved as corrected. Please see corrections on page 4.*

**Adjourn** – The meeting was adjourned at 8:35 p.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

**GLOSSARY OF TERMS USED IN THESE MINUTES**

ACHP – Advisory Council on Historic Preservation

ACOE – Army Corps of Engineers

BRAC – Base Realignment and Closure

COC – Contaminant of concern

DCA – Dichloroacetylene

DCE – Dichloroethylene

EA – Environmental Assessment

EATS – East-Side Aquifer Treatment System

EE/CA – Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis

EPA – U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

FONSI – Finding of No Significant Impact

HRC – Hydrogen Release Compound®

µ/L – Microgram/Liter

MNA – Monitored Natural Attenuation

MROSD – Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District

NAS – Naval Air Station

NASA – National Aeronautics and Space Administration

RAB – Restoration Advisory Board

ROD – Record of Decision

SHPO – State Historic Preservation Office

TAG – Technical Assistance Grant

TBD – To be determined

TCE – Trichloroethylene

USFWS – U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

VOC – Volatile organic compound

Water Board – San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board

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