

DRAFT

**FORMER NAVAL AIR STATION MOFFETT FIELD
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING
MOUNTAIN VIEW SENIOR CENTER
MOUNTIAN VIEW, 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 January 2011, at the Senior Center in Mountain View, California.

Community RAB Members in attendance:

Bill Berry, Gabriel Diaconescu, Linda Ellis, Libby Lucas, Stewart McGee, Diane Minasian, Bob Moss, Ralph Otte, Arthur Schwartz, Lenny Siegel, Steve Sprugasci, Peter Strauss, Dan Wallace, and Steve Williams

Regulatory Agency and Navy RAB Members in attendance:

Scott Anderson (Navy), Alana Lee (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency [EPA]), Sarah Kloss (EPA), Penny Reddy (EPA), and Elizabeth Wells (San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board [Water Board])

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

Lauren Cason (Sealaska Environmental), Don Chuck (NASA), Dr. Ann Clarke (NASA), Deborah Feng (NASA), Gaelle Glickfield (Army Reserves), Mark T. Hightower (NASA), Carolyn Hunter (Tetra Tech EMI), John Inks (City of Mountain View), Angie Lind (Navy), Gary Martin (NASA), George Sloup (NASA), Mike Schulz (AMEC Earth and Environmental [AMEC]), Keith Siuda (NASA), and Kevin Woodhouse (City of Mountain View)

Other Community Members in attendance:

Charles Allen, Roderick Bersamina (representative from Congresswoman Anna Eshoo's Office), Beth Bunnenberg (Save Hangar 1), Truman Cross (Oakland Cloud Dusters), Larry Ellis (Save Hangar 1), Jennifer Gates (California Preservation Foundation), Carl Honaker (Save Hangar 1), Georgina Hymes, Mike Makinen (Palo Alto Historic Board), Jack Nadeau (Save Hangar 1), Marty Rawson, Amalie Sinclair (Space for Progress), Tammy Skoog (Lockheed Martin), Robert Strena (U.S. Army Retired), Terry Terman (League of Women Voters), Greg Unonast, Jim Van Pernis (Save Hangar 1)

WELCOME

Bill Berry (RAB community co-chair) and Scott Anderson (U.S. Navy Base Realignment and Closure [BRAC] Environmental Coordinator) opened the meeting at 7:00 p.m. and welcomed everyone in attendance. Mr. Berry reviewed the agenda and noted the agenda is full. In addition to the scheduled items on the agenda, there will be RAB community co-chair and vice co-chair elections.

COMMUNITY CO-CHAIR AND VICE CO-CHAIR ELECTIONS

Mr. Anderson opened the floor to the RAB members to nominate community co-chair and vice co-chairs. Mr. Berry was nominated for community RAB community co-chair, and RAB member Bob Moss was nominated as vice co-chair. The RAB voted and approved Mr. Berry as the 2011 community RAB co-chair and Mr. Moss as the 2011 community RAB vice co-chair.

APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

Mr. Anderson asked for corrections/comments to the 18 November 2010 meeting minutes. The RAB voted to finalize the November 18, 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>.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Berry said that he has been monitoring the progress of the possibility that former NAS Moffett Field would become the site for the 2020 World's Fair. The decision to submit a proposal for the Bay Area as the site of the 2020 World's Fair will be made in February 2011. Currently, an economic study is being prepared to see if it is feasible for the Bay Area to host the 2020 World's Fair. There will be many infrastructure and transportation improvements necessary to host the number of people expected to attend the 2020 World's Fair. Other cities interested in hosting include Houston, Texas, and Minneapolis, Minnesota. In addition, Thailand, Moscow, and Turkey have expressed interest. Letters of intent will be submitted in May and June 2011, which kicks off the proposal and selection process for the 2020 World's Fair. Mr. Berry will update the RAB as information is available.

- RAB member Lenny Siegel asked if there will be an environmental review of the impacts of the 2020 World's Fair to the Bay Area before a proposal is submitted. Mr. Berry said that he is unsure if there will be a California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) determination before the proposal is submitted. Mr. Siegel said that a National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) determination will also have to be issued. Mr. Berry said there has been an effort to rally the major corporations in the area to support the 2020 World's Fair. There are generally more than 100,000 visitors each day at the World's Fair.

NASA UPDATE

Lewis Braxton (NASA) said that Congresswoman Anna Eshoo's earmark for \$10 million was not approved for the re-siding of Hangar 1. NASA is committed to find \$20 million but this challenge will be extremely difficult because it may not be considered a cost-effective way to spend NASA funds. NASA has received direction from NASA headquarters to cut its budgets. Mr. Braxton announced that he has been asked to support NASA for a 1-year term in Washington D.C. .

Dr. Ann Clarke (NASA) said there will be a NASA Ames symposium called Developing a Climate Change Adaptation Strategy on February 4, 2011 from 8:00 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. that is open to the public. Dr. Clarke invited the RAB members to attend the symposium.

REGULATORY AGENCY UPDATE

San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (Water Board)

Elizabeth Wells (Water Board) provided an update on Water Board activities for Former NAS Moffett Field. Ms. Wells said that the San Francisco Estuary Institute and Water Board work collectively to collect samples from San Francisco Bay under the Regional Monitoring Program. The monitoring results are available for review in *The Pulse of the Estuary 2010*. The document can be found electronically at www.sfei.org.

The monitoring results are provided during a meeting at hosted by the San Francisco Estuary Institute in October, which is open to the public. Ms. Wells said that based on data presented in *The Pulse of the Estuary 2010* the monitoring results for the bay near former NAS Moffett Field show that levels of polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) are not decreasing.

- Mr. Siegel asked if water in the storm drains from former NAS Moffett Field is treated before it enters the bay. Ms. Wells said that storm water is addressed through best management practices; sewage

treatment plants that the overflow from the stormwater drains is addressed under the sewage treatment system's applicable permits.

- RAB member Steve Williams said that the focus should be on runoff from large construction projects instead of stormwater runoff. Ms. Wells said that the municipalities are in charge of the runoff from construction projects. Kevin Woodhouse (City of Mountain View) said that construction projects in the Bay Area need to obtain comprehensive permits that must be approved before construction can begin. The City brings in inspectors during the projects to ensure it complies with the permits.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)

Alana Lee (EPA) introduced Penny Reddy, the newest member to EPA's Moffett Field project team. Ms. Reddy is EPA's Groundwater Project Manager for the Middlefield-Ellis-Whisman (MEW) Superfund Study Area, which includes the regional groundwater contamination on Moffett Field. Ms. Reddy will be leading EPA's Site-wide Groundwater Feasibility Study for the MEW Site. Ms. Reddy has worked for EPA as the lead remedial project manager (RPM) for McClellan Air Force Base for four years.

- Mr. Siegel announced that the MEW and Moffett Field community advisory board (CAB) will meet on Wednesday, February 9, 2011, from 7:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m. at the Mountain View City Hall to discuss the MEW site. EPA will provide a vapor intrusion and regional groundwater and Site-wide Feasibility Study update. The City of Mountain View is co-sponsoring the event. Mr. Siegel asked that if anyone is interested in attending the CAB meeting to let him know because space is limited.

On December 3, 2010, EPA initiated the dispute process with the Navy regarding the responsibility for implementing the vapor intrusion remedy in the Moffett Field Area. Ms. Lee said that the Dispute Resolution Committee comprised of EPA, Navy and Water Board senior officials met on December 21, 2010 and January 12, 2011 in an attempt to resolve the vapor intrusion remedy dispute. The dispute resolution process has been extended to January 19, 2011 to provide EPA and the Navy time to unanimously resolve the dispute.

- Mr. Berry said that the RAB has received EPA's correspondence and then asked about the dispute between EPA and the Navy. Ms. Lee said that the primary source of vapor intrusion into overlying buildings at the Site is shallow groundwater contamination. The TCE contamination in the groundwater is from multiple MEW, Navy and NASA sources co-mingling into what EPA refers to as the regional groundwater contamination plume. EPA is seeking the Navy's involvement in addressing vapor intrusion by implementing the remedy selected in the 2010 amendment to the 1989 Record of Decision (ROD)
- Mr. Siegel asked about the status for the memorandum of agreement (MOA) between the Navy and NASA for the environmental cleanup at former NAS Moffett Field. Mr. Anderson said that the Navy initiated the MOA to align the property owner (NASA) and the environmental cleanup program. The funds for the environmental cleanup would be transferred from the Navy to NASA, who would take on the responsibility of working with the regulatory agencies and moving the sites through the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) process. The MOA negotiations that took place in 2009 between the Navy and NASA were never completed.
- RAB member Gabriel Diaconescu asked what has happened in similar situations at other sites in transferring environmental responsibilities from one federal agency to another. Mr. Anderson said that this situation is not common, and that it is the Navy's preference to re-open discussions with NASA on this issue.
- Mr. Siegel said there are a large number of BRAC sites that have been transferred to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) that have vapor intrusion issues. The party responsible for the plume is also responsible for vapor intrusion mitigation at those sites.

- Mr. Moss asked who is responsible for mandating vapor intrusion practices for the construction of new buildings at former NAS Moffett Field. Ms. Lee said that NASA has an Environmental Issues Management Plan which includes vapor intrusion mitigation requirements for new construction. EPA will work with NASA to ensure that any new construction has the necessary vapor intrusion control systems.
- Mr. Williams asked if there will be additional costs associated with operating and installing a ventilation system (such as heating, ventilation, and air conditioning [HVAC]) system for NASA. He questioned whether NASA can ask the Navy to install and operate sub-slab vapor intrusion mitigation if there are additional costs. Mr. Anderson said that scenario has not been addressed at this point between NASA and the Navy.
- Mr. Williams said that he remembers that in 2008 when the MOA was initiated, NASA requested that the Navy re-side Hangar 1 in exchange for assuming the responsibilities for the environmental restoration program at former NAS Moffett Field. Mr. Anderson said that scenario was proposed by NASA but never went forward. However, he indicated that the Navy will initiate the MOA discussions again.
- Mr. Siegel proposed the RAB vote to urge the Navy to comply with the 1992 MOA to be responsible for vapor intrusion mitigation from the regional plume until financial responsibility for the base is transferred to NASA. The RAB approved Mr. Siegel's motion.
- Mr. Strauss asked for an update from EPA on its discussions with NASA on entering into a Federal Facility Agreement (FFA) for NASA's sites at former NAS Moffett Field. Ms. Lee said that in EPA's January 12, 2011 letter to NASA, EPA indicated its desire to enter into a FFA with NASA to ensure consistency and expediency of all of NASA's CERCLA actions performed at Moffett Field. Deborah Feng (NASA) indicated that NASA is responding to EPA's letter. Currently, the Navy, EPA, and the Water Board are parties to the FFA for the Navy's environmental cleanup program at former NAS Moffett Field. Ms. Lee said that while NASA is generally working with EPA on the regional groundwater contamination plume and its Areas of Investigation, there is no formal enforcement agreement in place between the regulatory agencies and NASA for these NASA environmental cleanup sites at former NAS Moffett Field.
- Deborah Feng (NASA) said that NASA is voluntarily cleaning up environmental sites and does not see a need for a formal agreement with the regulatory agencies. Mr. Siegel asked if an FFA will be implemented if NASA agrees to take over the environmental responsibility of former NAS Moffett Field from the Navy. Ms. Feng said that NASA does not currently have enough staff to address the environmental cleanup program at former NAS Moffett Field. It is also difficult to transfer funding through appropriations, which NASA will need to continue the environmental cleanup program. If the MOA is approved, NASA will work with the regulatory agencies to put some sort of agreement in place. Dr. Clarke said that the MOA discussions will require negotiations and will not be completed quickly. Mr. Siegel said that he supports NASA taking the environmental cleanup at former NAS Moffett if the Navy is able to transfer the appropriate funds. Ms. Feng said that NASA is open to discussions with the Navy. There will be challenges to addressing Hangar 1. Mr. Anderson said that the Navy's upper management will be initiating MOA discussions with NASA. Mr. Anderson said the Navy will continue to give the RAB updates on the progress of the MOA discussions.

HANGAR 1 SUBCOMMITTEE UPDATE

RAB member Linda Ellis provided a presentation on the Hangar 1 subcommittee's interest in saving the windows. Ms. Ellis said that \$1.2 million would need to be available in February 2011 to preserve the Hangar 1 windows before the Navy removes the siding. The appropriation of \$10 million that Congresswoman Eshoo

requested from Congress was retracted; a portion of the funds were be used to save the windows. Ms. Ellis said the RAB is requesting that the Navy and NASA work together with the RAB to find a workable solution to save the Hangar 1 windows. Ms. Ellis reviewed options developed by the RAB subcommittee to save the windows, including:

1. Remove windows, install new window frames, and reinstall the windows after the removal action is completed.
2. Demolish existing windows and window frames and replace them with new flat-glass windows and frames after the removal action is complete.
3. Demolish windows and window frames and replace with metal siding.
4. Demolish flat-glass windows and frames and only keep the corrugated glass windows.

Ms. Ellis said the RAB subcommittee wants to see a decision that meets the needs for sustainability, historical significance, functionality, and reconstruction. Ms. Ellis said that saving the current windows would benefit NASA because (1) it would reduce costs for renovation and energy requirements because light would enter the hangar, (2) it is historically sensitive to save the windows, (3) it is sustainable, and (4) it allows for more occupancy types and functions. Ms. Ellis said that saving the historic windows will benefit the Navy because it would reduce costs in that the windows will not have to be taken to a landfill, it is historically sensitive, and it will qualify for sustainability credits. Ms. Ellis asked that NASA and the Navy commit to working with the community to devise with a plan for saving the historic windows while keeping the removal action on schedule. Ms. Ellis asked the community to help the RAB work with public and private companies to help acquire the funding to save the historic windows.

HANGAR 1 REMOVAL ACTION UPDATE

Mike Schulz (AMEC) provided a presentation on the Hangar 1 removal action. The Navy is conducting the removal action to control the release of PCBs by demolishing interior structures, removing contaminated siding, and applying a weather-resistant coating to the steel frame. The Navy conducted a State Historic Preservation Office meeting in September 2010 and a regulatory progress meeting in December 2010. The Navy is continuing to conduct biological monitoring, which includes weekly observation of burrowing owls, inspection of biological activity inside the hangar, and weekly reports to California Department of Fish and Game and FWS. To date, there have been no observed impacts to protected species. Mr. Schulz said storm water protection measures have been implemented throughout the removal action. Sediment was removed from the storm water trench, plastic liners were laid over bare soil areas, silt barriers were set up around the storm drains, and the paved areas were vacuumed before storms.

- Mr. Williams asked what happens to the silt that is vacuumed up. Mr. Schulz said that the silt is placed in barrels and will be tested for PCBs.

Mr. Schulz said asbestos removal inside Hangar 1 was completed in December 2010. In all, 83 tons of asbestos waste was sent to the Altamont Landfill and 160 tons of PCB- and metal-contaminated waste was sent to Kettleman Landfill. The Navy also completed demolition of interior structures in December 2010. In this case, 1,897 tons of construction debris was sent to Newby Island Landfill and 431 tons of metal and 4,568 fluorescent light tubes and ballasts were recycled.

Dust suppression measures were taken throughout demolition of interior structures and asbestos abatement. Mr. Schulz said that the Navy collected baseline air samples in July 2010 and there was continuous air monitoring during the demolition and abatement. Three levels of air monitoring were conducted: on the workers, in the work areas, and at the perimeter of the site. All of the air monitoring has been coordinated with NASA, and weekly reports are available to the regulatory agencies and public. The dust suppression and air monitoring techniques are controlling the air emissions during the removal action. Mr. Schulz said the cork room hook and

rack system was saved completely and all of the historic artifacts that were designated to be preserved were provided to NASA. Mr. Schulz said that the Navy will begin to install the scaffolding system to remove the siding in February 2011. The removal action is currently on schedule.

- Mr. Siegel asked about the schedule to remove the hangar windows. Ms. Lind said that she has been talking to the Navy's contract specialist and the \$1.2 million in funding to preserve the windows would need to be in place in February 2011 to finalize contractual documentation with AMEC.
- Mr. Berry asked about the use for the \$1.2 million. Ms. Lind said that \$1.2 million will be used to decontaminate the corrugated windows and window frames to be released to NASA for reuse. The \$1.2 million does not include decontaminating any of the lower flat-panel windows on the hangar. Mr. Berry asked what would happen to the windows if they were not saved. Mr. Schulz said that the window caulking may contain PCB contamination and will be removed and disposed of at the appropriate landfill. If the windows are saved, all of the window caulk will be removed by hand.
- RAB member Arthur Schwartz asked if the windows can be decontaminated in place. Ms. Lind said the Navy discussed decontaminating the windows in place but the removal will need to be conducted in a contained environment because of the PCB in the paint and window putty.
- Ms. Ellis suggested a water-tight enclosure to surround the windows during PCB removal. Ms. Lind said that the Navy considered it but it was not considered feasible because of implementability and cost considerations. The corrugated windows are extremely high and difficult to access.
- Mr. Strauss said there will be higher costs to dispose of the PCB caulking in the appropriate landfill. If the windows are not hazardous, it makes more sense to reuse them instead of disposing of them.
- Mr. Williams said that if the windows and window frames are clean enough, that NASA should store them for reuse instead of sending them to a landfill. Ms. Lind said that NASA has not committed to accept the windows. The Navy will work with NASA to consider window-saving options if NASA is interested in reusing them.
- Mr. Schwartz asked if a window washing company has been contacted to see if they can decontaminate the windows in place. These companies are used to working at heights. Mr. Anderson said the windows cannot be decontamination in place during the removal action.
- Mr. Williams said that it makes more sense to save and reuse the windows, if possible, because they are historic and not easily replicated.
- Mr. Siegel asked that the Navy, NASA, and the community work together to preserve the historically significant windows that cannot be replaced.
- Mr. Moss said that the windows provide light into the hangar, which lowers electricity costs and there is value in keeping them for reuse. The Navy should look into existing funding to see what could be moved to save the windows.
- The RAB voted to request that the Navy and NASA devise some options on how to save the Hangar 1 windows once the caulking is characterized. Once the Hangar 1 window caulk is characterized and the Navy and NASA have met, an update on window saving options will be provided to the RAB by February 1, 2011.

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

Mr. Anderson opened the meeting for questions or comments from the public.

DRAFT

- Jennifer Gates (California Preservation Foundation) said that she is in support of the RAB's mission to save the historic hangar windows. The costs of preserving versus demolishing the windows need to be considered before the next steps can be established.
- Community member Jim Van Pernis said the RAB has strayed from its charter in the past few years and focuses too much on the preservation of the historic hangar. The RAB members interested in saving the hangar should work with NASA to establish a group that meets separately to discuss the future reuse of the hangar. The new committee should solicit wider public input on the reuse of the hangar. A separate committee to address the hangar will free the RAB's time to address the Navy's environmental cleanup program.
- Larry Ellis (Save Hangar 1 Committee) said the hangar windows are part of the historic structure that should be preserved. Saving the windows will help with persuading tenants to reuse the space. Tax credits are available to a company interested in reusing the historic hangar. There is a foundation that may be interested in reusing the hangar and would like to work out a way to save the windows.
- Jack Nadeau (Open Space Trust) said there are hundreds of community members in the area who would like to see the hangar windows saved and would contribute to the cause.
- Community member Georgina Hymes said that the military does not have an active presence in California. All of the military funds are going overseas for the war effort. The politicians should be asked for funds to save the hangar and restore former NAS Moffett Field to an active base.

Future RAB Meetings

Mr. Anderson announced the next RAB meeting will tentatively be held on 10 March 2011.

Tentatively scheduled RAB meetings for 2011 are:

- March 10, 2011
- May 12, 2011
- July 14, 2011
- September 8, 2011
- November 10, 2011

Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 9:35 p.m., and Mr. Anderson thanked all present for attending. Mr. Anderson can be contacted with any comments or questions:

- Mr. Scott Anderson
BRAC Environmental Coordinator, Former NAS Moffett Field, BRAC Project Management Office West;
1455 Frazee Road, Suite 900, San Diego, CA 92108; Phone: 619-532-0938; Fax: 619-532-0940;
E-mail: scott.d.anderson@navy.mil

DRAFT

ACRONYM LIST

AMEC – AMEC Earth and Environmental, Inc.
BRAC – Base Realignment and Closure
CAB – Community Advisory Board
CEQA - California Environmental Quality Act
CERCLA - Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act
EPA – U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
FFA – Federal Facility Agreement
FWS – U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
HVAC – Heating, ventilation, and air conditioning
MEW – Middlefield-Ellis-Whisman
MOA – Memorandum of Agreement
NAS – Naval Air Station
NASA – National Aeronautics and Space Administration
NEPA - National Environmental Policy Act
PCB – Polychlorinated biphenyl
RAB – Restoration Advisory Board
ROD – Record of Decision
RPM – Remedial Project Manager
Water Board – San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board

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,

Scott Anderson
Navy Co-Chair,
Former NAS Moffett Field RAB