

**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, July 14, 2011, at the Senior Center in Mountain View, California.

Community RAB Members in attendance:

Bill Berry, Gabriel Diaconescu, Linda Ellis, Patricia Guerrieri, Libby Lucas, 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:

Jim Whitcomb (Navy) and Alana Lee (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency [EPA])

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

Bryce Bartelma (Navy), Lauren Cason (Sealaska Environmental), Don Chuck (NASA), Dr. Ann Clarke (NASA), Deb Feng (NASA), Mark Hightower (NASA), Carolyn Hunter (Tetra Tech EM Inc.), John Inks (City of Mountain View), Lynne Kilpatrick (City of Sunnyvale), Alan Lee (Navy), Mike Mewhinney (NASA), Mike Schulz (AMEC Earth and Environmental [AMEC]), and George Sloup (NASA)

Other Community Members in attendance:

Roderick Bersamina (representative from Congresswoman Anna Eshoo's Office), Beth Bunnenberg (Palo Alto Resources Board), Larry Ellis (Air and Space West Foundation for Education), Jane Horton, Georgina Hymes, Rose Lesslie, Jack Nadeau (Save Hangar 1), Marty Rawson, Kris Rowberry, Diana Samuels (*Daily News*), Tammy Skoog, and Greg Unangst

WELCOME

Bill Berry (RAB community co-chair) and Jim Whitcomb (Navy Lead Remedial Project Manager) opened the meeting at 7:00 p.m. and welcomed everyone in attendance. Mr. Berry reviewed the agenda and asked if there is time on the agenda for him to present a proposed letter he drafted to NASA's Office of the Inspector General (OIG). The RAB agreed discuss the NASA OIG letter at the end of the agenda.

APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

Mr. Whitcomb asked for corrections to or comments on the minutes for the May 12, 2011, RAB meeting. Bob Moss (RAB member) asked that "try to focus" on page 5 be revised to "different approaches." Mr. Moss asked to "add development before restrictions" on page 4. Steve Williams (RAB member) asked the Navy to review the discussion regarding NASA's OIG concerns on page 4 and revise the meeting minutes. The RAB voted to finalize the minutes for the May 12, 2011, meeting with RAB comments incorporated. Final RAB 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.

<u>#</u>	<u>DOCUMENT</u>	<u>APPROXIMATE SUBMITTAL DATE</u>
1.	Site 25 Draft Final Remedial Design/Remedial Action Work Plan	August 2011
2.	2010 Annual Report of Landfill Sites 1 and 22	September 2011
3.	Site 27 Final Remedial Action Completion Report	September 2011

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Whitcomb introduced the new Base Closure Manager for former NAS Moffett Field, Alan Lee.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY (EPA) VAPOR INTRUSION UPDATE

Alana Lee (EPA) provided an update to the RAB on implementation of the vapor intrusion remedy at the Middlefield-Ellis-Whisman (MEW) Study Area, which includes portions of Moffett Field. Ms. Lee said that EPA conditionally approved the Site-wide Indoor Air Sampling and Analysis Work Plan for Unsampled Commercial Buildings (WP) prepared by the MEW parties in June 2011. Ms. Lee said the MEW parties are sampling 12 buildings in the Moffett Field Area in July 2011. EPA, NASA and the MEW representatives conducted building walk-throughs for the unsampled buildings where indoor air sampling is planned in the Moffett Field Area. Ms. Lee said that EPA wanted to ensure vapor intrusion sampling will take place in all of the occupied buildings that have not yet been sampled. Buildings that are vacant or planned for demolition will not be sampled at this time. Ms. Lee reviewed the estimated extent of the regional shallow groundwater trichloroethene (TCE) plume which defines the vapor intrusion study area. The vapor intrusion sampling for the unsampled buildings in the Moffett Field Area are planned to occur during July through September 2011.

- Peter Strauss (RAB member) asked what type of vapor intrusion sampling is being proposed. Ms. Lee said that EPA approved the WP which proposed the commonly used EPA TO-15 method using canisters. Mr. Strauss said that EPA should consider various methods of vapor intrusion sampling. Ms. Lee said that EPA is considering passive indoor air sampling methods for future sampling, but TO-15 using canisters is the approved method for the upcoming sampling. Mr. Strauss suggested that EPA should consider using unoccupied buildings for testing other vapor intrusion sampling methods. Ms. Lee said that EPA has conducted a research study comparing different sampling methods and many of the buildings sampled as part of the study included unoccupied buildings on Moffett Field.
- Mr. Moss asked if the vapor intrusion sampling is being conducted under the Superfund program. Ms. Lee said that EPA is conducting this work under the Superfund program.
- Lynne Kilpatrick (RAB member) asked who was present during the building walk-through. Ms. Lee said that EPA staff accompanied the MEW and NASA representatives to assess the building conditions and use, identify potential pathways for vapor intrusion, and select potential sampling locations.

Ms. Lee said that the Navy plans to prepare a separate WP for vapor intrusion sampling and evaluation for buildings within its area of responsibility.

DRAFT

NASA UPDATE

Deb Feng read an update on NASA's Hangar 1 position to the RAB:

“While we support all that is in the President's budget, we also understand the current economic climate and the difficult decisions the administration and Congress have to make. As previously reported, the NASA Inspector General has completed an independent review and report regarding Hangar One. NASA has concurred with the recommendations in the report. It would be inappropriate for us to speculate on Hangar One funding while congressional budget deliberations are ongoing.”

Copies of the OIG Report, which mentioned alternatives for NASA to explore, are available at the OIG's website at <http://oig.nasa.gov/> under "Reading Room" or at the following link:

<http://oig.nasa.gov/audits/reports/FY11/IG-11-020.pdf> (NASA's response is on page 16 of the report.)

Public Affairs Contacts:

NASA Ames Research Center: John Yembrick, (650) 604-2065, john.yembrick-1@nasa.gov and

Mike Mewhinney, (650) 604-3937, michael.mewhinney@nasa.gov

NASA Headquarters Office of the Inspector General: Renee Juhans, (202) 358-1712, renee.n.juhans@nasa.gov

- Mr. Berry asked for an update on the request for proposal (RFP) NASA issued for re-siding the hangar. Ms. Feng said an RFP was not issued; instead, it was a sources sought/request for information (RFI). NASA received partial results from various contractors from the RFI.
- Mr. Berry asked if NASA conducted an analysis on costs to demolish the hangar. Ms. Feng said that NASA has not assessed the costs of demolishing the hangar. NASA has completed only a materials analysis and an assessment on the hangar windows.
- Mr. Moss said it does not appear that NASA has interest in re-siding the hangar and asked about the ranking of priority for NASA to re-side the hangar. Ms. Feng said that NASA has a process to establish priorities at an agency-wide level. Ms. Feng said that NASA's public affairs office would have that information if Mr. Moss wants to contact the office.
- Mr. Williams said that he has not heard NASA's plan for the reuse of the hangar; there has not been any formal statement from NASA to the public on its intent. Mr. Williams asked if NASA sees value in re-siding and reusing the hangar at the local level. Ms. Feng said that NASA Ames cannot fund re-siding the hangar itself and needs financial assistance. There is not a priority for the 10 NASA centers to allocate \$32 million for re-siding the hangar since there currently is not a reuse plan. Funds to re-side the hangar are at a Congressional level.
- Lenny Siegel (RAB member) said that if there is a possibility of transferring the re-siding and reuse of the hangar to another federal agency that it will have to go through the Section 106 historical assessment process. Ms. Feng said that all of the required actions for re-siding and reusing the hangar will be met. Mr. Siegel asked about the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) process if the hangar is demolished. Ms. Lee said that John Chesnutt (EPA) would be a resource to answer the CERCLA process questions. Mr. Siegel said that returning to the CERCLA process would set the project back years because of all of the approvals needed.
- Mr. Williams said that he is concerned that NASA OIG did not take into account any of the public's concerns about the reuse in its assessment of Hangar 1.
- Mr. Strauss said that an explanation of significant differences (ESD) will need to be prepared and the Administrative Record reviewed for Hangar 1 if another alternative is selected for the reuse by NASA.

- Gabriel Diaconescu (RAB member) said that it is important for the business and local community that the hangar is reused. The business community should be involved in drafting the reuse plan. There may be funds available through the local business community to re-side the hangar.
- Ms. Kilpatrick asked how the community can stay informed about NASA's decisions on reuse of the hangar. Ms. Feng said that the community should contact NASA's public affairs office to receive information on Hangar 1.

HANGAR 1 UPDATE

Bryce Bartelma (Navy) provided an update on the Navy's work at Hangar 1. There have been no issues with air emissions or wildlife during the removal action. The Navy has been managing the stormwater and ground surface protection from debris throughout the removal action. The Navy worked with NASA and the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) on how to clean and reuse the clamshell door mechanisms. A Hangar 1 site tour with the Navy, NASA, and SHPO was conducted on June 7, 2011. Mr. Bartelma said that the Navy has been working with NASA to prepare an interactive compact disc (CD) on the history of Hangar 1, which will be finalized and available to the public in the upcoming months. The Navy has completed removal of mansard panels in zone 1 and initiated the redwood removal, with the windows to follow. The Navy has ensured permanent access to the Federal Aviation Administration roof beacon on Hangar 1. There was a recognition lunch for workers at Hangar 1 for more than 365 days and 70,000 man hours without a recordable incident or injury. The Navy is continuing removal action through the six zones of the hangar and is on track to complete the field work, confirmation sampling, and demobilization in the spring of 2012. Once the work is completed, a completion report will be issued in the summer of 2012.

- Mr. Williams asked if he will be able to receive the native files that are used to prepare the interactive Hangar 1 CD. Mr. Williams said that it is important for the public to have access to the coding of the information on the CD since media change frequently and a CD will become an obsolete technology at some point. Mr. Bartelma said that to his knowledge the coding of this interactive CD is costly and he will have to look to Navy management to determine if there are funds available to purchase the rights to the coding of the software that is used to prepare the interactive CD. Mr. Bartelma said that he will find out from the Navy what will be available to the public and let Mr. Williams know.
- Arthur Schwartz (RAB member) asked if the Navy has considered reuse of the redwood that is being removed from the hangar. Mr. Bartelma said that the unsalvageable redwood is being removed and disposed of. The redwood that is viable will be decontaminated on site.
- Mr. Siegel asked if the redwood that is viable will be reused. Mr. Bartelma said that the viable redwood will be sold by the Navy's contractor; this arrangement was negotiated as a cost saving measure in the contract for the removal action. Mr. Williams said that it does not seem appropriate that a contractor is able to sell historical property.
- Ms. Feng said that NASA looked into reuse of redwood that is viable. NASA will not be able to reuse the redwood based on fire codes and currently there is no funding available to purchase it.
- Linda Ellis (RAB member) said that fire codes can be negotiated as long as exiting in an emergency is addressed. There is also ways to negotiate using historical items such as redwood in future buildings.
- Libby Lucas (RAB member) asked how long the redwood has been a part of the hangar and if it has historical significance. Mike Schulz (AMEC Environmental) said that the Historic American Engineering Record does not identify the redwood as a historical significant material. It was added onto the hangar after the initial construction.

Mr. Bartelma said that the Navy received written comments at the May 12, 2011, RAB meeting and the Navy has responses in bold text below following the comments received:

- Community member Rebecca Feind: As a resident of Mountain View, I am concerned about the future of the bird population at Moffett Field. Regarding the burrowing owls at Moffett Field, they are part of an important breeding colony in Santa Clara County. These owls have a significant influence on the future of this species in the Bay Area. The Audubon Society is very interested in seeing plans for the preservation and conservation of this and other bird species at Moffett Field.
- Santa Clara Valley Audubon Society member Shani Kleinhaus: About 1/4 of the remnant Burrowing Owl population of Santa Clara County breeds at Moffett Field. We request a discussion of the efforts to preserve the nesting owls, habitat, and how plans for the site may impact the owls on the site and in the county. This could be a topic for a future meeting agenda. The 2020 Fair and its impacts are of special interest to us.

The Navy has developed a Biological Hazard Abatement Plan (BHAP) to ensure that birds are protected during the removal action at Hangar 1. There are biological experts on site to ensure the safety of the wildlife. Barriers have been erected and other measures have been taken throughout the removal action to protect Burrowing Owls onsite.

- Community member Jim Van Pernis: (1) What is the anticipated useful life of the coatings to be applied to the Hangar 1 structure? This could help provide us an estimate as to how long we have before residing must commence in order to preserve its structural integrity. (2) Is the Navy standing by its previous indication that it will provide for mitigation of birds nesting, by using sound to keep them at bay from the open structure.

The coating that is placed on the frame of the hangar has a warranty of 12 years. There will be routine inspections of the coating and touchups as needed. The Navy has developed the BHAP to help keep the birds from being affected by the hangar. There are various methods (including noise deterrents) in the BHAP that will help keep the birds from landing on the exposed hangar frame.

SITE 25 UPDATE

Mr. Bartelma provided an update on Site 25. The Navy distributed a draft remedial design and remedial action work plan (RD/RAWP) for Site 25 on March 30, 2011. Based on the significant and unusual amount of standing water at Site 25, the Navy issued a revised draft RD/RAWP on May 10, 2011, that included details on potential dewatering and water diversion methods. The Navy is developing a response to comments and the draft final RD/RAWP for Site 25 for regulatory agency review. Mr. Bartelma announced that the Site 25 fieldwork will likely be delayed until the spring of 2012. Mr. Bartelma said that the Navy may need to pump and/or manage up to 90 million gallons of water from Site 25 to complete the remedial action. Using two pumps will remove 7,000 gallons per minute. Under the dewatering alternative, the Navy would conduct daily compliance sampling for contaminants of ecological concern. The Navy collected four surface water samples for a baseline comparison of concentrations at Site 25 and Alviso A2E pond (where water would potentially be discharged). The baseline samples of Site 25 and Alviso A2E contained comparable chemical results, which makes the dewatering strategy viable. Mr. Bartelma said that a more likely alternative would include the use of water barriers at Site 25 to manage the water internally to IR Site 25. Mr. Bartelma said the Navy will visually inspect, clear vegetation, and hand remove pickleweed to minimize any impacts to biological activity at the site. The pickleweed potentially can be stored on-site for reuse. Silt fences will be used along access points near pickleweed to ensure the safety of the salt marsh harvest mouse. The Navy completed a nesting survey; no protected species were observed and there will be continuous inspections for bird sightings during the field work. Although the Western pond turtle is not expected at Site 25, the Navy will also take precautions to ensure its protection during the field work.

DRAFT

- Ms. Lucas asked if the pickleweed will be stored off site. Mr. Bartelma said the Navy is evaluating the best option for storing pickleweed. Ms. Lucas suggested the Navy talk to Bay Conservation and Development Commission, which has had to store pickleweed and may have some useful information.
- Mr. Williams asked if the water coming from Hangar 1 is affecting Site 25. Mr. Bartelma said that water from Hangar 1 is being treated on site and discharged off site once it is sampled and determined to be clean.
- Mr. Strauss asked if the Navy will be able to keep the funding since there is another year delay in the field work at Site 25. Mr. Bartelma said that the Navy will not lose the funding for Site 25 and is currently extending the contract.

RAB RESPONSE LETTER TO NASA OIG REPORT

Mr. Berry said that he prepared a draft letter that he would like to discuss and receive comments from the RAB before he sends it to NASA OIG. Mr. Berry said that the RAB members received the draft letter for comment before the meeting.

- Roderick Bersamina (Representative from Congresswoman Anna Eshoo's Office) said that he will bring the RAB's concerns to Congresswoman Eshoo. Mr. Bersamina said that letters can also be submitted by the public voicing concerns on the report in addition to sending a letter to NASA OIG from the RAB.
- Mr. Diaconescu suggested involving the local businesses in sending letters to NASA OIG to express their concerns.
- Mr. Schwartz suggested that the RAB sign the letter Mr. Berry prepared and also send separate letters individually.
- John Inks (RAB member) asked if the letter drafted by Mr. Berry includes all concerns regarding the NASA OIG report. Mr. Siegel said the letter focuses on showing NASA OIG the historical significance of the hangar.

The RAB voted and approved sending a combined letter in addition to sending individual letters to NASA OIG.

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

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

- Community member Georgina Hymes asked why the RAB has waited so long to save the hangar. Everyone is still trying to determine the future of Hangar 1 even after 3 years since the engineering evaluation/cost analysis was issued. NASA should send a shuttle to be kept in Hangar 1. The Navy should contact the Secretary of the Navy for funding to reuse the hangar. The Navy should restore the hangar and ensure that there is an active military presence in California.
- A community member said he works at former NAS Moffett Field and value the efforts of the RAB to save the hangar. He receives frequent calls from various organizations that express interest in the reuse of the hangar.
- A community member said that the bigger picture for former NAS Moffett Field needs to be considered in the work to save the hangar. The RAB needs to talk to the base neighbors and enlist their support.

DRAFT

Future RAB Meetings

Mr. Whitcomb announced the next RAB meeting is tentatively scheduled for September 8, 2011. Mr. Whitcomb asked for suggestions for future topics.

- Mr. Diaconescu asked for more educational presentations provided at the RAB meetings. Mr. Diaconescu suggested that the RAB members invite more community members to the meetings.
- Mr. Moss asked for an update on bioremediation at Site 26 Eastside Aquifer Treatment System.

Tentatively scheduled RAB meetings for 2011 are:

- September 8, 2011
- November 10, 2011

Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 9:10 p.m., and Mr. Whitcomb thanked all present for attending. The Navy can be contacted with any comments or questions:

- Mr. Scott Anderson
Base Realignment and Closure (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

ACRONYM LIST

AMEC - AMEC Earth and Environmental
BHAP – Biological Hazard Abatement Plan
BRAC – Base Realignment and Closure
CD – Compact disc
CERCLA – Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act
EPA – U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
ESD – Explanation of Significant Difference
MEW – Middlefield-Ellis-Whisman
NAS – Naval Air Station
NASA – National Aeronautics and Space Administration
OIG – Office of the Inspector General
RAB – Restoration Advisory Board
RD/RAWP – Remedial Design/Remedial Action Work Plan
RFI – Request for Information
RFP – Request for Proposal
RPM – Remedial Project Manager
SHPO – State Historic Preservation Office
WP – Work Plan

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>

DRAFT

Respectfully Submitted,

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