



Moffett Field RAB Hangar One Subcommittee Meeting

Next Meeting:

Moffett Field Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Meeting
Thursday, July 8 at 7:00PM

Mountain View Senior Center Social Hall 266 Escuela Avenue (between Villa and California), Mountain View, CA

MOFFETT FIELD RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

May 24, 2010 7:30 PM at UCSC Office at Moffett Field

Distribution

The author distributes to members in attendance. A "✓" indicates those present at the meeting. "J" indicates those present by phone.

| RAB Subcommittee Attendance | | | | |
|-----------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|--|
| ✓ | Bill Berry | RAB Co-Chair | O: 650.604.0511 | wberry@ucsc.edu |
| ✓ | Kathryn Stewart | RAB Co-Chair | O: 415.743.4715 | kathryn.stewart@navy.mil |
| ✓ | Lenny Siegel | RAB Subcommittee Chair | O: 650.961.8918 | lsiegel@cpeo.org |
| ✓ partial | Deb Feng | NASA, Director | O: 650.604.0256 | deb.feng@nasa.gov |
| ✓ | Keith Venter | NASA, Historic Preservation Officer | O: 650.604.6408 | keith.venter@nasa.gov |
| ✓ | Rocci Caringello | NASA | M: 650.810.6349 | tony.r.caringello@nasa.gov |
| ✓ | Gabriel Donescu | RAB Member | | lc1qlbl2@yahoo.com |
| ✓ | Carl Honaker | RAB Member | O: 408.929.1060 | carl.honaker@rda.sccgov.org |
| ✓ | Libby Lucas | RAB Member | P: 650-948-3552 | jlucas1099@aol.com |
| ✓ | Ralph Otte | RAB Member | P: 408.736.1477 | otte731@yahoo.com |
| ✓ | Jim Van Pernis | RAB Member | | |
| ✓ | Dan Wallace | RAB Member | | dan_wallace@juno.com |
| J partial | Steve Williams | RAB Member | M: 650.906.7827 | sbw@nuqu.org |
| ✓ | Larry Ellis | Air and Space West Foundation | M: 408.772.3289 | larry.ellis@airandspacewest.org |
| ✓ | Bill Wissel | Moffett Historical Society | M: 408.857.8871 | willyum54@comcast.net |
| ✓ | Linda Ellis | RAB Member | M: 408.772.3289 | lellisj@gmail.com |

Minutes submitted by,

The following minutes reflect the understanding of the discussion during the meeting. New items and updates are indicated by **bold text**. Please review these meeting minutes and report comments and clarifications to the author upon receipt; otherwise, these minutes become the record of the discussions and decisions at the next meeting.

| Item | Responsibility | Description |
|----------|-------------------|--|
| 05.24-01 | ALL | <p>MEETING OBJECTIVES</p> <p>Lenny calls the meeting to order at 7:35 PM. The agenda of the meeting follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Supplement the official artifact list with RAB list and priorities. Consider including Squadron art painted on plywood on interior building inside Hangar One. See attached photos and lists. 2. Consider ways to overcome limitations of Navy's \$75,000 budget for artifact preservation. 3. Ensure a process to identify and preserve artifacts throughout the deconstruction process and may include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training Contractors • Providing oversight by qualified historical experts • Process for extracting newly discovered artifacts for preservation. 4. Develop process to safely preserving contaminated artifacts |
| 05.24-02 | Lenny, Steve, RAB | <p>Save Hangar One Committee (SHOC) Named "Preservationist of the Year"</p> <p>California Preservation Foundation awarded SHOC preservationist of the year and Anna Eshoo as legislator of the year for efforts to save Hangar One. DOD \$10 million air-mark funds are pending. Lenny has CPF write up and will request press release.</p> |

| Item | Responsibility | Description |
|----------|--|---|
| 05.24-03 | <p>Info</p> <p>Deb, Kathy</p> <p>Linda, NASA</p> | <p><u>PURPOSE – For Identification and Prioritization of Artifacts</u> Linda states the purpose for the meeting objectives.</p> <p>1. <u>Maintain Historic Landmark Status</u> The U.S. National Parks Service (NPS) lists Hangar One as a National Landmark on it Historic Registry. To maintain landmark status, the hangar’s historical artifacts that hold intrinsic significance must to be re-installed or displayed in the Hangar when the landmark is restored.</p> <p>The RAB recommends the preservation the artifacts as part of the Navy’s deconstruction project to have the <u>OPPORTUNITY</u> to restore Hangar One and maintain its U.S. landmark status.</p> <p>2. <u>Maintain Options for Government or Private Sector Restoration</u> As a government restoration plan and DOD earmark funds for Hangar One are pending, and may not occur, preserving these artifacts for a private sector restoration is critical. A private sector preservationist can realize tax credits between 20-40% for the restoration of a national landmark. For example if the restoration costs \$100 million, the preservationist can receive a minimum tax credit of \$20 million. This tax credit applies to restoration and operational costs for national registered landmarks. Moreover, the State of California has a pending incentive initiative to match federal tax credits for historic restoration.</p> <p>Preservation restoration processes and tax incentives research was provided by Air and Space West Foundation members Christine Fedukowski, CFC Tax Specialist and Mike Garavaglia, Historic Preservation Architect.</p> <p>3. <u>Expand historic artifacts list while improving the efficiency of Navy’s Scope of Work</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Expand and re-prioritize artifacts list. · Identify artifacts that NASA can preserve outside of Navy’s scope. · Use Navy’s scope and budget only to address artifacts that cannot be addressed directly by NASA or others outside Navy Contract. · Modify Navy’s Scope of Work and keeping within the \$75,000 budget. · Modify Navy’s Scope without affecting Contractor’s “Means and Methods”. <p>Kathy’s surprised the list is a topic of conversation. Kathy and Deb state Navy and NASA are committed to work with RAB that is presenting creative options to preserve the artifacts for future restoration.</p> <p>Linda will work with NASA and update Addendum List to include a column for artifacts that are already included in the Navy’s scope, such as door motors, elevators, etc.</p> <p>For more detailed discussion notes for artifacts, See Items 05.24-05 through 05.24-11.</p> |
| 05.24-04 | Info | <p><u>Hangar Renovation</u> All are in favor of preserving as many artifacts for the opportunity to restore the hangar and maintain NPS Landmark status.</p> <p>Keith provided the attached NPS approach to the Subcommittee meeting. Keith prefers re-cladding the Hangar with corrugated metal siding and stated that Wayne Donaldson, the State Historic Preservation Officer also prefers metal siding. The SHPO’s recommendation is important for any proposed solution, but the NPS has final approval of alternative materials, metal cladding, PTFE, or other material, to maintain historical status.</p> <p><u>ADDENDUM: PTFE History</u> <i>The PTFE option presented to the RAB in May 2007 was in response to the first EE/CA when the Navy stated they had no obligation to re-clad the hangar and proposed complete demolition. The intent of the PTFE feasibility study was to validate and propose a cost effective alternative to restore the hangar. The RAB requested this alternative be included in the second EE/CA.</i></p> |

| Item | Responsibility | Description |
|--------------------|---|--|
| 05.24-04 Cont'd | Keith Info | <p><i>Linda worked with Wayne from the conception of using PTFE as an alternative skin. The first meeting with Wayne, Linda, and Rick Callison was in early 2007 at her Mountain View office where Wayne supported PTFE as a cost effective alternative to complete demollition.</i></p> <p><i>Last July, following a meeting at NASA where Wayne met with Deb Feng, Lew Braxton, and Linda, Wayne continued to support using PTFE as an honorable solution, providing his concerns were addressed and ensured the restoration would be completed in a manner worthy of our national landmark.</i></p> <p><i>Wayne and NPS architect had two conference calls with Linda to walk her through the NPS website and 106 Alternate Materials process. Wayne conveyed the information that he would require on application to endorse recovering the hangar with PTFE. Linda offered her assistance to NASA to file the NPS 106 application.</i></p> <p>The interactive Video is complete with the exception of the ending. Lenny requests Keith provide a copy of the preliminary video to the RAB for review.</p> <p>Until NASA or Private Sector Preservationist has a restoration plan is in place and funds are allocated, the RAB suggests all viable options for the skin be considered.</p> |
| 05.24-05 | Information NASA, Navy | <p><u>Hazardous Material Handling</u> To develop a working plan and cooperate with the Navy to preserve historic artifacts, Larry states that in response to an E-mail from Lenny, Sarah Kloss of EPA and Elizabeth Wells of the Water Board confirmed that PCB-contaminated materials would require cleaning or encapsulation; however, using his house built in 1930 as an example, a property owner can declare and transfer lead and asbestos to the new owner for decontamination or encapsulation. A second example occurs in the UCSC conference room where the subcommittee meeting was held.</p> <p>Asbestos is the primary material that is anticipated, and similarly, lead are both not typically exposed. PCB dust requires verification during the five phased of deconstruction; all agree.</p> <p>Lenny and others express concern that the Navy's deconstruction plan does not include care of handling, nor a contingency for historic artifacts. Lenny asks if everything with asbestos and lead can be encapsulated, and Kathy replies "Yes".</p> <p>The RAB requests, the Navy include the following processes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Care of handling artifacts • Identify and train for removal of PCB dust for artifact preservation • Plan for encapsulation of lead and asbestos for artifact preservation • Identify a plan for moving and storing historic artifacts within the hangar or to another location on site as part of deconstruction phasing. |
| 05.24-06 | Info | <p><u>PROCESS – Development and Prioritization of Artifacts List</u> RAB and SHOC members conducted interviews and identified and prioritized as many known historic artifacts as possible, then the NASA list received on 05.21.10 was incorporated. The information was presented in two ways as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Original RAB List (Appendix List to Prioritized List by Cost)</u> Linda presents the list prioritized from NPS Status artifacts of most importance to desired non-historical items of least importance an annotated where Navy work can be adjusted or omitted. The categories of this list follows: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Historic Artifacts important for Maintaining NPS National Historic Landmark Status and includes NASA HPO items. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Cork [Cell] Room – Independent Discussion Important to preserve in its entirety. 2. Cultural Artifacts Import to NASA HPO Moffett History Museum, SHOC and Veterans Groups 3. Operational Equipment Request 4. Miscellaneous Items – To be confirmed as removed from NASA List |

| Item | Responsibility | Description |
|------|---------------------------------|--|
| | <p>Info</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Prioritized List by Cost</u> To present a reasonable, cost effective approach, and work with the Navy to preserve historic artifacts, and ultimately Hangar One, Larry on behalf of the RAB, presents the artifacts list prioritized by cost in stoplight order and by importance. <p>Priority numbering: 1 has highest importance Green indicates artifacts/items included scope can be removed from Navy Scope, items that do not require remediation, or can be included in Navy Scope for least cost. Yellow indicates items that might require more work or cost. Red most potential cost impacts.</p> <p>Cost for preserving artifacts or items are organized by the following <i>*Actual Clean Up to be determined as part of deconstruction.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Scale-Size of Artifact or Object 2. Additional – Potential Scope item 3. PCB Dust Removal [Anticipated or Required]* 4. Asbestos/Lead Removal or Encapsulation [Anticipated or Required]* 5. Potential for Special Encapsulation [Anticipated or Required]* 6. Relative Cost Impacts Average (Rated) 7. Storage Location for Artifact -Items |
| | <p>Keith, Rocci, and Deb</p> | <p><u>Artifacts Lists Discussion</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NASA confirms storage areas. Building 200 is unconstrained. NASA and RAB will work together to expand list of artifacts to be preserved and identify items such as door motors and elevators that are currently in the Scope; Keith will work with Roger Ashbaugh. |
| | <p>Keith, Rocci, and Deb</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Carl recommends Moffett Field History Museum (MFHM) is invited to expand their list and not exclude artifacts of value based on their current capacity to display and store them. NASA agrees and plans to provide additional storage for museum use. Deb recommended Building 200 for additional storage. |
| | <p>Kathy, Keith, Rocci, Deb</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Navy has a “Performance Based”, “Fixed Price” Contract which allows the General Contractor (GC) to realize their profit by their efficiency to complete the Work. NASA and Navy will work with the GC on the adjusted list. |
| | <p>Kathy, Keith, Rocci, Deb</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RAB members recommends that the Cork [Cell] Room be preserved in its <u>entirety</u>. Other areas that can reduce contractor’s Work and costs and allow more artifacts to be saved are identified. Carl and Rocci recommend the lower level steel plate walls on West and East and masonry room at north be removed from GC’s scope. Kathy mentions adjustments need to meet Environmental Management and BRAC processes and be sensitive to additional costs. |
| | <p>Kathy Navy, NASA</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Elevator Rails are scheduled to be stripped of paint; however, this Scope might be omitted as work is most likely not required. Rails typically are not painted for ease of operation, and if they were painted, friction probably wore off any paint that was applied. |
| | <p>Keith, Linda</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Keith found benches in the Cork Room that appear to be covered in the same fabric that covered the Macon. These benches will be added to the list of Historic Artifacts. |
| | <p>Kathy, Keith, Rocci, Deb</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The benches exemplify unforeseen artifacts that may be found during deconstruction. NASA and Navy will work on the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Potential Artifacts List” for items that might be found by workers. • Worker training of what to look for notify supervisor and the Historic expert to evaluate found objects. • “Stop Work” plan that includes the capacity and options for handling all historic artifacts. |

| Item | Responsibility | Description |
|--------------------|--|--|
| 05.24-06 Cont'd | Kathy, Keith, Rocci, Deb Kathy, Deb Navy, NASA, MFHM Keith, Linda | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Descriptions of how the Navy will handle artifacts to ensure they can be restored to operation and their historic value will not be compromised. · Larry recommends team-building barbeques for Contractor and Owner's representatives including the MFHM Staff. · Artifact preservation can be deferred based on Navy's schedule for efficiency and funding. Lists will be adjusted. Also, see deferred artifact items below including windows and squadron art. |
| 05.24-07 | NASA, RAB, Navy | <p><u>Window Alternate – Preservation</u> The alternate to remove and store the window for \$1.5 million includes the removal and storage of <u>all</u> windows in the hangar. Dr. Ann Clark is also addressing this item scheduled to be removed next December. Preserved windows are scheduled to be cleaned and stored in Building 207. Lower windows are not unique and might be considered to omit from alternate scope to reduce the price of \$1.5 million.</p> |
| 05.24-08 | RAB | <p><u>Squadron Art</u> The squadron logos are painted on plywood on freestanding buildings within the hangar and are a lower priority to the historic value of the structure.</p> |
| 05.24-09 | Navy, NASA Kathy | <p><u>CONCLUSION</u> Lenny concluded that the OMB's decision states that the Navy is "obligated" to work with NASA to allow for the rehabilitation of the building. The RAB is looking for an understanding of how the work will be packaged and allowing for adjustments that will permit the Board to contribute to the success of the future restoration</p> <p>Lenny requested Kathy provide answers to Subcommittee prior to RAB Meeting for action items in these minutes including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Incorporation of NASA and RAB recommendations for the historic artifacts. · Move objects on site, in Hangar with option for moving artifacts from one side of the artifacts from one side to another · Provide Historic preservation training and oversight during the deconstruction. · Provide a Web cam for real-time review as requested. <p>Bill B. concluded by saying we must keep the lens on the fact that Hangar One will most likely be historically restored by the private sector.</p> <p>Meeting adjourns at 9:45 PM.</p> |
| 05.24-10 | | <p><u>NEXT MEETINGS</u> RAB Meeting – 07 08.10. See Page 1. RAB Subcommittee Meeting – TBD.</p> |

END OF MEETING MINUTES