

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, May 10, 2012, at the Senior Center in Mountain View, California.

Community RAB Members in attendance:

Bill Berry, Gabriel Diaconescu, Linda Ellis, Rebecca Feind, Diane Minasian, Bob Moss, Arthur Schwartz, Steve Sprugasci, Peter Strauss, Greg Unangst, Dan Wallace, and Steve Williams.

Regulatory Agency and Navy RAB Members in attendance:

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

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

Bryce Bartelma (Navy), Don Chuck (NASA), Andy Hocker (NASA), Carolyn Hunter (Tetra Tech EMI [Tetra Tech]), Quinn Johnson (Tetra Tech), Lynn Kilpatrick (City of Sunnyvale), Lisa Lockyer (NASA), Mike Mewhinney (NASA), Amanda Michels (Army Environmental Command [AEC]), Gary Munekawa (Resident Officer in Charge of Construction, Navy), George Sloup (NASA), Dan Stralka (EPA), Kevin Woodhouse (City of Mountain View), and John Yembrick (NASA)

Other Community Members in attendance:

Dean Alford, Roderick Bersamina (Rep. Anna Eshoo's office), Larry Ellis (Air and Space West Foundation for Education), Carl Honaker (Save Hangar 1 Committee), Alex Howard, David Paredes (Bay Area News-NBC), Marty Rawson, Jeff Segall, Amalie Sinclair (Space for Progress), Bill Wissel, and Jim VanPernis (Save Hangar One Committee)

WELCOME

Bill Berry (RAB Community Co-Chair) and Scott Anderson (RAB Navy Co-Chair) opened the meeting at 7:00 p.m. and welcomed everyone in attendance. Mr. Berry said that he would like to add an update on the proposed General Services Administration (GSA) evaluation of former NAS Moffett Field and Hangar 1 to the end of the RAB agenda after the Navy has completed its site updates. The RAB agreed with the addition to the agenda.

APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

Mr. Anderson asked for corrections to or comments on the minutes for the February 9, 2012, RAB meeting. RAB member Bob Moss asked to replace the word "asked" with "told" during his statement on page 4 of the February 9, 2012, meeting minutes. The RAB voted to finalize the minutes for the February 9, 2012, meeting with Mr. Moss' correction.

DOCUMENTS FOR REVIEW

Documents are available in compact disk (CD) format. A sign-up sheet for the documents listed below was circulated during the meeting to the RAB members.

<u>#</u>	<u>DOCUMENT</u>	<u>APPROXIMATE SUBMITTAL DATE</u>
1.	Draft Final Focused Feasibility Study for Site 26 Eastside Aquifer Treatment System (EATS)	May 2012
2.	Draft Supplemental Investigation Work Plan for Site 28	May 2012
3.	Draft 2011 Annual Report for the Site 1 and Site 22 Landfills	June 2012
4.	Final Monitoring Report for the 2011 Corrective Action Plan for Site 14 South	June 2012
5.	Final Vapor Intrusion Investigation Work Plan for Site 28 Westside Aquifer Treatment System (WATS)	June 2012

NAVY ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Anderson introduced the new EPA Remedial Project Manager, Yvonne Fong, and welcomed her to the team for former NAS Moffett Field.

Mr. Anderson announced that the Navy has submitted a no further action request to the regulatory agencies for their approval on Site 27. Now that the field work is complete, the Navy has submitted the final remedial action completion report (RACR) for Site 27.

RAB BUSINESS

Mr. Berry announced that Ralph Otte has resigned from the RAB.

SITE 25 UPDATE

Bryce Bartelma (Navy) provided an update on the field work the Navy is conducting at Site 25. Mr. Bartelma said that Site 25 is about 230 acres and was historically used beginning in 1953 for storm water management at former NAS Moffett Field. Previously, the Navy conducted sampling at Site 25 and determined that a sediment remedial action was necessary. The Navy is planning to remove 32,500 cubic yards of sediment from 32 acres at Site 25, to a depth ranging from 0.5 to 1.5 feet below the surface. Once the sediment removal action is complete, the Navy will restore pickleweed and other native grasses at the site. Mr. Bartelma said that the remedial action was planned to be conducted in 2011, but the Navy needed to identify an alternative sediment remedial plan because of the amount of water that was ponded at Site 25 from heavy winter rains. Before initiating the remedial action, the Navy will need to control the water coming onto the site by temporarily re-routing the water and will use a cofferdam to manage it.

Mr. Bartelma said the Navy is ensuring there are no issues with the on-site endangered species during the sediment remedial action. The Navy is removing all of the pickleweed by hand to ensure the endangered species are not injured during the process. A silt fence will be installed around the sensitive habitat areas of the site to prevent access of endangered species to those areas. The Navy also conducted a bird survey, and no endangered species were observed at Site 25. Mr. Bartelma said that although no Western Pond Turtles are likely present at the site, the Navy is using two different types of trapping methods (basking traps and hoop traps) to ensure the presence or absence of western pond turtles before the site is dewatered and the remedial

action conducted. The Navy has worked closely with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) throughout the field work preparation process. Throughout the remedial action and site restoration, the Navy will have biological monitors ensuring that the endangered species are protected. After the remedial action is complete, the Navy will restore the pickleweed and the site will be monitored for a minimum of 2 years. Mr. Bartelma said that the Navy will complete the sediment remedial action and vegetation restoration in the fall of 2012 and will submit the RACR for regulatory agency approval in the spring of 2013. The Navy will work with USFWS and CDFG throughout the process to ensure all of the endangered species are protected.

- RAB member Greg Unangst said he is on site frequently and asked if Site 25 will be restored to a salt marsh. Mr. Bartelma said the Navy is restoring Site 25 to a storm water retention pond, which was its historical and current use. Elizabeth Wells (Water Board) said that the Navy is cleaning up Site 25 to a level that would accommodate the area as a tidal and salt marsh. Thus, if NASA determines that Site 25 should be a tidal and salt marsh in the future, the cleanup levels will accommodate that use.
- RAB member Peter Strauss asked how the water management will be conducted at the site and how much disturbance to the area (sediment) would be anticipated. Mr. Bartelma said that the Navy will use a low-flow skimming procedure to manage the water. The Navy took samples before the work began and will also collect soil and water samples at the initiation of the water management activities to ensure that there is minimal disturbance to sediments. Mr. Strauss also asked about confirmation sampling after certain areas of sediment are excavated to ensure that all contaminated sediment is removed. Mr. Bartelma stated that if the confirmation samples show additional concentrations of ecological chemicals of concern are present then an additional 6 inches of sediment will be removed and additional confirmation samples will be collected.
- Community member Marty Rawson asked how the salt marsh harvest mouse is being protected during the remedial action at Site 25. Mr. Bartelma said the Navy will use biological monitors to flush wildlife from habitat prior to the pickleweed removal and that a silt fence will be installed around that area after the flushing and vegetation removal is completed. Biological monitors will be onsite throughout the process to ensure wildlife does not reenter the excavation areas. Mr. Bartelma said that USFWS and CDFG supports the Navy's plan, and this procedure has been successful at similar sites, such as former Mare Island Naval Shipyard, that needed to protect endangered species during fieldwork.

EPA VAPOR INTRUSION UPDATE

Alana Lee (EPA) presented a vapor intrusion update for former NAS Moffett Field and the Middlefield Ellis Whisman (MEW) area. EPA has worked with the Navy, NASA, and MEW on the trichloroethene (TCE) levels. Ms. Lee said that EPA conducted tests inside and outside of NASA's Building 10 and found elevated levels of TCE from vapor intrusion. EPA is working with the Navy on a long-term solution to mitigate vapor intrusion into Building 10. Ms. Lee said there have been questions regarding changes to the EPA's TCE indoor air cleanup levels for long-term exposure. She said that the TCE indoor air cleanup levels for vapor intrusion pathway at former NAS Moffett Field and the MEW area are health protective and EPA has no plans to change the indoor air cleanup levels for long-term exposure.

- Mr. Moss said there are high birth defect rates in New York from exposure via vapor intrusion. He asked if EPA is considering birth defect concerns for California and these vapor intrusion sites. Ms. Lee said that the vapor intrusion levels being used for former NAS Moffett Field and the MEW area are protective for potential long-term and short-term cancer and non-cancer effects.
- Mr. Moss asked how long someone can be exposed to chemicals from vapor intrusion before it becomes a health issue. Dan Stralka (EPA) said EPA uses the one-in-a-million excess cancer risk rate in calculating cancer risk. Potential developmental effects are considered in EPA's TCE

Toxicity Assessment in a separate calculation for noncancer risks. EPA is assessing short-term exposure risks (e.g., 21 days) for vapor intrusion. Mr. Stralka said risks from commercial exposure at the Moffett Field and MEW sites are being calculated using an exposure duration and frequency of 10 hours per day and 5 days per week.

- RAB member Steve Williams asked about NASA's use of Building 10. Mr. Anderson said that Building 10 is used by NASA facilities personnel, and the workers are in the building periodically throughout the day, but according to NASA it averages approximately 3 hours a day.
- Mr. Strauss asked about the interim TCE short-term removal action levels for vapor intrusion in the MEW area during construction activities. Ms. Lee said that EPA is considering interim short-term removal action levels for both former NAS Moffett Field and the MEW area. Mr. Stralka said that the MEW Companies submitted a white paper on TCE and EPA Region 9's proposed short-term removal action level to EPA Headquarters. The white paper contests the EPA's recommendation and basis for the interim short-term removal action level. The MEW Companies would like additional information from EPA regarding the noncancer endpoints to help determine the weight-of-evidence calculations. EPA Headquarters is working with EPA's Office of Research and Development and will provide a response to the MEW Companies.

HANGAR 1 UPDATE

Mr. Bartelma provided an update on the Navy's work at Hangar 1. Mr. Bartelma reiterated the removal action's objective to control the release of polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) from the hangar and the Navy's actions that were taken to achieve that objective. Mr. Bartelma said that the Navy increased the biological surveys and storm water protection during the rainy season. He said the Navy and NASA have been monitoring the air, and the data have shown there is control of the air emissions around Hangar 1 during the removal action.

Mr. Bartelma said that the Navy hosted a RAB tour of the hangar on March 14, 2012. The Navy appreciated the turnout of the RAB members for the tour, though it was a rainy day. He said the Navy completed work on the permanent roof access for the Federal Aviation Administration beacon and holiday star. The Navy has completed work in zones 1 to 3 and work is in progress at zones 4 to 6. The removal action, confirmation samples, and demobilization should be completed in September 2012. The Navy will issue the After Action Completion Report in the winter of 2012.

- Mr. Unangst asked who will be responsible for the security at Hangar 1 after the Navy completes its work. Mr. Bartelma said the construction fencing along the perimeter of Hangar 1 will remain and then NASA will be in charge of the security of Hangar 1. Mr. Unangst said that he is concerned about the safety of the hangar and vandalism because former NAS Moffett Field is accessible to the public.
- Mr. Moss asked when the scaffolding will be removed from the site. Mr. Bartelma said that some scaffolding has already been removed, and the remaining scaffolding will be removed from the base to be used for other projects after the removal of the siding is complete in the August 2012 timeframe. Mr. Moss said he is concerned there is a limited timeframe to get funding in place to re-side the hangar. It would be more cost effective to install the siding while the scaffolding is on site.
- RAB member Linda Ellis asked if the coating that was applied to the frame will last 12 years. Mr. Bartelma confirmed the warranty on the coating is 12 years.
- Community member Carl Honaker asked what the Navy is doing to address the bird air strike hazards after all of the siding is removed from the hangar. Mr. Bartelma said that the Navy prepared a bird hazard air strike plan that was approved by the regulatory agencies and NASA.

NASA UPDATE

The following statement was read at the RAB meeting on behalf of NASA Headquarters:

“NASA has not moved to excess Moffett Federal Airfield or Hangar One. However, the agency is working closely with interested members of Congress and the General Services Administration (GSA) to evaluate the appropriate future stewardship of these properties. The local communities, federal, state and local agencies, local members and other interested parties would all play a key role in this process to determine how to maximize the benefit for all stakeholders. NASA is committed to a process that will best respect the airfield’s current uses, the community’s interest and the taxpayer’s value. Again, NASA has not moved to excess Moffett Field or Hangar One. A disposition of property would only take place after formal notice by NASA under GSA procedures that would ensure robust public participation and transparency in the process.

“The Navy has requested the opportunity to hold a public Open House at the completion of the de-skinning. NASA would need to work with the Navy to ensure our concerns about public safety and public access are addressed before we could commit to a large public event adjacent to the airfield. The Navy also would need to cover all cost associated with the event.”

“Public Affairs Contacts:

“NASA Headquarters Office of Communications

“Michael Cabbage, 202-358-1600, mcabbage@nasa.gov”

- RAB member Arthur Schwartz said that he is 79 years old and the community has been dealing with concerns regarding Hangar 1 since 1997. Mr. Schwartz said he wants to see every effort being used to expedite the process to reside and reuse the hangar. Adding a GSA property assessment will only slow down the reuse of the hangar. Mr. Schwartz proposed that the RAB prepare a letter expressing its concern with delaying the reuse of Hangar 1.
- Mr. Williams said he has been working with all of the groups associated with Hangar 1 since 1997 and he has gone through the hard work and process to save the hangar. The foundation for restoring the hangar is to involve the public in the process and express its concern over delays from the GSA assessment. The community needs to resist these delays and get the hangar reused.
- Mr. Schwartz said going through the GSA assessment will delay the project by months, if not years. A formal letter to NASA and GSA from the RAB expressing its concerns with this process will help. He said NASA has not been forthright with providing information to the public. The community needs to let NASA know that it needs to be transparent with its communication about the reuse of Hangar 1.
- Mr. Moss suggested the RAB issue a letter to NASA Headquarters expressing its displeasure with involving GSA in the process to re-side the hangar and thus ignoring the public and private partnership to reuse the hangar. Mr. Moss said the RAB should encourage the surrounding cities to support its letter to NASA.
- Mr. Strauss asked if GSA’s involvement in the process will cause problems with Google’s proposal (H211) to lease the hangar.
- Community member Larry Ellis said there are a few viable tenants that have expressed interest in the hangar and should be considered. Having interested local parties should help secure the community’s interest in protecting the hangar.
- Mr. Moss said the GSA assessment takes NASA’s off the hook for future responsibility of Hangar 1.
- Mr. Honaker said it is important to know who all of the key players are regarding this decision to assess the property. It is a decision that was made as part of the current political administration. The Navy

Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) program has historical experience dealing with GSA and its management of real estate, which causes unnecessary issues. Mr. Honaker said he is concerned that if Hangar 1 is not leased to H211, then Google will take its fleet of airplanes out of Silicon Valley.

- RAB member Gabriel Diaconescu suggested that the RAB discuss its concerns with the local NASA Director of AMES regarding GSA's involvement in the project. The local NASA staff will understand that this GSA evaluation does not support the community's interest in protecting and reusing Hangar 1.
- Mr. Berry said he will work with Save Hangar 1 RAB Subcommittee Chair Lenny Siegel to draft a letter to NASA and GSA outlining these concerns.
- Mr. Moss said after the RAB prepares the letter, it should be provided to the surrounding cities for their signature.
- Mr. Williams said that, based on his past experience, trying to get support from a city takes time that the RAB does not have. The letter should be issued from the RAB to NASA and GSA as soon as possible.
- Kevin Woodhouse (City of Mountain View) suggested the RAB move forward with issuing a letter to NASA since this is a timely manner and forego the process of getting support from the surrounding cities.
- Mr. Unangst said the City of Sunnyvale has already sent a letter of concern to NASA.
- Mr. Ellis said NASA and GSA cannot just excess portions of the base. The community needs to make sure the government is going to do the right thing.

PROPOSED GSA EVALUATION OF MOFFETT FEDERAL AIR FIELD AND HANGAR 1

Mr. Berry provided an update on the timeline of events regarding the release of information on the proposed GSA evaluation. Mr. Berry said he received a request from Representative Anna Eshoo's office to achieve RAB support with the concern of involving GSA in evaluating Moffett Federal Air Field and Hangar 1. Mr. Berry said the National Trust for Historic Preservation, State Historic Preservation Office, and Advisory Council on Historic Preservation submitted letters to NASA supporting the H211 proposal.

Mr. Berry agreed to submit a letter to NASA and GSA on behalf of the RAB to support Representative Eshoo and the historic agencies' concern with this proposed evaluation.

PUBLIC COMMENT / QUESTION PERIOD

Mr. Anderson opened the meeting for questions or comments from the public. No public comments were offered.

Future RAB Meetings

Mr. Anderson said that the next scheduled RAB meeting will be on August 9, 2012. The tentative schedule for RAB meetings in 2012 is:

- August 9, 2012
- November 8, 2012

DRAFT

Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned, and Mr. Anderson thanked all present for attending.

The Navy 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

ACRONYM LIST

BRAC – Base Realignment and Closure
CD – Compact disc
CDFG – California Department of Fish and Game
EATS – Eastside Aquifer Treatment System
EPA – U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
GSA – General Services Administration
MEW – Middlefield Ellis Whisman
NAS – Naval Air Station
NASA – National Aeronautics and Space Administration
PCB – Polychlorinated Biphenyls
RAB – Restoration Advisory Board
RACR – Remedial Action Completion Report
TCE – Trichloroethene
USFWS – U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
WATS – Westside Aquifers Treatment System

RAB meeting minutes are posted on the Navy's environmental website 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