

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, August 9, 2012, at the Senior Center in Mountain View, California.

Community RAB Members in attendance:

Bill Berry, Gabriel Diaconescu, Linda Ellis, Rebecca Feind, Libby Lucas, Diane Minasian, Bob Moss, Arthur Schwartz, Lenny Siegel, 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]), and Elizabeth Wells (San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board [Water Board])

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

Bryce Bartelma (Navy), Don Chuck (NASA), Wilson Doctor (Navy), Beth Flynn (AMEC Environmental), Steve Hall (Accord Engineering), Mark Hightower (NASA), Carolyn Hunter (Tetra Tech EMI [Tetra Tech]), Lynn Kilpatrick (City of Sunnyvale), Cynthia Rueles (EPA), George Sloup (NASA), Kevin Woodhouse (City of Mountain View), and Tommie Jean Valmassy (Tetra Tech)

Other Community Members in attendance:

Dean Alford, Beth Bunnenberg, Larry Ellis (Air and Space West Foundation for Education), Georgiana Hymes, Sarah Lewis, Jodine Morris, Jack Nadeau, Delbar Jahanian, Iraj Jahanian, Marty Rawson, Tammy Skoog, and Bill Wissel

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 announced that the NASA Inspector General (IG) report "NASA's Infrastructure and Facilities: An Assessment of the Agency's Real Property Leasing Practices" was released and he will make sure to distribute it electronically to the RAB after the meeting. The link to the report is: <http://oig.nasa.gov/audits/reports/FY12/IG-12-020.pdf>

APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

Mr. Anderson asked for corrections to or comments on the minutes for the May 10, 2012, RAB meeting. On page 6, "Mr." needs to be changed to "Ms." Ellis. The RAB voted to finalize the minutes for the May 10, 2012, meeting with the 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 Site 29 Long-Term Management Plan	September 2012
2.	Final Zook Road, Sump 63 and UST Closure Report	September 2012
3.	Draft Vapor Intrusion Monitoring Summary Report	October 2012
4.	Final 2011 Annual Report for the Site 1 and Site 22 Landfills	November 2012

HANGAR 1 UPDATE

Bryce Bartelma (Navy) provided an update on the field 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 were taken to achieve that objective. Mr. Bartelma said that birds in one bird nest in the hangar have not fledged. The biologists are monitoring the nest and it will be removed from the hangar once the birds have fledged. The Navy has been conducting surface, water, and air monitoring to ensure protectiveness to human health and the environment during the removal action at the hangar. Mr. Bartelma announced that the final piece of siding material was removed from Hangar 1 on July 19, 2012. The Navy replaced the electrical components of the holiday star on top of the hangar and needed a helicopter to complete the work. Now that the removal action portion is complete, the Navy will tear down the scaffolding by the end of October 2012 and complete the final touch-ups, cleaning, and surface soil removal by the end of November 2012. The Navy plans to submit the after action completion report in the winter or spring 2013 for regulatory agency approval.

- RAB member Steve Williams asked how much manpower is anticipated to be needed to prevent the animals and birds from entering the hangar and ensure safety for those using the runways. Mr. Bartelma said that the Navy has a bird airstrike hazard plan (BASH) that works in conjunction with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act to protect the birds. The Navy has been working with NASA and its biologists to ensure that there is a buffer zone for the nesting birds and burrowing owls during the removal action. A cannon is used to keep the birds off the runways and has been approved by the NASA biologists. Once the Navy completes its work at Hangar 1, NASA will take over responsibility to ensure the BASH is followed. Mr. Williams said that there is not an easy answer to address the bird and runway hazards and the Navy is not addressing them effectively. NASA has to address serious risks with the runway hazards. Mr. Bartelma said that the Navy has been working with NASA throughout the process to ensure that the transition will be successful.
- RAB member Peter Strauss asked if the Navy has finalized the hangar soil removal work plan (WP). Mr. Bartelma said the Navy finalized the soil removal WP. Mr. Anderson said the Navy will conduct the soil removal and confirmation sampling to ensure that no contaminants remain.
- RAB member Bob Moss asked if there is a warranty for the coating on the hangar. Mr. Bartelma said the coating used on the hangar has a 12-year warranty. Mr. Moss asked who pays for repair or maintenance to the coating since there is a 2 percent anticipated degradation annually that needs to be

considered. The coating on top of the hangar will wear quicker than the rest because it is exposed to the weather. Mr. Bartelma said that there are regularly scheduled maintenance checks and touch-ups included in the hangar operations and maintenance (O&M) plan. The Navy installed a platform at the top of the hangar to ensure that it is easily accessible for future O&M.

- RAB member Linda Ellis said that the O&M plan and installation of the platform on the roof of the hangar have not been reviewed or commented on by the RAB.
- Mr. Moss said that he would like to see the inspection procedures that are outlined in the O&M plan since it will be at least 12 years until it is resided for reuse. Mr. Moss said that he would have preferred the Navy to spend the \$40 to \$45 million to reside the hangar as opposed to coat it and continue to perform regular maintenance and coating touch-ups. The 2 percent degradation of the coating annually should have been considered into the overall costs. Mr. Moss said that there are concerns of pinholes in the coating that will go undetected and will cause problems later.
- RAB member Gabriel Diaconescu asked that the RAB get a presentation from the Navy and NASA that outlines the transition plan for the hangar. The RAB would like to know the transition process and also where the RAB stands once the hangar is managed by NASA. Mr. Bartelma said that the Navy has worked closely with NASA throughout the removal action and will continue to do so to transition all of the installation restoration sites at former NAS Moffett Field. Mr. Anderson said that as long as the Navy is working at the site, the RAB will continue to meet and discuss its environmental restoration work. Mr. Anderson said that reuse topics for former NAS Moffett Field, including reskinning the hangar, will need to be addressed in a different venue than the RAB. Mr. Strauss said that the Navy will be completing environmental work for quite a few more years and the RAB will continue to meet regularly. Mr. Diaconescu said his concern is that there will be items that will be lost in the transition.
- Mr. Williams said that the community needs to find a new venue to discuss the reuse of Hangar 1. Mr. Williams asked that NASA become more active in the discussions and meetings in regards to the hangar. Mr. Anderson said that the Navy will be involved in the remainder of Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) steps for the hangar from the feasibility study (FS) to the record of decision (ROD), which will be discussed at future RAB meetings.
- Mr. Berry said that he would like a report from General Services Administration (GSA) on the surplusing of property, including the hangar and runways at former NAS Moffett Field, at a future RAB meeting.
- RAB member Arthur Schwartz suggested that the community consider developing a community advisory board to address the reuse of the hangar.
- RAB member Lenny Siegel said that portions of the regional trichloroethene (TCE) groundwater plume the Navy is responsible for cleaning up will take many years to complete. Until the regional groundwater plume is cleaned up, the RAB will be meeting to receive updates.

SITE 25 UPDATE

Mr. Bartelma 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 has been used as a storm water management system for former NAS Moffett Field since 1953. The Navy issued the Final Remedial Design and Remedial Action Work Plan (RD/RAWP) for Site 25 in March 2012, which proposed removal of more than 32,500 cubic yards of sediment from 0.5 to 1.5 feet below ground surface. Once the sediment removal action is complete, the Navy will restore the vegetated areas with pickleweed and other native grass, which will be monitored for 2 years to ensure the re-vegetation is successful. The Navy re-routed the storm water prior its discharge to the site. This allowed the site to dry out naturally. As of August 2012, all of the water has evaporated from Site 25. Mr. Bartelma said

the Navy is ensuring there are no issues with the on-site endangered species during the sediment removal action by working closely with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG). The Navy removed all of the pickleweed by hand to ensure the endangered species were not injured during the process. A silt fence will be installed around the sensitive habitat at the site to prevent endangered species from accessing the excavated areas. The Navy also conducted a bird survey, and no endangered species were observed at Site 25. Mr. Bartelma said the vegetation removal at Site 25 is almost complete and the biological surveys and sediment excavation are ongoing. The Navy plans to submit the remedial action completion report (RACR) for Site 25 in the spring of 2013.

- Mr. Strauss asked how the water will be kept out of Site 25 until the removal action is complete. Mr. Bartelma said the storm water retention ponds have a lock and key system to manage the water, and the Navy is re-routing stormwater and WATS water temporarily to the east-side of the base.
- RAB member Libby Lucas said that the Navy's removal action at Site 25 will run into the clapper rail nesting season. Mr. Bartelma said the Navy is aware of the clapper rail nesting season, and the removal action at Site 25 is planned to be completed by the end of September 2012. The Navy's work will be completed before the beginning of the clapper rail nesting season. The biologists have been monitoring the site and have not encountered a clapper rail to date. Mr. Anderson said the Navy conducted trapping for the western pond turtle on the eastern-diked marsh portion of Site 25 and has not encountered one to date.
- Mr. Strauss said that only 2 years of vegetation monitoring seems optimistic. He asked whether there are there additional funds set aside in case the habitat does not flourish and more than 2 years of monitoring is necessary. Mr. Strauss said the Navy should have a contingency fund for Site 25. Mr. Anderson said that the Navy has been closely working with USFWS and CDFG to ensure the vegetation takes at the site and flourishes. Mr. Bartelma said that generally pickleweed is a hardy plant.
- Mr. Siegel asked where the Navy is getting the pickleweed to re-vegetate Site 25. Mr. Bartelma said that the Navy will not replant the pickleweed that is taken from the site before the removal action. The site will be hydroseeded with native plant species, and the pickleweed seeds have been harvested from the site and will also be brought in from a local source.
- Community member Marty Rawson asked when the last burrowing owl was spotted at Site 25. Mr. Bartelma said the Navy saw one burrowing owl recently. The biologist has been monitoring Site 25 and has found that most of the burrows are from western harvest mice on site.

NAVY VAPOR INTRUSION UPDATE

Wilson Doctor (Navy) provided an update on the Navy's vapor intrusion work at former NAS Moffett Field. Mr. Doctor said that in August 2010 EPA amended the soil and groundwater cleanup remedy for the Middlefield-Ellis-Whisman (MEW) Superfund Study Area (Site) to address the vapor intrusion pathway. The Navy agreed to implement the vapor intrusion remedy in its area of responsibility on former NAS Moffett Field. The vapor intrusion pathway is the migration of volatile chemicals, such as TCE, in the shallow groundwater upwards through the soil and possibly through cracks and openings in the building foundation or subsurface structures. As part of the assessment, the Navy conducted visual inspections in November 2011 and April 2012 of all buildings within the Navy's area that are currently occupied or will be occupied in the future. The building and facilities managers were interviewed to find out the building use, operations, occupancy and work hours, building ventilation system operations, chemical use, and any information that should be considered in planning the vapor intrusion assessment. From May 18, 2012, through June 12, 2012, the Navy collected 258 air samples in 23 buildings. The sampling results indicate that a majority of the buildings had TCE detections above outdoor air levels but below the indoor air cleanup levels. Multiple samples exceeded indoor air cleanup levels from Buildings 10 and 126. TCE results exceeded the cleanup level from a single location in each of

Buildings 3, 12, N210, and N239A. Mr. Doctor said that the heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) system operation in Building N210 had been previously modified as an interim vapor intrusion mitigation measure. The indoor air is below indoor air cleanup levels with the building ventilation system in operation. In Building 10, Mr. Doctor said the Navy installed a blower system in the utility corridor as an interim vapor intrusion control measure to prevent vapors from migrating into Building 10. To address the nearby tetrachloroethene (PCE) and TCE source to Building 126, the Navy has planned a groundwater investigation for the fall of 2012 (Site 28). Mr. Doctor said that additional air samples will be collected to determine the source and pathway of the TCE vapors found in Building 239A. The slightly elevated TCE in air may be caused by routine activities in an adjacent utility room. Mr. Doctor said that the Navy will develop a RD/RAWP to implement the appropriate vapor intrusion response actions in the buildings.

- Mr. Siegel confirmed that only two buildings had vapor intrusion above indoor air cleanup levels. He asked whether the Navy used EPA's regional screening levels for vapor intrusion when sampling the buildings. Mr. Doctor said the Navy used EPA's indoor air cleanup levels in the 2010 ROD Amendment and the Navy's sampling results were generally consistent with previous sampling results.
- Mr. Siegel said that vapor intrusion is more pronounced in the winter months and wanted to know if the Navy was going to collect another round of samples then. Mr. Doctor said that there is a possibility that follow-on samples could be collected during the winter.
- Mr. Siegel said that he was pleased that the Navy collected samples with both the HVAC systems on and off. Mr. Siegel asked if the Navy's sampling approach took into account the new information about TCE and the potential short-term health concern (e.g., cardiac birth defects). Mr. Doctor said that the Navy has been working with EPA on the sampling methods and we are aware of EPA's proposed interim short-term removal action level. Mr. Siegel said that EPA is working on a national level on the short-term health impacts of TCE.
- Don Chuck (NASA) said that the blowers in Building 10 and the associated tunnel are being run 24 hours a day to manage the vapor intrusion.
- Mr. Moss asked which EPA cleanup values the Navy is using for its vapor intrusion results. Mr. Anderson said that the Navy is using EPA's indoor air cleanup levels established in the 2010 ROD Amendment. Alana Lee with EPA has stated at previous RAB meetings that that the TCE indoor air cleanup levels continue to be protective for both short-term and long-term exposure.
- Mr. Siegel said that he wants to make sure the Navy is being as protective as possible when analyzing vapor intrusion risk. Yvonne Fong (EPA) said that EPA Region 9's proposed interim TCE short-term removal action level is generally based on three times the indoor air cleanup level. EPA HQ is currently discussing how to address the new short-term TCE risk values at vapor intrusion sites.
- Mr. Moss asked if nine to 11 vapor intrusion sampling locations in an average sized building is acceptable. Mr. Doctor said that the number of samples collected depends on the size and use of the building.
- Mr. Strauss asked about the use of Building 10 historically. Mr. Doctor said that Building 10 was a boiler room and provided steam heating for portions of the base. It is currently used by maintenance contractors. The Navy spoke with NASA and it was confirmed that the steam line that runs from Building 10 to Hangar 1 can be closed since it is not used anymore.
- Mr. Siegel asked if NASA plans to take any additional actions for Building 10. Mr. Chuck said that NASA has an environmental management report that addresses some of the utilities around Building 10. The utility corridor beneath Building 10 is not used, but appears to be serving as preferential migration pathway for vapors. Mr. Chuck said that the PCE found in Building 10 is probably coming from the

Building 88 source area. Mr. Anderson stated that additional investigation of the former Building 88 area is planned for late summer/fall 2012.

PUBLIC COMMENT / QUESTION PERIOD

Mr. Anderson opened the meeting for questions or comments from the public. Mr. Anderson asked if the RAB members have anything else they would like to comment on or discuss.

- Mr. Siegel said the GSA is in discussion of the future use of former NAS Moffett Field in Washington D.C. There is no funding in any of the upcoming budgets to reskin the hangar. Mr. Siegel said that at the headquarter level at NASA, the reskinning and Google H211 proposal for future use of the hangar is not part of the agency's mission. The best option to get NASA support for reuse of the hangar is to get the air and space foundation involved in the future use of the hangar.
- Mr. Williams said that it does not sound promising that the H211 proposal will move forward.
- Mr. Moss said that NASA will have problems leasing the hangar if it is not reskinned first.
- Mr. Siegel said that NASA's administration does not have a need for the hangar, which he said is not surprising.
- Community member Larry Ellis said that the hangar should be leased to Google for plane storage. The hangar should be returned to its original use.
- Community member Georgina Hymes said that scientists want to see the hangar resided so a space shuttle can be housed there for visitors to see.

Future RAB Meetings

Mr. Anderson said that the next scheduled RAB meeting will be determined once schedules are assessed. The Navy will send an announcement out to the RAB once the date has been determined.

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

BASH – Bird Airstrike Hazard

BRAC – Base Realignment and Closure

CD – Compact disc

CDFG – California Department of Fish and Game

CERCLA – Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act

EPA – U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

FS – Feasibility Study

DRAFT

GSA – General Services Administration
HVAC – Heating, ventilation and air conditioning
HQ – Headquarters
IG – Inspector General
MEW – Middlefield Ellis Whisman
NAS – Naval Air Station
NASA – National Aeronautics and Space Administration
O&M – Operations and maintenance
PCB – Polychlorinated biphenyls
PCE — Tetrachloroethene
RAB – Restoration Advisory Board
RACR – Remedial Action Completion Report
RAWP – Remedial Action Work Plan
RD- Remedial Design
ROD — Record of Decision
TCE – Trichloroethene
USFWS – U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
VOC – Volatile organic compound
WB - Water Board
WP – Work Plan

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