

**FORMER NAVAL AIR STATION MOFFETT FIELD  
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING  
BUILDING 943, EAGLE ROOM  
MOFFETT FIELD, 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, 12 March 2009, at Building 943 in the Eagle Room at Moffett Field, California. Bob Moss, RAB community co-chair, and John Hill, U.S. Navy Base Closure Manager, opened the meeting at 7:00 p.m.

**WELCOME**

Mr. Hill and Mr. Moss welcomed everyone in attendance. Mr. Moss asked those present to introduce themselves after he provided a brief overview of the agenda for the meeting.

The Moffett Field RAB meeting was attended by:

RAB Members	Regulators	Navy	Consultants & Navy Support	NASA	Public & Other
10	4	2	2	7	17

**ANNOUNCEMENTS**

- Mr. Hill announced that the Navy is interviewing candidates for the Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Environmental Coordinator (BEC) position. Until a former NAS Moffett Field BEC is selected, Mr. Hill will be filling in as the Navy RAB co-chair. Mr. Moss said that the Navy has had five different BECs in the past 8 years for former NAS Moffett Field. Mr. Moss stated his hope is that the new BEC remain on the former NAS Moffett Field site long term.
- Mr. Hill announced the Navy is anticipating the Site 27 Northern Channel field work to begin in April 2009.
- Mr. Moss introduced community member, Ralph Otte, who has applied for the RAB. Mr. Moss asked the RAB members to vote on Mr. Otte’s application. The RAB members unanimously voted to approve Mr. Otte to the RAB. Mr. Moss welcomed Mr. Otte to the RAB.

**APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES**

Mr. Moss asked for corrections to the 8 January 2009 meeting minutes. Community member Steve Williams said he provided a comment on the 8 January 2009 meeting minutes electronically to the Navy. Mr. Williams would like the sentence “Mr. Williams stated that community access and particularly space set aside for the Moffett Historical Society Museum must be a primary consideration for reuse of Hangar 1” added to his statement on page 3. Mr. Moss said that on page 4, fifth bullet; the word “build” should be replaced with the word “station.” The correct statement should read “Mr. Moss said Hangar 1 would be a good place for Lockheed to station air ships.” The 8 January 2009 meeting minutes were approved as corrected. 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.

<u>#</u>	<u>DOCUMENT</u>	<u>APPROXIMATE SUBMITTAL DATE</u>
1.	Draft Sites 1 and 2 – Runway Landfill and Golf Course Landfill 2008 Annual Report	April 2009
2.	Draft Site 22 2008 Annual Report	April 2009
3.	Draft Site 25 Record of Decision	April 2009
4.	Draft Site 27 Remedial Action Completion Report	April 2009

**SITE 29, HANGAR 1 PROGRESS UPDATE**

Mr. Hill said the Navy has been working with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) on the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) for transfer of the Environmental Restoration (ER) sites at former NAS Moffett Field. The Navy is currently developing a scope of work for the removal action, consisting of removing the siding at Hangar 1 and coating the painted structural steel. Mr. Hill said the Navy plans to award the removal action contract in the summer of 2009. The removal action work plan will take 6 months to develop.

Lewis Braxton (NASA) also said NASA has been meeting with the Navy to discuss the details of the MOA. NASA estimated the costs to reside Hangar 1. NASA's calculations for the residing costs are greater than the Navy's costs. NASA has requested the Navy install watertight siding on the hangar once the removal action is complete. NASA attempted to identify a private partner to reside and reuse Hangar 1 because funding for residing the hangar is not available to NASA. NASA is considering reuse of the hangar for a "lighter-than-air" or "green" aviation project. Mr. Braxton said that during meetings with NASA Headquarters in Washington DC, NASA requested the Navy to reside the hangar before NASA will agree to the MOA. Mr. Braxton said NASA is taking on many unknown factors in transferring the ER sites into its responsibility. Mr. Braxton informed the surrounding city councils as well as some of the RAB members of NASA's decision before this RAB meeting. The Navy was just informed of NASA's decision as well. NASA will develop a community outreach program to keep the public informed of the progress on the ER program. NASA will not begin the process of transferring the ER sites from the Navy unless it is confident it can complete the program successfully.

- Mr. Moss asked if NASA has a firm figure on the hangar residing costs. Mr. Braxton responded that NASA is only beginning to develop the costs for residing. Mr. Moss confirmed the community is supporting NASA on its request that the Navy complete the removal action and residing of Hangar 1.
- A community member asked about the types of agreements in the MOA. Mr. Braxton said the MOA contains a 3-year transition process from the Navy to NASA to take over the ER sites at former NAS Moffett Field. Once the transfer process is complete, NASA would be responsible for overseeing the ER sites through the rest of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) process and NASA would be responsible for any known and unknown costs. NASA is asking the Navy to furnish the upfront costs to reside Hangar 1 because NASA's ER budget is limited and does not include funds for residing Hangar 1.

- Peter Strauss (RAB member) asked if NASA is opposed to taking over the ER sites at former NAS Moffett Field. Mr. Braxton said NASA is working with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) for its approval of the transfer of responsibility from the Navy to NASA. Mr. Strauss asked who would be responsible for long-term monitoring (LTM) of the sites. Mr. Hill said NASA would take over site by site once they reach the operation and maintenance (O&M) phase of the CERCLA process. Mr. Braxton continued that, unless the MOA is approved, the Navy will be responsible for all ER sites at former NAS Moffett Field indefinitely.
- Mr. Williams asked who is responsible for the budget of the pump-and-treat systems at former NAS Moffett Field. Mr. Braxton said that, if the MOA is executed, the Navy would transfer the funding for the pump-and-treat systems to NASA to continue the upkeep.
- Community member Georgina Hymes stated her opinion that funding should be available from the Pentagon to help the Moffett community. She suggested funding that is currently going overseas for the war efforts could be redirected to help the local community. Ms. Hymes requested NASA ask the Pentagon for additional funding.
- A community member suggested that NASA review the RAB resolution that was drafted for cleanup and reuse of Hangar 1. Mr. Braxton said NASA has seen the RAB resolution and is committed to reusing Hangar 1. NASA is working with the Navy to resolve differences on the path forward for the ER program at former NAS Moffett Field.
- Mr. Moss asked that NASA come back and update the RAB on its progress on the ER sites if the MOA is executed. Mr. Braxton reiterated that NASA is committed to keeping the RAB informed on the progress of the MOA and ER at former NAS Moffett Field. NASA is looking into developing a website to keep the community informed of the progress.

**FORMER NAS MOFFETT FIELD ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION (ER) PROGRAM BUDGET**

Ms. Lind provided a presentation on the Navy’s ER program budget for former NAS Moffett Field. The Navy receives funding for its ER programs as they are identified to Congress by priority. Congress sets a priority on funding work for sites that pose higher risk to human and ecological health. The Navy uses past information about a site and prepares a cost estimate for work to complete each phase of the CERCLA process using a cost estimating program. The Navy updates the cost estimates in October and March of each year. Once the Navy has finalized a budget, it is submitted to Congress for approval and allocation of funding.

Ms. Lind reviewed the ER sites for former NAS Moffett Field and their current costs for work per year or the cost-to-complete the project:

- Site 1, 2, and 22 Landfills \$200,000/year for LTM
- Site 25 Eastern Dike Marsh \$10,000,000 cost to complete (CTC)
- Site 26 East-Site Aquifer Treatment System (EATS) Area \$250,000/year O&M
- Site 27 Northern Channel \$0 (site closure pending)
- Site 28 West-side Aquifers Treatment System (WATS) Area \$500,000/year O&M
- Site 29 Hangar 1 \$32,000,000 CTC plus LTM costs
- Underground Storage Tanks (UST) \$4,000,000 CTC
- Basewide Groundwater LTM \$300,000/year

## FINAL

- Cooperative Agreement with San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (Water Board) \$210,000/year
- Libby Lucas (RAB member) asked about the status of the Western pond turtle relocation efforts at Site 27. She said that installing gravel in the Northern Channel does not provide viable habitat for the pond turtles. Ms. Lind said the Navy has been working with a biologist to make sure there is an inhabitable environment for the pond turtle at Site 27.
- Mr. Strauss asked if NASA will be responsible for O&M costs at Site 27 once the Navy has completed the removal action. If the MOA is executed, NASA would be responsible for O&M at Site 27. Mr. Strauss asked if there is a possibility for the ER program to receive funding from the federal stimulus package. Ms. Lind said that former NAS Moffett Field will not be receiving funding from the stimulus package.

Mr. Hill said the Navy cannot spend money until the funds have been appropriated. The Navy currently has budget for ER work in fiscal year 2009. He continued the Navy is working on the budgets for fiscal year 2010.

- Lenny Siegel (RAB member) asked if funds can be moved around easily in the BRAC Program, depending on the needs of a site. Mr. Hill responded that prior BRAC funding is different from the 2005 BRAC funding. Funds are generally allocated to the BRAC Program depending on the needs of each site. If a site does not use all of its allocated funds, the money is returned to a general pool, which can be reallocated to other sites.
- A community member asked if the Navy can transfer funding set aside for O&M to be used to reside Hangar 1. Mr. Hill answered the Navy is currently complying with the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation's request for historical mitigation for Hangar 1. The Navy is still in discussions with NASA to identify the path forward for Hangar 1. NASA's plan for the Navy to reside the hangar has cost implications that were not included in the Navy's previous cost estimates.
- Mr. Siegel asked if the Navy can provide NASA with the annual funding for long-term O&M for ER sites, is it also feasible for the Navy instead to provide the upfront costs for residing the hangar. Mr. Hill said the Navy does not have funds set aside for residing the hangar. Multiple Navy sites in California need funding for CERCLA work.
- A community member asked who in the Pentagon will make the decision if the Navy agrees to reside the hangar to execute the MOA. Mr. Hill said Assistant Secretary of the Navy B.J. Penn would be the decision-maker. BRAC reports to Mr. Penn.
- Ms. Hymes said that all of the funding has been going to the southern states. Funding is needed for former NAS Moffett Field. Ms. Hymes is concerned there is no military presence in California and she believes former NAS Moffett Field needs the funding the southern states are receiving.

## REGULATORY AGENCY UPDATE

Elizabeth Wells (Water Board) said that the Water Board staff has taken a 10 percent pay cut to accommodate budget cuts. Ms. Wells continued that each California agency has been requested to produce a plan to cut its budget. Water Board representatives were asked to take 2 additional days off each month without pay to accommodate the budget cuts.

Ms. Wells said the Water Board has been working with the Navy to close another four petroleum program sites at former NAS Moffett Field. The Water Board is reviewing a work plan to address another eight petroleum program sites.

- Ms. Lucas asked if the regulatory agencies have been involved with the Navy's plan to backfill the Northern Channel at Site 27. Ms. Lucas said the pond turtles need soft banks to inhabit and that the

FINAL

planned gravel channels will not provide viable habitat for the turtles. Ms. Wells responded she consulted with the California Department of Fish and Game on the draft site restoration plan. She clarified that only a portion of the channel will be lined with gravel. Mr. Hill said the Navy has successfully remediated the channel and provided an inhabitable environment for the pond turtles. Mr. Hill also said the Navy can provide the RAB members specific information on pond turtle management during the site restoration at Site 27.

## **RAB BUSINESS**

### **RAB Resolution Discussion**

Mr. Moss asked for RAB approval of the resolution that was drafted for Hangar 1. Mr. Strauss requested that all discussion on Alternative 4 be removed before the resolution is approved. Mr. Moss said he disagrees with Mr. Strauss' request to remove recommendations on Alternative 4. He said using Alternative 4 is a viable option to coat the hangar. Executing Alternative 4 would take a matter of months as opposed to other alternatives that will take years to complete.

Dr. Ann Clarke (NASA) indicated that NASA would not vote on the RAB resolution. NASA does not agree that Alternative 4 is a viable option for residing Hangar 1. The coating has the potential to be flammable.

Mr. Siegel said Alternative 4 is not a permanent residing option. It will not address the polychlorinated biphenyls of concern in the siding material.

Sarah Kloss (EPA) also said that EPA Region 9 does not support Alternative 4 over Alternative 10. Mr. Moss said, however, that EPA representatives in Akron, Ohio, approved of using Alternative 4. Ms. Kloss clarified that the Akron site is not included on the National Priorities List and the action taken is regulated under the Toxic Substances Control Act (not CERCLA). Therefore, EPA did not specifically select the alternative at the Akron site. Mr. Moss agreed to revise the Resolution to remove all references to Alternative 4, and to request approval of the rest of the resolution by the RAB. After a brief discussion the RAB voted 9-1 to approve the resolution rejecting actions to complete Option 10, removal of the walls of Hangar 1, unless and until there is a firm, funded commitment to replace the siding. The revised Resolution is provided as an attachment on pages 7 and 8 of these meeting minutes. The RAB agreed to wait on approving the resolution until the Navy and NASA have decided on the path forward for residing Hangar 1.

### **Future RAB Topics**

Mr. Hill announced the next RAB meeting will be held on 14 May 2009. Mr. Hill asked for additional suggestions for topics at future RAB meetings. Mr. Strauss suggested presentations on the Site 26 work plan and an update on Site 25. Mr. Siegel requested an update from the U.S. Army on the Orion Park site and its CERCLA action. Alana Lee (EPA) said EPA is working with the Army on a phased approach for Orion Park. The Army should issue a work plan for Orion Park for EPA review in the next few months. Mr. Siegel requested the update on Orion Park be provided once the work plan is issued. Mr. Hill said that he will review the RAB Charter for guidance on the Army using the Navy's RAB to provide future updates on its CERCLA action.

### **RAB Schedule**

The next RAB meeting will be held from 7 to 9:00 p.m. at Building 943 in the Eagle Room at Moffett Field, California. The 2009 RAB meetings are scheduled for Thursday evening at 7 p.m. as follows:

- 14 May 2009
- 9 July 2009

FINAL

- 10 September 2009
- 12 November 2009

### **Adjourn**

The meeting was adjourned at 9:00 p.m., and Mr. Hill thanked everyone for attending. Mr. Hill can be contacted with any comments or questions:

- Mr. John Hill  
Base Closure Manager, former NAS Moffett Field, BRAC PMO West;  
1455 Frazee Road, Suite 900; San Diego, CA 92108; Phone: 619-532-0985; Fax: 619-532-0940;  
E-mail: john.m.hill@navy.mil

### **ACRONYM LIST**

BEC – BRAC Environmental Coordinator  
BRAC – Base Realignment and Closure  
CERCLA – Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act  
CTC – Cost to complete  
EATS – East-side Aquifer Treatment System  
EPA – U.S. Environmental Protection Agency  
ER – Environmental Restoration  
LTM – Long-term monitoring  
MOA – Memorandum of Agreement  
NAS – Naval Air Station  
NASA – National Aeronautics and Space Administration  
O&M – Operation and maintenance  
PMO – Program Management Office  
RAB – Restoration Advisory Board  
UST – Underground storage tank  
Water Board – San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board  
WATS – West-side Aquifers Treatment System

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>

FINAL

**ATTACHMENT**

**\*This is submitted for information purposes on behalf of the Restoration Advisory Board (RAB)  
Community Co-chair**

Resolution Regarding Remediation Actions for Hangar One

Whereas the Navy has selected Alternative 10, remove the siding and retain only the structure of Hangar 1 in order to remediate the toxic materials in the walls but not to re-cover the structural supports or restore Hangar 1 and,

Whereas removal of the hangar walls without replacement does not preserve the historical integrity of Hangar 1 as requested by the Advisory Council for Historic Preservation, members of the community, members of the RAB, and members of local Historical Associations and,

Whereas leaving the bare structural supports will create a location next to the Moffett Field runways that will attract birds and increase the hazards of bird strikes with aircraft using the airfield and,

Whereas removing the walls of Hangar 1 will expose the utilities now housed inside the Hangar to the environment without protection, requiring NASA Ames to either relocate or enclose these utilities at a cost estimated to be significant that would be paid by NASA Ames, and

Whereas, no assured source of funding for re-skinning Hangar 1 has been identified yet, and

Whereas the Navy's estimated cost of re-skinning Hangar 1 is at least \$15 million, but NASA Ames considers this estimate to be very low, and

Whereas NASA Ames stated that at present they have no source of funding to replace the existing siding of Hangar 1 and unless and until adequate funding to re-side Hangar 1 is provided by the Navy, NASA Ames strongly opposes removal of the present Hangar 1 siding, and

Whereas Alternative 10, remove the siding and retaining only the structure of Hangar 1 but not assuring that the structure will be re-covered violates historic preservation and the expressed desires of the community members of this RAB, the position of the City Council of Mountain View, the City Council of Sunnyvale, ACHP, many community members, and NASA, and

Whereas RAB members consider Alternative 10 to be non-responsive to the goals, objectives, and needs of the community and adequate historic preservation of Hangar 1, now therefore

Be It Resolved that the RAB urges the Navy to set aside and make no attempt to act on Alternative 10 unless and until the Navy either agrees to fund in full re-skinning of the structure of Hangar 1 to be done at the same time that the existing walls are removed or until an assured source of funding to re-skin Hangar 1 is verified, and

Be It Resolved that the RAB urges the Navy not to request bids to demolish the walls of Hangar 1 unless and until it is assured and verified that re-skinning Hangar 1 has been funded and will be done promptly after the walls are removed, and

FINAL

Be It Resolved that the RAB urges the Navy to be attentive and responsive to the requests that Hangar 1 be preserved and its' historic integrity be protected as stated by ACHP, members of the community, members of the RAB, local historic associations, and the City Councils of Mountain View and Sunnyvale.

Approved this 12th day of March, 2009 by the Moffett Field RAB by a vote of 9 in favor, 1 opposed.