

5090
Ser 1813CG/L3098

01 DEC 1992

From: Commander, Western Division, Naval Facilities Engineering Command
To: Distribution

Subj: INSTALLATION RESTORATION PROGRAM FOR NAVAL AIR STATION,
MOFFETT FIELD - SEPTEMBER 1992 PUBLIC MEETING QUESTIONS AND
ANSWERS

Encl: (1) NAS Moffett Field, National Priorities List Site, Public Meeting, Questions
Posed To The Panel, September 9, 1992

1. Enclosure (1) is provided for your use and information.
2. Should you have any questions regarding this matter, the point of contact is Commander, Western Division, Naval Facilities Engineering Command (Attn: Ms. Camille Garibaldi, Code 1813CG, (415) 244-2516).

Original signed by:

GILBERT A. RIVERA
By direction

Distribution:

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (Attn: Roberta Blank) 1536
Department of Toxic Substances Control (Attn: Cyrus Shabahari) 1537
Regional Water Quality Control Board (Attn: Elizabeth Adams) 1538

Copy to:

Middlefield-Ellis-Whisman Study Area (Attn: Eric Madera)
Schlumberger Technology Corp. (Attn: Bob Bostic)
SAIC/TSC (Attn: Fred Molloy)
Santa Clara Valley Water District (Attn: Tom Iwamura)
NASA Ames Research Center (Attn: Sandra Olliges)

Blind copy to:

(w/o encl) 181, 1813, 1813SC,
(w/encl) 09CMN, 1813CG, Admin. Record (w/2 copies)
NAS Moffett Field (Code 189, LT Openshaw)
COMNAVBASE San Francisco
IT Corp. (Attn: Don Cox, Martinez) (Attn: Keith Bradley, Knoxville)
Martin Marietta Energy Systems, Inc. (Attn: Paula Pritz)
PRC Environmental Management, Inc. (Attn: Josh Marvil)
Writer: C. Garibaldi, 1813CG, 2516
File: MOFFETT/MON RPT

1536
1537
1538

**NAS MOFFETT FIELD
NATIONAL PRIORITIES LIST SITE
PUBLIC MEETING
QUESTIONS POSED TO THE PANEL**

**September 9, 1992
Eagles and Anchors Club**

Panel Members

Roberta Blank	US Environmental Protection Agency
Bobbie Smith	Regional Water Quality Control Board
Cyrus Shabahari	State of California Environmental Protection Agency
Stephen Chao	Navy-Western Division, Naval Facilities Engineering Command
James Haas	NAS Moffett Field
Keith Bradley	IT Corporation
Joe LeClaire	James M. Montgomery, Inc.

Questions for Roberta Blank:

I didn't understand the impact on the endangered species, are they harmed by the toxics or how, are they threatened?

Answer:

There will be an ecological risk assessment performed on OU 6, specifically, and on the remainder of the base for the overall or site-wide risk assessment. Information from existing studies will be used and new information gathered.

When will EPA require the current RI reports to be updated to reflect the 21 new wells installed since April 1992 - some of which are reported to have high chemical concentrations?

Answer:

EPA has not received the final report for the 21 wells. The IT Corp. prepared RI reports will include all of the information available to the Navy at the time of their preparation. The information will be included within the final RI report if the results are available for the 21 new wells at that time. The information can also be presented within the feasibility study after the RI is complete.

When will EPA require the Navy to show all areas with high chemical concentrations on its maps - for example west of Hangar 1?

Answer:

The Navy RI report is currently under review by the EPA. Comments from the EPA and other interested parties will be addressed in future versions of the OU 4 RI report.

Why are wells being "closed down" around Mountain View? Refilled, capped, etc.? Any relationship between the closures of Mountain View water wells and Moffett Field?

Answer:

Many of the old production wells owned by the City of Mountain View are being closed due to the lack of use of the wells. Current Santa Clara Valley Water District requirements state that any production well which has been inactive must either be reopened and used or be properly abandoned after one year. The city currently cannot use the production wells for fear of causing lateral spreading the regional plume so the city is permanently abandoning the wells as required by the Santa Clara Valley Water District.

Are there any seepages from Moffett reaching the Mountain View water well #18 (the well that provides water with Hetch Hetchy for residents along Murlagan and Tyrella St. areas)?

Answer:

Mountain View wells 10, 17, and 18 are still available for pumping and are periodically used for additional water by the city on an as needed basis. There is no indication of seepage or water quality degradation of the producing intervals in any of those three wells. Water from these wells is blended with water from Hetch Hetchy for taste purposes.

Reviewers have pointed out many significant errors and omissions in the present RI reports. When will these RI reports be completed and corrected, if EPA approves them now? Will EPA require more investigations prior to EPA approval?

Answer:

We are still reviewing, and will address a number of points in our discussions with Navy, via informal dispute resolution process. The FFA dictates the timeframe and process for resolution.

The present RI reports do not provide sufficient data on Moffett Field potential sources to permit the MEW companies to design the EPA mandated regional groundwater remedial system. When will EPA require the Navy to fully identify and investigate all Navy potential sources?

Answer:

The EPA believes that sufficient information currently exists on the nature and extent of contamination beneath NAS Moffett Field for the MEW companies to initiate their remediation design. The Navy is currently in the final process of addressing the last of the potential source areas defined in the MEW record of decision.

Question for Roberta Blank and Stephen Chao:

When will the Navy include all available data for Moffett Field in its RI reports, as EPA requires private parties to do in their RI reports. This is necessary to permit meaningful review of the RI reports by the public.

Answer:

The EPA currently requires the Navy to provide all pertinent data within the RI reports. Newly acquire data are included within the body of the report, while previously published data are enclosed by reference.

The revised RI has maps showing "clean" groundwater around west edge of Hangar 1, yet Navy HydroPunch data show high levels of contamination. Why does the RI ignore what is an obvious potential source?

Answer:

The contours for various contaminants in the OU 4 area were developed based on data from monitoring wells. Additional data from HydroPunch samples were used to develop trends in areas where no monitoring well data were currently available. HydroPunch data are by virtue of its nature a one time sampling event and are generally not legally-enforceable data, therefore the HydroPunch data are used only as a trend indicator.

Review of historical maps and air photos show that the buildings and land use on Moffett Field have changed significantly over the years. Historical activities have never been completely described so that all potential sources can be investigated. When will this be done and reported? For example, when will the Navy address the older auto hobby shop area that predated the construction of Building 544?

Answer:

The Navy is currently in the process of reviewing the Initial Assessment and the Confirmation Studies to determine if any additional information is available which suggests that additional source areas may be present at NAS Moffett Field. If additional suspect buildings or source areas are identified, they will be investigated during the feasibility study phase. These investigations, if necessary, will not affect the current schedules for the remedial designs currently being conducted by the Navy and the MEW companies.

Question for Stephen Chao:

The Initial Assessment Study and the RI Work Plan both describe leaking drum storage and solvent wash down of spills near the ends of Hangar 1 - Why haven't these areas been investigated or addressed in the OU2 or OU4 RI reports?

Answer:

The Navy is currently in the process of investigating the reports on the current and former waste handling procedures in the areas adjacent to Hangar 1. Several discrepancies exist in the IAS and the CS descriptions which suggest that the waste handling areas described in the IAS and CS may have actually been at the corners of Hangars 2 and 3.

Questions for Keith Bradley:

In regard to Sites 8 & 9 impact study, when you say "contamination may impact groundwater for drinking", are you talking about groundwater utilized for Mountain View residents?

Answer:

The reference to "groundwater for drinking" refers to the use of groundwater directly underlying the sites. Using this groundwater as a potable water supply is only for the purpose of conducting a risk assessment. This groundwater is currently unusable and would be remediated prior to any potential use. The contamination detected at Sites 8 and 9 does not threaten the drinking water supplies of the City of Mountain View. This contamination is not only located downgradient of the Mountain View well field, but is also separated from the drinking water aquifers by thick relatively impermeable layers of clay.

Will contaminants eventually seep to lower levels? If they do, does that affect public drinking water systems? Will remediation prevent this?

Answer:

The contamination in the regional plume currently has affected only the upper aquifers in the Santa Clara Basin. The drinking water aquifer, referred to as the C-aquifer zone is protected from the overlying contamination by a thick aquitard. Additionally, the hydraulic heads in the C-aquifer zone prevent contamination from migrating downward under the present conditions. The only extraction wells operating in the vicinity of the regional VOC plume are operated by the City of Mountain View. The production from these wells is closely monitored by the City of Mountain View and the California Department of Health Services to assure that the wells are operated in a safe manner.

Question for Jim Haas:

When will complete restoration be achieved? How much is it ultimately costing, including surveys and reports as well as actual cleanups?

Answer:

The restoration of the ground water and soils at NAS Moffett Field has been estimated to take as long as 20 to 30 years. The estimated cost for the full remediation of the regional VOC plume has been estimated to be in the vicinity of 100 million dollars.

Questions for Joe LeClaire:

Please address the movement of TCE in groundwater toward the bay and wetlands.

Answer:

TCE contamination has been only detected in the two upper aquifers in the vicinity of the San Francisco Bay and the wetlands. The Navy and the MEW Companies are currently investigating the existence of a cone of depression in the vicinity of the bay which has affected the two

contaminated aquifers and serves to prevent any further migration of the regional plume towards the bay or the wetlands.

Has anyone checked for seepage at the Moffett Station into the Hetch Hetchy pipes that run through Moffett Field?

Answer:

The Hetch Hetchy aqueduct is located hydraulically upgradient of NAS Moffett Field and run through the Middlefield-Ellis-Whisman properties. This aqueduct is a continuously pressurized underground pipeline and is not susceptible to infiltration of contaminated groundwater from the regional VOC plume.

Questions for anyone:

If new or previously ignored sources of contamination are discovered after the RI is deemed complete, will they be addressed in FS and RD phases?

Answer:

The current RI/FS process used by the EPA allows for additional source incorporation throughout the entire process. Additional sites can be added to the RI/FS at any time up to and including during the preparation of the final Record of Decision (ROD).

Any evidence that lower aquitards could be penetrated/dissolved as the uppermost aquitard has been?

Answer:

To date, no evidence of significant contamination of the lower aquifers has been detected. The few areas of low level contamination that have been detected are attributable to old agricultural supply wells which are currently being properly abandoned by the MEW Companies and the Navy. The low levels of contamination currently detected pose no threat to the drinking water supply.