

National Aeronautics and
Space Administration
Ames Research Center
Moffett Field, CA 94035-1000

N00296.002318
MOFFETT FIELD
SSIC NO. 5090.3



DQH:218-1

JUN 22 1995

Reply to Attn of:

Mr. Stephen Chao
Department of the Navy
Engineering Field Activity West
900 Commodore Way, Building 101
San Bruno, California 94066-0720

Dear Mr. Chao:

This letter contains NASA's comments on the *Moffett Federal Airfield formerly Naval Air Station, Moffett Field California, Additional Sites Investigation Phase II Draft Report*, dated April 20, 1995 as described below.

General Comments/Questions:

1. Are the other additional sites (i.e. #23, the Golf Course Landfill 3, and #24, the active Petroleum Sites) addressed in the Station-wide Remedial Investigation?

2. Page 4, Section 1.3 Geology

It would be helpful to have a figure that graphically displays the aquifers (i.e. A, B, C), aquifer zones (A1, A2, B2, and B3) and aquitards in cross-section.

3. Page 5, Section 1.4 Terrestrial Ecology, 2nd para.

The burrowing owl is a California species of special concern and a candidate 2 species for Federal listing.

3rd para.

The California black rail is not found at Moffett (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Black Rail Survey, 1993).

The San Francisco forktail damselfly is not listed as endangered. It was previously a Candidate 2 species, but has received downgraded status from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (personal communication Harding-Smith, 1995, U.S.F.W.S.).

Other species on Moffett but not included in this section are the black shouldered kite (California fully protected, endangered species), the loggerhead shrike and salt marsh yellow throat (Candidate 2 species), and the horned lark and American white pelican (California State species of special concern).

4. Page 8, Section 1.5.1 Zook Road Fuel Spill Site, 3rd para.

The relevance of the NASA fuel farm site to the Zook Road Fuel spill site is not stated. And although petroleum contamination has been identified at the NASA fuel farm there is

no evidence (from Navy or NASA monitoring or sampling events) that any contamination from the NASA fuel farm has migrated downgradient from the site. Even OVA readings from the soil borings taken upgradient of the Zook Road site as part of this investigation indicate that "hydrocarbon concentrations in the soil quickly diminished with distance from SBZR-2A and SBZR-2D" (pages 8 and 9, Section 1.5.1).

The VOC's detected in the soils are at a depth coincident with groundwater levels at the NASA fuel farm and are probably from the regional VOC plume which extends through this site.

5. Pages 14-15, Section 2.2 Cone Penetrometer Testing, 3rd para.

Were some pore pressure dissipation tests conducted more than once on a single CPT? Which ones? (If seventeen tests were conducted, and tests were only conducted at 11 of the 15 CPT points).

6. Page 16, Section 2.4.1.1 Soil Reconnaissance Borings

Add "north" to "approximate distances <north> from SBZR-8 of 10 feet and 25 feet...." to aid in reading, especially since the reconnaissance borings are not shown on any figure.

7. Page 20, Section 2.7 Aquifer Testing

Why were no observation wells used during the tests? They could have been used to indicate any effect on the "perched" water (monitoring wells WGC2-3 and WGC2-2) within the landfill, especially since each well was tested individually. Were any calculations made to determine the radius of influence during drawdown?

8. Page 20, Section 2.8 Surveying of Investigation Sites

USGS benchmark H-111 is not shown on figure 1 as indicated and would be more informative if plotted on figure 2.

9. Page 22, Section 3.0 Investigation Results, para. 2

Delete duplicate text, "posted on the results" on line 2.

10. Page 23, Section 3.1.1 Site Lithology, para. 3 and Plate 1

The zone of soil discoloration in the unsaturated soil is a little misleading as shown in the cross-sections on Plate 1 since the "green" color is only shown for the clay soil type. Either change the legend box to reflect diagonal lines only (no green color) in the silt, sand and silty sand areas or color them green too.

11. Page 31, Section 3.3.1 Site Lithology, para. 2 and Plate 2

On Plate 2, the monitoring well location nearest to point D on the plan view is indicated as "WGC2-1/SBGC2-12" but in cross-section D-D' is shown as "WGC2-1 (SBGC2-6)". In addition, monitoring well WGC2-7 is also indicated as "SBGC2-12" on the plan view (i.e. there are two SBGC2-12's at different locations shown on the plan view).

para. 3

The height of landfill should be indicated as being measured above ground surface.

PAGE 3

COMMENTS ON THE
DRAFT ADDITIONAL SITES INVESTIGATION
PHASE II REPORT

THE ABOVE IDENTIFIED PAGE IS NOT
AVAILABLE.

EXTENSIVE RESEARCH WAS PERFORMED BY
NAVFAC SOUTHWEST TO LOCATE THIS PAGE.
THIS PAGE HAS BEEN INSERTED AS A
PLACEHOLDER AND WILL BE REPLACED
SHOULD THE MISSING ITEM BE LOCATED.

QUESTIONS MAY BE DIRECTED TO:

DIANE C. SILVA
RECORDS MANAGEMENT SPECIALIST
NAVAL FACILITIES ENGINEERING COMMAND
SOUTHWEST
1220 PACIFIC HIGHWAY
SAN DIEGO, CA 92132

TELEPHONE: (619) 532-3676