

5090
Ser 1843.1/L6134
March 7, 1996

Dear RAB Member:

On behalf of the Moffett Federal Airfield (MFA) Base Closure Team and the Community Co-Chair, you are invited to our next Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) meeting.

Our last RAB meeting was held on February 8, 1996 at the City of Mountain View Police/Fire Administration Building in Mountain View, CA. The meeting summary is provided as enclosure (1). Our next RAB meeting will again be held on the second Thursday of the month, **March 14, 1996, at the City of Mountain View Police/Fire Administration Building.** The meeting will begin at 7:00 p.m. The agenda for the meeting is as follows:

7:00-7:02 PM Meeting Overview
7:02-7:04 PM Minutes Approval
7:04-7:20 PM Remedial Project Managers Meeting Report
7:20-7:30 PM MEW All Parties Meeting Report
7:30-7:40 PM Subcommittee Reports
7:40-8:00 PM Future Transfer Issues Discussion
8:00-8:20 PM Station-Wide RI Report Presentation
8:20-8:40 PM Station-Wide RI Report Discussion
8:40-8:55 PM FFA Schedule & Document Status Discussion
8:55-9:00 PM Agenda/Schedule for April RAB Meeting

If you have any questions or comments, please contact me at (415) 244-2563, Mr. Hubert Chan of this office at (415) 244-2562, or Mr. Robert Moss, Moffett's Community Co-Chair, at (415) 852-6018.

Sincerely,

STEPHEN CHAO
BRAC Environmental Coordinator
Moffett Federal Airfield

Distribution:

Moffett Federal Airfield RAB Members
Karen Huggins, ARC Ecology/ARMS Control Research Center
Gay Howard, Onizuka Air Station
Maurice Bundy, Potential RAB Member

Ser 1843.1/L6134
March 7, 1996

Blind copy to:

184, 1843, 1843.1, 1843.2, 1843.3, 09CMN, 60.x

PRC Environmental Management Inc. (Attn: Michael Young)

PRC Environmental Management Inc. (Attn: Tatiana Roodkowsky)

Montgomery Watson (Attn: Chris Peterson)

NFESC (Attn: Maureen Little)

Information Repository (2 Copies)

Chron, pink, green

File: Moffett

Distribution:

Elizabeth	Adams	Julio	Valera
Bernie	Album	Mary	Vrable
Maurice	Ancher	John	Young
John	Beck		
Charles	Berrey		
Michael	Bessette		
Anne	Blakeslee		
Dena	Bonnell		
Jim	Burgard		
Steve	Chin		
Diane	Cho		
Joseph	Chou		
Bob	Climo		
Ann	Coombs		
Robert	Davis		
Russ	Frazer		
Michael	Gill		
David	Glick		
John	Gurley		
Jim	Haas		
Thomas	Harney		
Bob	Holston		
Thomas	Iwamura		
Susan	Jun		
Byron	Leigh		
Paul	Lesti		
Michael	Martin		
James	McClure		
Stewart	McGee		
Bob	Moss		
Sandra	Olliges		
Edwin	Pabst		
Robin	Parker		
Richard	Schuster		
Christina	Scott		
Lenny	Siegel		
Cynthia	Sievers		
Ted	Smith		
Steve	Sprugasci		
Peter	Strauss		
Robert	Strena		

**MOFFETT FEDERAL AIRFIELD
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING**

MEETING MINUTES

**CITY OF MOUNTAIN VIEW POLICE/FIRE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING
1000 Villa Street
Mountain View, California**

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 1996

I. INTRODUCTIONS AND MEETING OVERVIEW

Mr. Stephen Chao, Navy co-chair, opened the meeting of the Moffett Federal Airfield (Moffett Field) Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) and reviewed the following agenda items for this meeting:

- Minutes Approval
- Remedial Project Manager's (RPM) Meeting Report
- Committee Reports
- Presentation: "Post-ROD Public Participation"
- Agenda/Schedule for March RAB Meeting

II. MEETING MINUTES APPROVAL

Mr. Chao solicited comments on the minutes for the January 11, 1996, RAB meeting. The minutes were approved without amendment.

III. REMEDIAL PROJECT MANAGER'S MEETING REPORT

Mr. Michael Bessette, California Environmental Protection Agency (Cal/EPA), Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), provided a report of the February 8, 1996 RPM meeting.

Mr. Bessette provided an update on recent National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) activities. NASA is preparing for additional overexcavation of soils at the Lindbergh Avenue storm channel. The RPMs requested cross sections illustrating results of excavation activities to date.

Mr. Bessette reported that the Navy provided a letter indicating that Sump 25 would be included in the remediation of the naval exchange (NEX) gasoline station. He noted that the Navy had collected surface water and sediment samples from the Northern Channel at the site of a previous sheen on the water. Mr. Bessette stated that a report will be prepared to summarize the sample results. Mr. Bessette indicated that the Navy public works center is preparing to construct a fence around the Site 2 landfill to prevent future illicit dumping. The fence is scheduled to be completed within the next 2 months.

Mr. Bessette stated that operations at the Site 14 recirculating in situ treatment (RIST) system are continuing and that an evaluation report will be prepared in the summer. He noted that the Navy is working to correct problems related to controls for the Building 45 treatment system at Site 9. Mr. Bessette reported that quarterly sampling is scheduled for February and that the Navy had repaired several leaking artesian monitoring wells. He indicated that the blower for the Site 5 bioventing system had been repaired and that an evaluation report for Site 5 was scheduled for April 1996.

Mr. Bessette reported that the draft final site-wide ecological assessment (SWEA) report was expected on April 12, 1996 and that the final report was scheduled for June 1996. He noted that the Navy was responding to comments on the draft final station-wide remedial investigation (RI) report and that the final report was due on April 5, 1996. Mr. Bessette stated the draft final station-wide feasibility study (FS) report was scheduled to be submitted on June 1, 1996. He indicated that the operable unit (OU) 5 draft record of decision (ROD) was submitted on February 7, 1996 and was expected to be finalized on June 3, 1996.

Mr. Bessette noted that activities for the iron curtain pilot test were progressing and that construction was anticipated in March. He noted tracer tests to evaluate groundwater velocity had mixed results, but the reaction wall would be constructed using a conservative thickness of 6 feet. Mr. Lenny Siegel, Pacific Studies Center, asked what funds and contract vehicle were used for the pilot test. Mr. Chao responded that Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) funds were used for a fixed price contract. Mr.

Chao added that a RAB tour will be held during construction, probably about 1 week following the next RAB meeting. He indicated that additional information would be presented at the next RAB meeting.

Mr. Peter Strauss, MHB Technical Associates and consultant to the Silicon Valley Toxics Coalition (SVTC), asked why the iron curtain pilot test was being conducted and what outcome was expected. Mr. Chao replied that the reaction wall technology, if effective, could be used in addition to pumping. Mr. Strauss asked if the Middlefield-Ellis-Whisman (MEW) companies planned to use the technology. Mr. Chao responded that the MEW companies are waiting to evaluate the success of the pilot test. Mr. Strauss stated that the pilot test may only be an experiment without a real cost benefit. Mr. Chao indicated that operation and maintenance (O&M) costs for the in situ iron curtain technology would be significantly less than pump and treat O&M costs. Mr. Siegel encouraged the Navy to spread the results of the pilot tests more widely throughout the Department of Defense (DoD). Mr. Chao responded that the Navy has a program to coordinate studies such as the iron curtain and that results will be distributed throughout DoD.

Mr. Bessette continued his summary of the RPM meeting. He noted that the regulators will meet with the Navy in March to discuss changes to the state's petroleum sites cleanup guidance. Mr. Bessette reported that the Navy is preparing a business plan update to the BRAC cleanup plan instead of revising the entire report. He indicated that the Navy was incorporating comments from the City of Mountain View and the California Integrated Waste Management Board into the OU 1 responsiveness summary. Mr. Bessette reported that the RPMs discussed the recent finding of suitability for transfer (FOST) prepared for NAVAIR Manor.

Mr. Strauss asked what were the implications of a sheen on the Northern Channel. Mr. Bessette replied that understanding the source of the sheen was important because the channel ultimately discharges to San Francisco Bay. Ms. Christina Scott, Lockheed Martin, asked when the sheen was observed. Mr. Chris Petersen, Montgomery Watson, responded that the sheen was observed in early December 1995 after a heavy rain and that samples were collected during December 19 to 21, 1995. He added that disturbing the channel sediments creates a sheen on the water.

Mr. Chao summarized issues related to the NAVAIR Manor FOST. He indicated that the 10.9-acre property is located about 1 mile south of Moffett Field. Residential housing was built in 1952, damaged during the Loma Prieta earthquake, and demolished in 1990. Asbestos was removed during demolition. No lead or asbestos were detected in soil samples collected after demolition. The property was transferred to Sunnyvale for use as low-cost housing. An environmental baseline survey is available for review at the Mountain View public library.

Mr. Siegel asked if the transfer was a sale or a public benefit transfer. Ms. Robin Parker, City of Sunnyvale, responded that the property was sold, not leased, to the city for development as low-income housing. Mr. Chao added that two other Navy properties related to Moffett Field exist off site: (1) Shenandoah housing and (2) Crows Landing. Shenandoah housing consists of townhomes near the intersection of Middlefield Road and Moffett Boulevard that are now owned by the Air Force. The Crows Landing auxiliary landing field, about 50 miles southeast of Moffett Field, was transferred to NASA. Ms. Scott asked what price was paid for the NAVAIR Manor property. Ms. Parker replied that market price was paid. Mr. Siegel added that a public benefit conveyance cannot be used for housing.

A RAB member asked if NASA leaves, would Moffett Field be transferred to a city. Mr. Chao indicated that other federal agencies would have first choice for the facility. He asked that additional discussion on the topic be postponed until Ms. Sandy Olliges of NASA was available.

IV. COMMITTEE REPORTS

Mr. Chao asked the committee chairs to deliver their reports.

A. Communications, Media, and Outreach Committee

Ms. Leslie Byster, SVTC, reported that the RAB brochure was available. She indicated that she would discuss distribution with Mr. Chao.

B. Technical, Historical, and Educational (THE) Committee

Dr. McClure, Harding Lawson Associates and THE committee chair, announced that three handouts were available at the RAB meeting. The handouts concerned Cal/EPA Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) comments on the draft final station-wide RI report. Dr. McClure reported that the THE committee had discussed issues related to the station-wide RI report with PRC Environmental Management, Inc. (PRC) at the last meeting and that the committee had provided comments from Ms. Scott and Ms. Cynthia Sievers to PRC.

Dr. McClure asked what was the status of obtaining an extension to the June 1, 1996 deadline and whether the RAB should provide assistance. Mr. Chao responded that Navy counsel determined that the draft final (not the final) station-wide FS report is due June 1, 1996. He added that the Navy can meet this schedule. Dr. McClure asked how the remaining schedule was set and whether the final FS report would be on an expedited schedule. Mr. Chao replied that National Defense Authorization Act set no additional deadlines but that the Moffett Field federal facilities agreement (FFA) specifies time frames for report review and completion. He added that the review times arranged in the FFA can be changed by agreement of the Navy and the regulators. Mr. Chao noted that reports do not automatically become final if the Navy and the regulators do not agree; instead, the schedule is extended to allow for dispute resolution. Ms. Sievers suggested that an overview of the FFA process and time frames involved would be useful. Mr. Chao agreed to provide an overview.

Dr. McClure reported that the THE committee discussed changes in future land use if Moffett Field is transferred from NASA. The committee suggested PRC meet with the Navy to prepare a written synopsis of future land use issues that could be presented to the RAB and also incorporated into the station-wide RI or FS reports. Mr. Siegel added that the Navy has a national position on this issue and that the states often do not agreed with the position. He indicated that property transfers may favor long-term leases in the future.

Mr. Strauss asked what were the committee's main observations regarding the station-wide RI report. Ms. Sievers summarized her comments in two areas: (1) landfill concerns, and (2) future uses of the report. She noted similar landfill concerns as for OU 1 (contents, landfill boundaries, and groundwater monitoring). Ms. Sievers expressed concern over the time allowed for gathering risk-related data,

especially if the report becomes a data source for the future. She added that a table summarizing significant impacts and directing the reader to sections of the report could be a useful addition to the executive summary. Mr. Chao replied that he would consider the suggestion. Mr. Strauss asked if the station-wide FS report would only address other sites not already covered by OU-specific reports. Mr. Chao responded that the station-wide risk assessment evaluated cumulative risks (both to soil and groundwater) over all sites and was not restricted to "new" sites. Ms. Sievers reiterated that a table summarizing significant risks would be helpful. Mr. Bob Moss, community co-chair, added that the table should also indicate areas that are not problems so readers have confidence that all areas and issues were examined.

C. Cost Committee

Ms. Scott, cost committee chair, reported that the committee did not meet since the last RAB meeting.

V. POST-ROD PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PRESENTATION

Mr. Chao introduced Mr. Michael Young, PRC, to update the RAB on remedial design (RD) activities that will follow after a ROD is completed. Mr. Young described various plans and documents that are completed during the design of a cleanup project including construction designs, monitoring plans, and O&M plans. Construction designs are, in general terms, instructions for contractors to follow in implementing the cleanup. Drawings and specifications provide the detailed instructions. These documents are prepared at draft and final levels and will be summarized in a public information fact sheet. Monitoring plans address types and frequency of monitoring and reporting requirements. O&M plans form the instruction manual for system operation and include topics such as equipment changeout, safety, and maintenance procedures. Mr. Young stated that thorough reviews of preliminary documents are important because designs are much more easily modified during the early, rather than late, stages.

Ms. Sievers asked where quality assurance and quality control (QA/QC) fit in the design process. Mr. Young replied that each document addresses QA/QC and that a field QA process also operates during construction. Ms. Mary Vrabel, League of Women Voters, asked who receives the O&M manual. Mr. Young responded that the contractor uses the manual and reports back to the Navy. Mr. Moss

stated that a mechanism should exist to stop a cleanup system if data for several years of operations indicate the site is clean. Likewise, a similar process should occur if asymptotic contaminant levels are reached and no further cleanup progress is made. Mr. Young responded that the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) requires re-evaluation of the cleanup remedy's protectiveness every 5 years. This process includes public participation. Mr. Moss asked if the process could occur sooner than at 5-year intervals. Ms. Elizabeth Adams, EPA, responded that 5 years is the maximum time period and that petitions for changes can be made at any time.

Mr. Chao discussed remedial action (RA) activities that follow the completion of the RD phase. The RA phase includes contracting, construction, and operation and maintenance. After securing funds, the Navy selects a contractor. Contracting options include competitive bid, remedial action contractor (RAC), indefinite quantities contractor, or small business. The time until contract award varies from 60 to 120 days depending on the contract vehicle. Using the RAC or indefinite quantities contractors takes less time because much of the contracting is already completed.

Mr. Chao indicated that, after the contract award, the contractor prepares various documents including administrative submittals (such as a health and safety plan), a construction schedule, and construction submittals (for example, specific equipment selections). This preconstruction period usually lasts 2 to 6 weeks. The Navy grants a notice to proceed to the contractor after all documents are acceptable. Construction commences and can last from 2 weeks to 18 months, depending on the complexity and scale of the project. Implementation of the action follows. The O&M and long-term monitoring plans describe activities during the cleanup period, which may last more than 50 years.

VI. AGENDA/SCHEDULE FOR MARCH RAB MEETING

Mr. Chao announced that the next meeting of the RAB will take place on Thursday, March 14, 1996, at 7:00 p.m. He asked the RAB members to suggest agenda topics. Mr. Chao indicated that an overview of the FFA time frames, the station-wide RI report, and future transfer issues would be agenda topics.

Ms. Susan Jun, DTSC, reported on how other closing bases hold RAB meetings. She indicated that the RAB for the Sacramento Army Depot meets quarterly and distributes a newsletter. The BRAC coordinator is responsible for addressing RAB concerns not the lessee, Pacific Bell. Ms. Jun stated that the RAB for Hamilton Air Force Base (AFB) meets monthly and provides quarterly newsletters. She noted that she could provide contacts at these bases if RAB members wanted further information. Dr. McClure added that he knows the community co-chair of the Hamilton AFB RAB and that ongoing land use issues are also a concern there.

Mr. Chao closed the meeting at 9:10 p.m.