

5090
Ser 1843.1/L6171
April 3, 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 March 14, 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, April 11, 1996, at the City of Mountain View Police/Fire Administration Building. The meeting will begin at 7:00 p.m. The auditorium schedule has been confirmed for our use. The agenda for the meeting is as follows:

7:00-7:02 PM Meeting Overview
7:02-7:04 PM Minutes Approval
7:04-7:25 PM Remedial Project Managers Meeting Report
7:25-7:40 PM Subcommittee Reports
7:40-8:10 PM Iron Curtain Presentation
8:10-8:30 PM Iron Curtain Discussion
8:30-8:40 PM Break
8:40-8:55 PM RAB Quiz
8:55-9:00 PM Agenda/Schedule for May 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,

Original signed by:

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

2806

Distribution:

Elizabeth Adams
Bernie Album
Maurice Ancher
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

Julio
Mary
John

Valera
Vrable
Young

Ser 1843.1/L6171
April 3, 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, green

File: Moffett

MOFFETT FEDERAL AIRFIELD
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING

MEETING MINUTES

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

THURSDAY, MARCH 14, 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) at 7:35 p.m. The meeting was delayed because of a schedule conflict. Mr. Chao reviewed the following agenda items for this meeting:

- Minutes approval
- Remedial project managers' (RPM) meeting report
- Middlefield-Ellis-Whisman (MEW) meeting report
- Committee reports
- Future transfer issues discussion
- Presentation: "Station-wide Remedial Investigation (RI) Report"
- Federal Facilities Agreement (FFA) and document status discussion
- Agenda and schedule for April RAB meeting

II. MINUTES APPROVAL

Mr. Chao solicited comments on the minutes of the February 8, 1996 RAB meeting. Mr. Michael Gill, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), noted that the lessee at the Sacramento Army depot (page 7 of the minutes) should be Packard Bell, not Pacific Bell. Mr. Bob Moss, community co-chair, noted a typographical error on page 3 of the minutes. The minutes were approved as corrected.

III. RPM MEETING REPORT

Mr. Gill provided a report of the March 13, 1996 RPM meeting. Mr. Gill stated that the three Navy Site 9 source control measure treatment systems were operating at a combined flow rate of approximately 23 gallons per minute. He reported that the Site 14 recirculating in situ treatment (RIST) system was not operating due to electrical problems. Mr. Gill stated that the Navy had completed a quarterly sampling event in February 1996 that focused on new wells throughout Moffett Field.

Mr. Gill reported progress on the site-wide ecological assessment (SWEA). He noted that dose modeling had been completed. He indicated that the draft final phase II report was due on April 12, 1996. Mr. Gill added that polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) and pesticides concentrated at outfall areas appeared to be the primary ecological risks. He reported that the Navy and the regulators had resolved issues related to the human health risk assessment in the station-wide RI report and that the final version of the report was due on April 1, 1996.

Mr. Gill reported that comments on the draft operable unit (OU) 5 record of decision (ROD) were due in the coming week. He indicated that EPA comments would focus on the need for a clearer and more complete discussion of applicable laws and regulations. Mr. Gill stated that comments on the OU 1 ROD would be due in about 45 days.

Mr. Gill reported on the iron curtain pilot test. He stated that construction of the passive treatment system was scheduled to begin in April. He noted that a tour for RAB members was planned for April 19, 1996. Mr. Chao added that the tour would begin at 1:30 p.m. and last about 1 to 2 hours. He indicated that additional information would be provided at the next RAB meeting. Mr. Lenny Siegel, Pacific Studies Center, volunteered to solicit media coverage of construction if the Navy desired.

Mr. Gill reported that the annual update of the Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Cleanup Plan (BCP) was scheduled to be submitted on March 22, 1996. He noted that the update was presented as a short business plan to save resources over preparing a full revision.

Mr. Gill reported that the Moffett Field information repository would be relocated in the near future while the Mountain View library is remodeled. He indicated that the relocation would last about 2

years and that the Mountain View city hall was one option for a replacement location. Mr. Gill stated that city hall hours would allow access to the repository 3 days per week from 1:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. Mr. Siegel suggested contacting the Sunnyvale library. Mr. Stewart McGee, City of Sunnyvale, agreed to contact the library. Mr. Moss stated the city hall hours would not be acceptable to most people.

Mr. Gill reported that the RPMs discussed the state's recently revised petroleum cleanup guidance. He indicated that the guidance contains criteria to evaluate human health risks from petroleum, but that ecological risks were considered separately. Mr. Michael Rochette, California Environmental Protection Agency (Cal/EPA) Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Francisco Region (RWQCB), added that Region 2 had prepared additional information and that he would provide copies of the new petroleum cleanup guidance at the next RAB meeting.

Mr. Moss asked whether the new guidance would result in limited land reuse options. Mr. Brian Werle, PRC Environmental Management, Inc. (PRC) and consultant to the Navy, responded that no restrictions on reuse were intended. He stated that the guidance allows evaluation of exposure pathways and recommends natural degradation of the petroleum if no risks exist. Mr. Moss asked whether vapor emissions, which could collect in basements or underground garages, were considered in the pathway evaluation. Mr. Werle replied that this pathway was included in the evaluation process.

Mr. Moss stated that, even if a petroleum plume was considered safe under the state guidance, potential property buyers may be discouraged simply by the presence of contamination. He added that realtors in Palo Alto consider disclosure of groundwater contamination very seriously in property transactions. Mr. David Glick, Geoplexus and community vice co-chair, noted that the petroleum guidance was based on standards developed by the American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) and that the guidance was an iterative evaluation process. Mr. Tom Harney asked how relevant the new guidance would be to Moffett Field sites. Mr. Chao responded that the guidance would be very relevant and that the Navy would re-evaluate cleanup decisions at all petroleum sites at the station. Mr. Harney added that full disclosure of all input information used in the evaluation, not simply the results of the evaluation, was important for property transfers.

IV. MEW MEETING REPORT

Mr. Tim Mower, PRC, provided a report of the March 13, 1996 MEW meeting. Mr. Mower reported that the typical meeting format included updates of National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) and Navy activities which had already been covered in the RPM meeting report. He added that the group of 12 to 15 companies within the MEW area also provide updates on recent activities. Mr. Mower reported that items of interest to the RAB included completion of the design of the regional remediation system south of U.S. Highway 101 and startup or continued operation of many of the proposed source control systems in the MEW area. Dr. Jim McClure, Harding Lawson Associates and consultant to the MEW companies, added that initial results from the Silva well program at the MEW site indicated no groundwater contamination was present in aquifers below the C aquifer. He also noted that the Navy planned to accelerate completion of the design of its long-term source control measures to more evenly coordinate with activities planned by the MEW companies on Moffett Field.

Mr. Siegel asked whether the acceleration of Navy activities was related to budget issues. Mr. Chao responded that increased coordination with the MEW companies was the main reason for changing the schedule. Ms. Mary Vrabel, League of Women Voters, asked why source controls at the MEW site were started so long after contamination was identified. Dr. McClure responded that source control implementation had begun as early as 1982, but was widely variable. He added that source controls at one site within the MEW area had still not begun, despite groundwater trichloroethene (TCE) concentrations as high as 400 milligrams per liter.

V. COMMITTEE REPORTS

Mr. Chao asked the committee chairs to deliver their reports. Dr. McClure, technical, historical, and educational (THE) committee chair, reported that the committee met on March 13, 1996 to discuss five new Navy documents. The documents included:

- Draft OU 1 ROD
- Draft OU 1 Remedial Design and Remedial Action (RD/RA) Work Plan
- Draft Eureka Laboratory Data Replacement Investigation Technical Memorandum
- Draft Wash Rack Area Investigation Technical Memorandum
- Revised Final OU 6 RI Report

Dr. McClure stated that the committee reviewed three letters from Cal/EPA containing comments on OU 1. He added that the OU 1 ROD would be the main focus for committee review and asked that all RAB members who commented on the OU 1 proposed plan review the Navy's responses.

Ms. Christina Scott, Lockheed Martin and cost committee chair, reported that the cost committee did not meet since the last RAB meeting. Ms. Leslie Byster, Silicon Valley Toxics Coalition (SVTC) and communications, media, and outreach committee chair, was not present and no committee report was presented.

VI. FUTURE TRANSFER ISSUES DISCUSSION

Ms. Sandy Olliges, NASA, stated that NASA had no active plans for reuse of Moffett Field and solicited questions and concerns from the RAB members. Mr. Rochette asked whether NASA had a long-term budget. Ms. Olliges replied that NASA did not yet have a budget for the current year and that budgets are prepared for only 1 year at a time. Mr. Moss asked to what extent NASA would take over for the Navy. Ms. Olliges explained that NASA had already taken over from the Navy and that a memorandum of understanding (MOU) between NASA and the Navy outlines each parties' responsibilities. Mr. Moss expressed concern that if the Navy did not have adequate resources, that NASA would be forced to take over. Ms. Olliges responded that the MOU, as well as the FFA, define Navy responsibilities for future actions. Mr. Chao added that the budget process is the same for NASA and the Navy.

Mr. Siegel noted that NASA had inspected the property before accepting transfer of the station. He asked whether, considering the recommended downsizing of Onizuka Air Force Base, changes would occur at the golf course and housing areas. Ms. Olliges replied that NASA maintains control of the golf course although the Air Force operates the course for NASA. She stated that the Air Force owns the housing areas. Ms. Olliges indicated that NASA would prefer that the Department of Defense (DoD) maintain the housing areas and that housing appeared to be in demand among other military groups. She added that she would solicit further information from the Air Force about future plans for the Moffett Field housing areas. Mr. Siegel asked if NASA left and the station transferred to a nonfederal agency whether areas of restricted use (landfills and the fuel farm, for example) would

remain. Ms. Olliges responded that an environmental baseline survey done at the time of transfer would evaluate land use restrictions.

Mr. Siegel asked whether the large-capacity underground storage tanks at the fuel farm would be replaced by 1998 in accordance with current regulations. Ms. Olliges replied that NASA has worked to bring the tanks into compliance with the regulations, but not necessarily to replace them. She indicated that the current tenant, the Defense Fuel Supply Center (DFSC), did not favor constructing a secondary containment system because of the very large capacity of the tanks. Ms. Olliges stated that DFSC requested a waiver from RWQCB to allow installation of a leak detection system in place of secondary containment. She indicated that the leak detection system was under construction. Mr. Siegel commented that NASA should not receive special consideration. Mr. Chao added that the Navy would remove and close the tanks when they are no longer needed.

Mr. Peter Strauss, MHB Technical Associates and consultant to SVTC, stated that he believed many additional reuse questions existed. Mr. Chao indicated that members could call him after the meeting with any additional questions and that he would forward the questions to Ms. Olliges. Ms. Olliges added that NASA will follow National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) procedures when a reuse plan is considered, but no plan currently existed. Mr. Siegel asked to what extent groundwater extraction wells and piping would restrict future land use. Mr. Chao responded that piping would follow existing utilities as much as possible and that land use probably would not be significantly affected. He added that groundwater use would be prohibited during the active remediation phase. Mr. Siegel noted that horizontal groundwater extraction wells may be useful to limit the amount of surface facilities and accompanying land use restrictions.

VII. STATION-WIDE RI REPORT PRESENTATION

Mr. Werle updated the RAB on the station-wide RI report. He stated that the purpose of the report included providing (1) a comprehensive summary of site data, (2) data for new sites, and (3) a comprehensive, station-wide human health risk assessment. The report summarizes previous investigations as well as more recent investigations at newly identified sites. The new sites include the Zook Road fuel spill, Patrol Road ditch, golf course landfills 2 and 3, active petroleum sites, and miscellaneous sites (weapons bunkers, flux ponds, and potential runway wetland). The human health risk assessment considered exposure to multiple sites and multiple media (both soil and groundwater).

Data from all sites were incorporated into the risk assessment. The risk assessment considered potential exposures from residential, recreational, and occupational uses.

Mr. Werle reported that the risk assessment indicated no immediate risks, but only potential future risks from volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and PCBs. Risks from VOCs resulted at OU 5 when soil and groundwater exposures were combined. PCB concentrations in sediments caused risks in outfall areas such as the Northern Channel and Patrol Road ditch. PCB-related risks are consistent with results to date from the SWEA. No contamination is associated with the weapons bunkers or the potential runway wetland. VOCs were detected at the flux ponds, but the ponds were cleaned up and closed. Risks related to the west-side aquifers were not included because this area will already be remediated to maximum contaminant levels (MCLs) as specified in the MEW ROD.

Ms. Scott stated that Cal/EPA Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) had significant comments on the risk assessment and asked if this part of the report had been revised. Mr. Chao responded that issues with DTSC had been resolved and that most of the requested information was already in the report and only clarifications were necessary. Mr. Siegel indicated that he did not favor segregation of risk because cumulative effects from the whole area should be considered. Mr. Strauss asked whether risks from exposures on the western side of the station affected risks calculated for the eastern side of the facility. Mr. Chao replied that the risk assessment assumed the two areas of the base remained separate. He added that the Navy had legal concerns about re-evaluating human health risks for the west-side aquifers since risks for this area were already estimated. Mr. Michael Young, PRC, added that risks calculated for the MEW assessment were included in the station-wide report, even though the risk assessment methodologies were different. Dr. McClure noted that the MEW companies did not conduct the risk evaluation, but that EPA contractors did this assessment. Mr. Siegel stated that full identification of risk may affect future funding priorities as well as future land use. He added that cumulative risks, including the west-side aquifers, should be integrated into the report for accuracy and completeness.

Mr. Werle concluded his presentation by indicating that the next steps in the station-wide process included completion of the final RI report and the draft final feasibility study (FS) report. The FS report will incorporate results from the station-wide RI as well as the SWEA and OU 6 RI. Mr. Paul Lesti asked if a radiation survey was included in the station-wide RI report. Mr. Werle replied that a survey was planned for OU 1, but had not been completed. Mr. Mower added that a survey of the weapons bunkers had been completed by NASA and results from the survey were contained in the final

work plan for the station-wide RI. Mr. Young indicated he would bring the results of this survey to the next RAB meeting. Dr. McClure encouraged members to pay close attention to the schedule for the station-wide FS report because the station-wide FS represents the public's last opportunity to comment on planned remedial activities.

VIII. FFA SCHEDULE AND DOCUMENT STATUS DISCUSSION

Mr. Young summarized scheduled delivery dates for upcoming documents. Mr. Chao added that the draft final station-wide FS report is scheduled to be submitted in August 1996 (instead of June 1996) because he received a 2-month extension from DoD. Mr. Young stated that final RODs for OUs 1 and 5 were scheduled for July and June 1996, respectively. Mr. Strauss asked when the final station-wide ROD was due. Mr. Joseph Chou, DTSC, replied that the FFA schedule indicated this document was due in September 1997. Mr. Siegel stated that ROD deadlines do not ensure funding and asked which remedial projects would be completed first. Mr. Chao responded that funding is available for the west-side aquifers source control pump-and-treat system and for the OU 1 landfill caps. He added that funding for the OU 5 pump-and-treat system was expected in about 18 months. Mr. Siegel asked whether any high priority sites were not funded. Mr. Chao indicated sufficient funds were available for all high priority sites. Mr. Siegel added that DoD had increased funding to the BRAC program and that BRAC is one of the few, well funded programs.

Mr. Moss suggested that a Gantt chart illustrating the schedule of upcoming documents and public comment periods would be useful for planning RAB activities and to avoid missing important cleanup areas or delaying the schedule. Mr. Moss announced that he had fact sheets from two Superfund sites in Palo Alto available at the meeting.

IX. AGENDA AND SCHEDULE FOR APRIL RAB MEETING

Mr. Chao indicated items for the April 11, 1996 RAB meeting would include a Gantt chart and any additional reuse questions for NASA. Mr. Siegel suggested that a presentation on the relative risk ranking system used to prioritize funding of Navy sites might be useful.

Mr. Lesti asked what progress had occurred on the SWEA. Mr. Chao replied that toxicity reference values (TRVs) had been developed for a large suite of chemicals for multiple exposures for numerous receptors within seven food chains. He stated that TRVs were selected for about 60 percent of the

possible chemicals, exposures, and receptors. He added that data were not available for every chemical for every exposure to each receptor and that, consequently, a qualitative evaluation would be needed for the remaining chemicals and receptors. Mr. Lesti asked whether the TRVs would apply throughout the San Francisco Bay region. Mr. Chao responded that the TRVs would be specific to Moffett Field and would not be applicable bay-wide. He added that the TRVs would be available for review in May 1996.

Mr. Chao closed the meeting at 9:35 p.m.