

5090  
Ser 1843.1/6282  
June 28, 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. A special thanks and farewell is extended to Mayor Robin Parker for her dedicated services as a part of the Moffett RAB. We would also like to officially welcome Sunnyvale Councilmember Jack Walker to our RAB.

Our last RAB meeting was held on June 13, 1996 at the City of Mountain View Police/Fire Administration Building in Mountain View, CA. The meeting summary is provided as enclosure (1). In addition, a copy of the letter prepared by the City of Mountain View regarding funding for cleanup at Moffett is attached as enclosure (2).

Our next RAB meeting will again be held on the second Thursday of the month, **July 11, 1996**, at the City of Mountain View Police/Fire Administration Building. The meeting will begin promptly 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 Subcommittee Reports  
7:30-7:40 PM Review/Approve RAB Funding Letter  
7:40-8:10 PM Phase 2 SWEA Presentation  
8:10-8:20 PM Break  
8:20-8:40 PM Phase 2 SWEA Discussion  
8:40-8:55 PM RAB Quiz  
8:55-9:00 PM Agenda/Schedule for the Next 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

20591

Ser 1843.1/6282  
June 28 1996

**Distribution:**

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

**Blind copy to:**

184, 1843, 1843.1, 1843.2, 1843.3, 09CMN, 60.x  
PRC Environmental Management Inc. (Attn: Michael Young)  
Montgomery Watson (Attn: Chris Peterson)  
NFESC (Attn: Maureen Little)  
Information Repository (2 Copies)  
Chron, pink, green  
File: Moffett

Distribution:

Elizabeth Adams  
Bernie Album  
Maurice Ancher  
John Beck  
Charles Berrey  
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  
Michael Rochette  
Richard Schuster  
Christina Scott  
Lenny Siegel  
Cynthia Sievers  
Ted Smith  
Steve Sprugasci  
Peter Strauss  
Robert Strena  
Julio Valera

Mary  
Jack  
John

Vrable  
Walker  
Young

**MOFFETT FEDERAL AIRFIELD  
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING**

**MEETING MINUTES**

**CITY OF MOUNTAIN VIEW POLICE/FIRE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING  
1000 Villa Street  
Mountain View, California 94041**

**THURSDAY, JUNE 13, 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 7:10 p.m. Mr. Chao recognized Mr. Jack Walker as the new RAB member representing the City of Sunnyvale. Mr. Walker replaces Dr. Robin Parker. Mr. Chao reviewed the following agenda items for this meeting:

- Minutes approval
- Remedial project managers' (RPM) meeting report
- Committee reports
- Building 191 discussion regarding operable units (OUs) 1 and 5
- RAB quiz
- Presentation: "Barron Park Association Foundation Site"
- Discussion of Barron Park Association Foundation Site
- Agenda and schedule for July RAB meeting

**II. MINUTES APPROVAL**

Mr. Chao solicited comments on the minutes of the May 9, 1996 RAB meeting. Mr. Michael Gill, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), stated that page 9 of the minutes should be corrected to indicate that the use of the risk-based corrective action (RBCA) policy by the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) was outlined in a letter dated December 1995. He added that this specific policy has not been in effect since 1991, as the minutes state. Mr. Michael Rochette, RWQCB, replied that the intent of the RBCA policy has been applied since 1991 through the

concept of containment areas. Mr. Gill stated that the text of page 10 of the minutes may incorrectly imply that the regulatory agencies' position has changed to a policy that does not encourage cleanup. Mr. Chao responded that the Navy will seek clarification of these issues from Mr. Kevin Graves, RWQCB, who made the presentation.

Mr. Graves provided additional information in a telephone conversation with Mr. Tim Mower, PRC Environmental Management, Inc. (PRC) on June 18, 1996. Regarding the issue of the date of implementation of the petroleum policy, Mr. Graves stated that the memorandum outlining RWQCB's position was dated January 1996. However, he indicated that RWQCB had been attempting to implement the concepts described in the policy for the past 5 to 6 years. Concerning the implication that RWQCB policy no longer favors cleanup, Mr. Graves responded that protection of beneficial uses of groundwater was still a priority. He added that the petroleum policy allows RWQCB to consider the time required for cleanup of other contamination at the site in evaluating petroleum cleanup options. The policy does not recommend bypassing remediation, but instead allows natural processes to remediate petroleum compounds. Mr. Graves acknowledged that many issues are involved and that insufficient time was available at the April 11, 1996 RAB meeting to fully discuss them. He stated that RWQCB encourages open dialogue and debate on these issues and welcomed calls from interested RAB members at (510) 286-0435.

Mr. Bob Moss, community co-chair, stated that the address listed on page 6 of the minutes should be 395, not 365, Page Mill Road. He added that the Barron Park Association should be corrected to Barron Park Association Foundation on page 11 of the minutes. There were no other comments and the minutes were approved as corrected.

### **III. RPM MEETING REPORT**

Mr. Gill provided a report of the June 12, 1996 RPM meeting held at the California Environmental Protection Agency (Cal/EPA), Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) offices in Berkeley.

Mr. Gill stated that the Navy's Site 9 source control measure treatment systems were operating at a combined flow rate of approximately 20 gallons per minute (gpm). Four groundwater extraction wells were pumping at 1.5 to 2 gpm each and the storm drain system contributed about 12 gpm. Mr. Gill

reported that the Navy design for the west-side aquifers treatment system was in progress and that construction was expected to begin in 6 to 9 months. Mr. Gill stated that the Navy submitted the final station-wide remedial investigation (RI) report. He noted that EPA did not have comments on the draft final version and that Cal/EPA was checking that its comments on the previous version had been addressed. Mr. Gill reported that the Navy submitted the draft final phase 2 site-wide ecological assessment (SWEA) report. He added that the report quantifies risks to ecological receptors and that comments on the report are due on July 22, 1996.

Mr. Gill said that the Navy was collecting groundwater samples at the Iron Curtain pilot test site. He reported that a technical memorandum describing field activities conducted at OU1 in April 1996 was scheduled to be submitted on June 28, 1996. Mr. Gill noted that the Navy had learned that an existing underground gas line at Site 2 was actually a 36-inch diameter, high-capacity pipeline that was one of three mains supplying the City of San Francisco. The Navy is working with Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) to obtain additional information to evaluate whether the proposed landfill cap at the site will affect the line. The line will be redirected around the landfill if it cannot be left in place.

Mr. Peter Strauss, MHB Technical Associates and consultant to the Silicon Valley Toxics Coalition (SVTC), asked when this information was discovered. Mr. Chao responded that the Navy learned these details about 1 month ago. Mr. Lenny Siegel, Pacific Studies Center, suggested that a systematic search throughout Moffett Field for other, similar utilities might be useful. Mr. Chao noted that depth of the line and the potential effects from heavy earth-moving equipment are the concerns for cap construction. Dr. Jim McClure, Harding Lawson Associates (HLA) and consultant to the Middlefield-Ellis-Whisman (MEW) companies, commented that the line depth and type of backfill material used could affect the local groundwater flow, depending on the line's orientation. Mr. Strauss asked whether the Navy's horizontal conduit study contained additional information about the line. Mr. Chao replied that the study focused on the western side of the facility to investigate the effects of the subsurface infrastructure on migration of the MEW regional plume. Mr. Moss added that settlement of the pipe caused by aquifer dewatering during the OU5 groundwater remediation could be a concern. Mr. Gill said that the Navy had solicited a copy of the access agreement and a location map from PG&E.

Mr. Gill continued his RPM meeting report. He stated that the Navy and the regulatory agencies had reached agreement on the issue of Building 191 and that operation of Building 191 would be included as part of the remedy in the OU5 record of decision (ROD). Mr. Gill reported that the final OU5 ROD would be submitted in about 3 weeks. He added that the draft final OUI ROD was submitted on June 7, 1996, and contains similar language concerning the operation of Building 191. Mr. Gill noted that other issues related to the OU5 ROD had been resolved.

Mr. Gill reported that the next submittal of the station-wide feasibility study (FS) report was scheduled for August 1, 1996. He added that this report would be one of the last remedy selection documents for Moffett Field. Mr. Gill stated that EPA submitted comments on the Navy's 35 percent design report for the west-side aquifers treatment system. He noted that RWQCB's comments on a Navy report discussing the need for remediation of petroleum compounds in the Site 9 area would be submitted in about 1 week.

Mr. Gill reported on National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) activities. NASA completed backfilling operations at area of interest (AOI) 1. NASA collected groundwater samples from two new wells at AOI 2 and determined that trichloroethene (TCE) concentrations were higher than expected, confirming earlier HydroPunch results. NASA will evaluate the area for TCE sources. Samples from two new wells at AOI 3 contained lower total petroleum hydrocarbons (TPH) concentrations than indicated by previous samples. AOI 3 is being investigated to evaluate the potential feasibility of using thermally enhanced soil vapor extraction to treat contaminated soil. Samples to define hydrocarbon plumes from two leaks at AOI 4 were collected during the week of June 3, 1996. A report is scheduled for August 1996. Additional sampling is planned at AOI 5 to verify the extent of hydrocarbon contamination. Final excavation activities at the AOI 6 storm drain channel will begin during the week of June 17, 1996. The replacement well installed within the former excavation area at AOI 7 was sampled and the groundwater TCE concentration was 8.5 micrograms per liter. This groundwater TCE concentration is much lower than concentrations measured before excavation activities. DTSC approved the work plan and samples were collected during the week of June 3, 1996 at AOI 8. A report containing sample results is scheduled to be submitted in mid-July 1996. NASA plans to resample soils at some transformer locations (AOI 10) to confirm results from earlier composite samples. Sampling will occur concurrently with activities at AOI 5. NASA is preparing

closure reports for several underground storage tanks (AOI 11). Groundwater at AOIs 3, 7, 9, and 12 will be treated in conjunction with the regional remediation system planned by the MEW companies.

Mr. Gill stated that the next RPM meeting is scheduled for July 10, 1996. He added that a fact sheet prepared by Elizabeth Adams, EPA RPM for the MEW site, was available at the RAB meeting. Dr. McClure asked whether the Site 9 petroleum report was distributed to the RAB. Mr. Michael Young, PRC, responded that the report was sent as an internal review copy only to RWQCB. He added that a draft report would be prepared and distributed after RWQCB's comments were addressed. Dr. McClure noted that HLA had received approval for a natural attenuation remedy at another site. He said that he had received Navy responses to comments on the final horizontal conduit study. He added that the responses did not adequately address the MEW companies' concerns and that the station-wide RI report also did not address these issues. Dr. McClure asked about the review period for the final station-wide RI report. Mr. Gill responded that the report was final and that no additional comments were expected from the regulatory agencies. Mr. Strauss asked Dr. McClure what issues he wanted addressed. Dr. McClure replied that the MEW companies considered the scope of the horizontal conduit study too narrow. He said that the report addresses subsurface infrastructure only as a means to move existing contamination and not as a potential contaminant source. Mr. Gill responded that past spills probably had occurred but existing pollution prevention programs and remediation activities were adequate to address the potential for contamination from the infrastructure. He added that the Navy had relined a section of sanitary sewer and had ongoing source control measures for the Site 9 area and for storm drains and sumps. Mr. Gill noted that the Navy's planned remediation for the west-side aquifers also would address any potential contamination from subsurface utilities.

Dr. McClure asked what review schedule would apply to the final station-wide RI report. Mr. Chao responded that no further revisions were planned if the regulatory agencies did not submit additional comments. He welcomed any comments on the Navy's responses to regulatory agency comments. Dr. McClure stated that additional review of the horizontal conduit study was necessary, especially considering past, documented releases. Mr. Chao asked what issues remained that were not addressed by the remediation planned for the west-side aquifers. Dr. McClure stated that an agreement involving the MEW companies, the Navy, and NASA was not yet finalized and that the horizontal conduit study concerns were valid until an agreement was reached. Mr. Chao responded that the interested parties had reached an agreement in principle and that the Navy had recently received the draft agreement

between NASA and the MEW companies. He added that the remaining tasks included modifying this agreement to create a Navy/MEW agreement, and signing the agreement.

#### IV. COMMITTEE REPORTS

Mr. Chao asked the committee chairs to deliver their reports. Mr. David Glick, community vice co-chair, reported that the technical, historical, and educational (THE) committee met on June 12, 1996. He stated that the committee distributed the draft final OU1 ROD, final station-wide RI, and draft final SWEA reports for review. Mr. Glick added that the committee was pleased by the progress on resolving the issues related to the operation of Building 191. Dr. McClure stated that copies of the April 1996 final report from the Federal Facilities Environmental Restoration Dialogue Committee (FFERDC) were available from EPA. Mr. Siegel added that he also had copies available. Dr. McClure said that a handout was available at the meeting concerning an Army Superfund site in Wisconsin. He reported that the Army was proposing changing an agreed upon remedy based on insufficient funding. Dr. McClure noted that delays in implementation were usually acceptable, but changing a remedy would represent a new consideration for Superfund sites. He added that such a policy change could affect other Department of Defense (DoD) facilities, such as Moffett Field. Mr. Chao responded that he had addressed this topic previously and that the Navy might consider implementing a remedial action in phases due to reduced funding, but that the remedy itself would not be changed. Mr. Siegel stated that the FFERDC had considered this potential problem in its report.

Mr. Chao noted that the City of Mountain View had sent a letter to local congressional representatives and Navy headquarters concerning funding for Moffett Field cleanup activities. Mr. Moss asked the City of Sunnyvale to send a similar letter because continued plume migration may affect the effectiveness of some cleanup remedies. Dr. Parker responded that she had not yet received the letter sent by the City of Mountain View. Mr. Siegel said that the Navy's mechanism for setting funding priorities allocates funds first to sites with the highest risk or highest potential for contaminant migration. Mr. Chao stated that a copy of the letter sent by the City of Mountain View would be included with the announcement of the next RAB meeting. Mr. Siegel noted that SVTC had sent the letter circulated at the last RAB meeting to congressional representatives and Navy headquarters. There were no reports from the cost, organizational, or communications, media, and outreach committees.

## V. BUILDING 191 DISCUSSION REGARDING OU1 AND OU5

Mr. Chao stated that the Navy had decided to revise the text of the OU1 and OU5 RODs to include operation of Building 191 as part of the cleanup remedy. He added that this change was incorporated into the draft final OU1 ROD and would be added to the final OU5 ROD. Mr. Strauss stated that SVTC's position was that the operation of Building 191 was only part of the solution. He added that some future landowners may want to discontinue operation of Building 191 and SVTC does not want to foreclose future land uses. Mr. Strauss suggested that an additional clause be added to the RODs that clearly assigns responsibility for continued operation of Building 191 or, if there is a change in operation, that the responsible party will redesign the cleanup remedy if the change in operation renders the remedy ineffective. He noted that the RODs should contain a process to address this contingency. Mr. Siegel added that opportunities for future reuse should not be limited. For example, private reuse parties may not want to undertake the expense of continuing the operation of Building 191. He said that the issue of who is responsible—the new user or the old polluter—is an ongoing unresolved nationwide debate.

Mr. Siegel stated that the issue contains two parts. First, the ROD must require a deed restriction that requires continued operation of Building 191 or a redesign of the remedy. Second, the Navy and NASA must make clear who is responsible to record the deed restriction and NASA must sign an agreement if NASA is to be responsible. Mr. Chao responded that NASA will not sign the RODs but that the Navy was working with NASA to develop a covenant to address this issue. Mr. Siegel stated that NASA must be responsible to pass on the Building 191 operations requirement when the agency leaves the facility. Mr. Gill added that the responsible party may not be the Navy if the Navy has met its obligations under the ROD. Mr. Young noted that the Navy response to SVTC comment 2 on page 120 of the draft final OU1 ROD contains additional details as follows:

While Moffett Field remains federally owned land, the necessity of continued operation and maintenance of the pump station shall be noted in the Master Plan for the government's land uses and, in the event of any future conveyance of the property, shall be addressed by appropriate notices and land use covenants binding on subsequent property owners. While the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) deed covenant and notice requirements would be applicable to any property transfer, any change in land use (either before or in connection with a transfer) would also be subject to an evaluation pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), which would require the

government to solicit public comment and evaluate the environmental impacts, including any possible effect on the remedial activities at OU1.

Mr. Paul Lesti asked to confirm that a change in land used requires two items: notices and land use covenants to pass on to subsequent users. Mr. Alex Terrazas, City of Mountain View, asked to confirm that an environmental assessment under NEPA would be required. Mr. Chao responded that both statements were correct. Mr. Siegel asked whether NEPA requirements were enforceable enough to influence actions at the facility. He added that NEPA requires only adequate documentation for government decisions. Dr. Parker noted that any transfer of Moffett Field out of federal government control would likely result in state control of the facility. She added that state laws would then govern activities and that state laws would provide adequate controls. Mr. Strauss asked whether the City of Sunnyvale would have to conduct an environmental assessment if the city assumed operation of Moffett Field and wanted to stop pumping at Building 191. Dr. Parker responded that she assumed this was true. Mr. Siegel added that land at Moffett Field that is below sea level would be transferred to the state land trust, not to a city. He noted that, unless the contingency is planned for, continued pumping would be required even if the new landowner wanted to restore wetlands at the site.

Mr. Moss asked whether an environmental assessment was necessary if the land use changes significantly. Mr. Chao said that this was correct. Mr. Moss stated that future potential concerns would, therefore, be addressed during the environmental assessment. Mr. Siegel responded that the issue of enforcement is not resolved. Mr. Robert Strena asked what obligation the Navy has to continue cleanup operations at Moffett Field, especially in light of current budget cuts. Mr. Gill responded that EPA conducts reviews at 5-year intervals and that the Navy is also obligated to continue monitoring at the landfill sites. Mr. Siegel added that, provided any Navy funds are available for cleanup activities, the state and EPA can force the Navy to allocate funds to continue operation of Building 191. Mr. Chao welcomed any suggestions for additional text for the ROD. Mr. Siegel suggested starting with language prepared by Mr. Strauss.

Mr. Rochette stated that the current proposal to the RWQCB board states that Building 191 must remain operational, but that he could change this language. Mr. Chao agreed to review the text developed by Mr. Strauss and suggested that Mr. Strauss also review the draft final OU1 ROD to evaluate the current text. Dr. McClure stated that the RWQCB board meets on June 19, 1996 and, therefore, the RAB must act on the existing information. Mr. Rochette replied that he would distribute

any changes to his proposed text to Mr. Strauss, Mr. Siegel, and Dr. McClure. Dr. McClure commented that concerns vary among individuals and little time remained for changes. Mr. Siegel added that their views did not conflict, but only varied in emphasis.

## **VI. RAB QUIZ**

The RAB quiz was postponed due to lack of time.

## **VII. BARRON PARK ASSOCIATION FOUNDATION PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION**

Mr. Moss presented information concerning cleanup activities at Superfund sites in Palo Alto. The area of concern involved neighborhoods surrounding a Stanford University research park, including Barron Park. Leaking solvents from underground storage tanks were discovered in 1982. The Barron Park Association formed the Barron Park Association Foundation (BPAF) specifically to address the contamination. BPAF received a technical assistance grant (TAG) from EPA in 1989 to study the Hewlett-Packard (HP) site at 1501 Page Mill Road. The majority of contamination exists in groundwater down to 60 to 80 feet below ground surface. HP installed more than 130 monitoring wells at the site. BPAF also studied a second HP site at 640 Page Mill Road. This site contains several groundwater contamination plumes that are hydraulically controlled by a local pumping station that removes water from an underpass at the Oregon Expressway. Remedial activities at this site included demolition of the structure at 640 Page Mill Road and installation of groundwater extraction wells, including some wells inside the basement of a building at 620 Page Mill Road. BPAF studied a third HP site at 395 Page Mill Road. This area will be redeveloped, probably as a mixed use of housing, shops, and offices. Redevelopment is occurring even though the groundwater is contaminated and cleanup is ongoing.

Mr. Siegel asked if the sites were listed on the National Priorities List (NPL). Mr. Moss responded that the sites were on the NPL and part of the Superfund program. Mr. Lesti asked what remedy was employed for cleanup. Mr. Moss replied that groundwater extraction and treatment using air stripping was used. He added that air and steam sparging and soil vapor extraction were used effectively for soil remediation at one site. Mr. Moss reported that groundwater concentrations have declined about 20 percent during the past 5 years. He noted that BPAF has met with HP for 5 years and currently meets

with HP every 4 months. Mr. Moss stated that HP determined that community feedback through BPAF was beneficial for technical input as well as for information distribution. He noted that BPAF helped HP obtain an access agreement from an uncooperative property owner for well installations.

Mr. Siegel asked how much of the TAG was used. Mr. Moss responded that BPAF received \$43,000 for its first grant, but used only \$31,000. BPAF currently has a \$50,000 TAG for the 640 Page Mill Road site and has used about \$25,000. Mr. Moss added that the TAG extends to 1998. He stated that BPAF was writing a summary of lessons learned and project successes to be submitted to EPA in July 1996. Mr. Moss summarized his presentation by indicating that he believed that the BPAF example illustrates how open communications keep the cleanup process moving forward and save money.

Mr. Strauss asked who BPAF hired as technical advisor. Mr. Moss replied that Uribe and Associates was the main advisor. He added that the advisor provided support in three general areas:

- Hydrogeology and well system adequacy
- Baseline public health risk and comparisons to overly conservative EPA assessments
- Interpretation of technical information and review of fact sheets for technical correctness

Mr. Rochette asked whether deed restrictions were applied. Mr. Moss responded that deed restrictions were applied at the 395 Page Mill Road site because some contamination cannot be removed.

### **VIII. AGENDA AND SCHEDULE FOR JULY RAB MEETING**

Mr. Siegel suggested that the RAB study the Moffett Field fuel program. He added that he had experience with Eglin Air Force Base and similar fuel-related issues including large tanks, long pipelines, and delivery of fuel by barge. Mr. Chao responded that he would attempt to have a presentation made by the Defense Fuel Supply Center, which is responsible for the fuel systems at Moffett Field. Mr. Moss announced that he would prepare a letter for review by the RAB requesting additional funding for Moffett Field cleanup activities. Mr. Lesti suggested discussion of the draft final phase 2 SWEA report might be a topic for the next meeting. Mr. Chao noted that the next RAB meeting was scheduled for July 11, 1996. Mr. Chao closed the meeting at 9:15 p.m.



# CITY OF MOUNTAIN VIEW

Office of the Mayor and City Council • 500 Castro Street • Post Office Box 7540 • Mountain View, California 94039-7540  
415-903-6305 • FAX 415-903-6039

May 29, 1996

Mr. Mark Herbach, Head  
Operational Navy/DERA Branch  
Engineering Field Activity, West  
Naval Facilities Engineering Command  
900 Commodore Drive  
San Bruno, CA 94066-5006

Dear Mr. Herbach:

I am writing to you to express the City's concerns regarding the lack of Fiscal Year 1997 funding provided for the cleanup of Moffett Federal Airfield. The level of funding approved does not provide sufficient financial resources to maintain the Federal government's and the Navy's responsibility (and commitment) for the restoration and cleanup of Moffett Federal Airfield.

It is the City's understanding that the BRAC Moffett Federal Airfield Environmental Coordinator requested approximately \$11 million for Moffett Field cleanup programs. Unfortunately, the funding approved was well below the \$11 million necessary for the cleanup actions planned for Moffett Federal Airfield. Of the \$11 million requested, only \$1.4 million was approved for cleanup actions at Moffett Field. The \$1.4 million approved for Fiscal Year 1997 is totally insufficient to move forward with planned cleanup actions at Moffett Federal Airfield.

The City of Mountain View urges you to support providing additional financial resources to adequately move forward with the environmental cleanup of Moffett Federal Airfield. Additionally, the City urges you to pursue and support future funding requests in order to fulfill the Federal government's and, specifically, the Navy's responsibility to clean up Moffett Federal Airfield.

I look forward to your response to this correspondence and the continued cooperation from the Federal government and the Navy in regard to the cleanup of Moffett Federal Airfield.

Sincerely,

Ralph Faravelli  
Mayor

RF/AT/MJG/603-5-20-96LA/DLA

cc: The Honorable Diane Feinstein  
The Honorable Barbara Boxer  
The Honorable Anna Eshoo  
Mr. Stephen Chao  
Mr. Robert Moss  
City Council