

5090
Ser 1843.1/7110
February 6, 1997

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 January 9, 1997 at the City of Mountain View Police and Fire Auditorium in Mountain View, California. The meeting summary is provided as enclosure (1).

Our next RAB meeting will again be held on the second Thursday of the month, February 13, 1997. It will be held at the usual meeting location, the Mountain View Police and Fire Auditorium in Mountain View, California. The meeting will begin at 7:00 p.m. The agenda for the meeting is as follows:

7:00-7:05 PM Meeting Overview
7:05-7:10 PM Minutes Approval
7:10-7:30 PM Remedial Project Managers Meeting Report
7:30-7:45 PM Subcommittees Report
7:45-8:00 PM Stationwide Feasibility Study (FS) Discussion
8:00-8:30 PM Westside Aquifers Treatment System (WATS) Presentation
8:30-8:50 PM Westside Aquifers Treatment System (WATS) Discussion
8:50-9:00 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 my staff 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

Ser 1843.1/7110
February 6, 1997

Distribution:

Moffett Federal Airfield RAB Members
Karen Huggins, ARC Ecology/ARMS Control Research Center
Eric Ortega, 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, green
File: Moffett

Ser 1843.1/7052
December 3, 1996

Moffett RAB Members:

Elizabeth	Adams	Jack	Walker
Bernie	Album	John	Young
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		
Lenny	Siegel		
Cynthia	Sievers		
Ted	Smith		
Steve	Sprugasci		
Peter	Strauss		
Robert	Strena		
Mary	Vrable		

**MOFFETT FEDERAL AIRFIELD
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING**

MEETING MINUTES

**CITY OF MOUNTAIN VIEW POLICE AND FIRE AUDITORIUM
Thursday, January 9, 1997**

I. INTRODUCTIONS AND MEETING OVERVIEW

Mr. Don Chuck, Navy, opened the meeting of the Moffett Federal Airfield (Moffett Field) restoration advisory board (RAB) at 7:10 p.m. Mr. Chuck reviewed the following agenda items for this meeting:

- Minutes approval
- Remedial project manager's meeting (RPM) report
- Committee reports
- Presentation: "Wetlands Issues"
- Discussion of presentation
- Agenda and schedule for next RAB meeting

II. MINUTES APPROVAL

Mr. Tim Mower of PRC Environmental Management, Inc. (PRC) requested comments on the minutes of the November 14, 1996 RAB meeting. Ms. Patty Valez of the California Department of Fish and Game had two corrections on the previous minutes:

- Page 6, 2nd Paragraph: Ms. Valez requested that the last sentence be changed to indicate that comments have been requested from the Department of Fish and Game, but the comments have not been provided to the Navy yet.
- Page 8, 1st Paragraph: Ms. Valez stated that the Department of Fish and Game had inspected the habitat and was impressed with the overall quality. The Department of Fish and Game has not made a recommendation on whether modification of the habitat is necessary and requested that the minutes be changed accordingly.

The minutes were then approved as corrected.

III. RPM MEETING REPORT

Mr. Joseph Chou, Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) provided a report of the January 8, 1997 RPM meeting held at the U.S. Navy Engineering Field Activity West (EFA West) offices in San Bruno.

Mr. Chou reviewed the recent field work and documents submitted. Mr. Chou stated that the Navy's Site 9 source control measure treatment systems were operating continuously during the past month. The systems did however experience overflows because of the heavy rains. Mr. Chou explained that the Building 45 treatment system treats water that is collected from a subsurface tunnel and an electrical vault. The system routinely treats some storm water runoff, but occasionally is overrun during periods of high rain. Mr. Lenny Siegel of the Pacific Studies Center, asked if the Navy has investigated the possibility of stopping infiltration of contaminated groundwater into the conduits rather than treating it after it has infiltrated. Mr. Chuck replied that the Navy did in fact investigate this, but has not been able to implement this type of solution because of the cost. Mr. Michael Rochette of the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), stated that he will look into this possibility with the Navy and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA).

Mr. Chou then discussed the recent field work at the iron curtain site including the installation of wells and peizometers to bring the total number of monitoring points in the vicinity to 62. He also stated that the third round of sampling was being conducted this week. Mr. Chou discussed the abandonment of a former 189 foot deep, agricultural well next to the runways that was completed in December 1996. He stated that the Navy completed a video survey and abandoned the well in accordance with Santa Clara Valley Water District (SCVWD) regulations. Mr. Chou indicated that a sample of the water within the well was taken and the results indicated that no volatile organic compounds were detected. Mr. Lenny Siegel asked how this well was discovered. Mr. Chuck replied that it was obvious because of the wet area surrounding the well was wet and had a different type of vegetation than the rest of the runway area. He also stated that the Navy will summarize the action in a letter report.

Mr. Chou also discussed the submission of the August 1996 Quarterly Report. He indicated that in addition to the normal summary of analytical and water level data this report includes a summary of the reports which were submitted during the quarter.

Mr. Chou then discussed recent field activities at Operable Unit (OU) 1. He stated that two A1 wells and two A2 peizometers were installed in December. Mr. Chou stated that the Draft Final Technical Memorandum will be submitted following receipt of the laboratory results. Mr. Chou also stated that the Navy has agreed to pursue consolidation of Site 2 into Site 1. Mr. Siegel asked how this would be documented. Mr. Chou replied that the Navy would produce an alternatives analysis technical memorandum to compare consolidation and capping. Following this technical memorandum the Navy would then proceed with a proposed plan and public comment prior to producing a record of decision. Mr. Peter Strauss, MHB Associates consultant to the Silicon Valley Toxics Coalition (SVTC), asked what was found at Site 2 that prompted the reevaluation of the remedy. Mr. Chou replied that during excavations to verify the location of the gas main, the Navy found that the landfill was in fact primarily construction debris. He stated that the Navy's plan for consolidation was to begin excavation at the two locations where refuse is known to exist and excavate radially until the end of refuse is found. Ms. Cynthia Sievers noted that there is significant infrastructure within the landfill and that extreme care should be used during the excavation activities. Mr. Chou acknowledged that worker safety will be closely monitored during the action. Mr. Chuck added that most of the refuse is located north of the major gas pipeline that bisects the site and limited excavation near the gas line will be required.

Mr. Strauss asked how the limited size of the landfill relates to the initial reports of the wastes originally thought to be disposed of at Site 2. He also stated that the original investigations at Sites 1 and 2 were limited because of danger in investigations and heterogeneity of wastes. He asked if because of the information which was determined at Site 2 is the investigation methodology for other landfills at the facility being reexamined. Mr. Michael Gill, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), stated that all of the landfills at the facility had been investigated in accordance with the general guidance on the presumptive remedies for landfill sites. He stated that no change in the general methodology seemed warranted. Mr. Strauss asked if Site 1 could be characterized more thoroughly. Mr. Gill responded that he did not think that more characterization would effect the remediation decision to cap the landfill. Mr. Strauss agreed that the remedy for Site 2 should change, but that perhaps the approach for Golf Course Landfill #2 should be reevaluated.

Mr. Chou continued with the RPM meeting report by stating that comments on the draft final Station-wide FS report and the responses to comments on the draft final Station-wide Ecological Assessment Report are anticipated to be issued by the regulators by January 31, 1997. He also stated that the Navy will submit the Westside Aquifers 100% Design on January 13, 1997 and the Preliminary OU5 Design Report on February 24, 1997.

Mr. Chou summarized activities conducted by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA). NASA has taken a second round of samples at area of interest (AOI) 1. At AOI 4, NASA is awaiting comments from DTSC on the removal action fact sheet. NASA has also issued a report describing sampling results from AOI 5. The report summarizing work at the former Lindbergh Avenue storm channel (AOI 6) is in progress and additional monitoring wells will be installed in January or February.

IV. COMMITTEE REPORTS

Dr. Jim McClure, Harding Lawson Associates and consultant to the Middlefield-Ellis-Whisman companies, reported that the technical, historical, and educational (THE) committee met on January 8, 1997. He stated that the primary area of discussion at the meeting was on the ecological risk assessment. He stated that the committee was concerned that there was an apparent lack of a process to gather all of the information being collected at various sites around San Francisco Bay into a coherent forum. As a result it seems that remediation decisions are being made without the knowledge of the whole situation. Ms. Jenny Decker, California Department of Fish and Game, stated that one of the advantages of actions completed under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) is that it does allow for the evaluation of each facility without the effects of surrounding areas. Dr. McClure acknowledged this advantage, but reiterated that current investigations will not adequately contribute to the base of knowledge that will be used to make future decisions. Ms. Decker stated that the natural resources trustees such as the Department of Fish and Game are attempting to develop the base of knowledge, but are generally hampered because of a lack of funding.

Dr. McClure stated that the THE committee was also concerned that the remediation decisions at Moffett were to be based on a limited number of actions and that the types of actions were controversial. He

suggested that perhaps more of the limited resources be directed not towards remediation, but towards a more efficient evaluation of the area. Ms. Decker stated that through the synergism of the trustees and agencies, the best action for the good of the site may be taken. She also noted that there are legal limitations on the manner for funds to be expended.

Ms. Sievers stated that the South San Francisco Bay region is a unique area. She asked what body is evaluating the area and reporting on its general health. Ms. Decker replied that RWQCB was responsible for this type of evaluation. Mr. Rochette stated that RWQCB was currently evaluating the general health of the estuary and will reorganize to assist in the efforts to address watershed management areas.

V. WETLANDS ISSUES PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION

Mr. Chou introduced Ms. Decker and Ms. Valez from the California Department of Fish and Game. Ms. Decker is an attorney with the department and Ms. Valez is the technical lead for MFA. Ms. Decker then began the presentation by explaining that for the approximately 146 facilities in California in the Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) and Installation Restoration (IR) programs the Department of Fish and Game is the state natural resources trustee for fish, wildlife, and biota. She stated that in the past the primary focus of the department has been on hunting and fishing, however, recently the trustee duties have become more important.

Ms. Decker also explained that the department is often involved in dispute resolution activities. Mr. Tom Haney asked who was used for dispute resolution. Ms. Decker replied that the department uses its own resources and expertise. She stated that it was found that outside agencies do not tend to make good decisions. Mr. Haney asked if an independent mediator was used. Ms. Decker replied that no independent mediator is generally used. She also stated that most of the time agreement can be reached on the technical aspects of the dispute with the other natural resource trustees.

Ms. Decker continued the presentation by stating that the Department of Fish and Game is primarily concerned with the remedial investigation and ecological risk assessments conducted at the sites. She stated that department involvement is critical because of the different criteria used to evaluate the sites by each of the natural resource trustees. Mr. Strauss asked what are the EPA's criteria and who sets them. Ms. Decker stated that the evaluation criteria are not agreed upon by all the trustees and that a site specific

consensus is made. Mr. Strauss asked what are the exit criteria used at the sites. Mr. Chuck replied that in some instances the detection limit is used as the exit criteria. Ms. Decker stated that some of the detection limits stated in the contract laboratory program may not represent the results that can be seen using other analytical methods. She stated that if the resources cannot be used to cleanup sites to the desired levels, the risk managers are responsible for making decisions on how to best protect human health and the environment at the site. Ms. Decker stated that at most sites the cleanup goals are derived through consensus of the natural resource trustees and the risk managers.

Ms. Decker also explained the Department of Fish and Game's responsibility during natural resource damage assessments (NRDA). She stated that following the remediation at a site, the NRDA is an evaluation that is conducted by the resource trustees to value the loss of the natural resources. The resource trustees can sue the responsible party to compensate for the loss of resources. Mr. Paul Lesti asked what is the statute of limitation on NRDA actions. Ms. Decker replied that the statute of limitation is three years following completion of the remedial action. Mr. Harney asked what is the standard of proof used during NRDA actions. Ms. Decker stated that the standard of proof is that the chemical of concern is the sole or substantial reason for a damage to the resources. Mr. Harney stated that it is generally difficult for the state to sue the federal government successfully. Ms. Decker replied that the overriding concern of the department is that the remediation be completed.

Ms. Decker continued by stating that when evaluating NRDA actions, the state considers many items including the damage to the resources during the remediation process. She stated that if a cleanup is required and the resources are continued to be lost during the remediation process, the responsible party would still be potentially liable for the resource loss. Ms. Decker reiterated that the general concern of the Department of Fish and Game is more that the area be restored as quickly as possible and not that potential NRDA actions be evaluated at the sites. Mr. Siegel asked how a potential change in ownership of MFA from the federal government would be handled by the department. Ms. Decker stated that if the ownership transferred from the federal government, the federal trust lands could be forced to be restored to their original state.

Mr. Chuck then closed the meeting by informing the audience that the next meeting would be held on February 13, 1997. Mr. Chuck then solicited for potential agenda items for the next meeting. Mr. Strauss asked if the THE committee was planning on commenting on the draft final Station-wide Feasibility Study

report. Dr. McClure stated that there was no plan to comment at this time. Mr. Siegel asked if the Navy was planning on presenting an analysis of the cost to consolidate Site 2 into Site 1 at the next meeting. Mr. Chuck replied that this information will be presented in the Alternative Analysis Technical Memorandum.