

5090
Ser 6421/8028
November 6, 1997

Dear RAB Member:

The Moffett Federal Airfield (MFA) Base Closure Team and the Community Co-Chair would like to be the first to wish you a Happy Holiday Season ahead. No meetings are scheduled for November and December. The next meeting will be in January.

Our last RAB meeting was held on October 9, 1997 at the Mountain View Senior Center in Mountain View, California. The meeting summary is provided as enclosure (1). Our next RAB meeting will be held on the third Thursday of the month, **January 15, 1998**. It will be at 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
7:10-7:40 PM Remedial Project Managers Meeting Report
7:40-7:50 PM Subcommittees Report
7:50-8:10 PM Draft Final Stationwide FS Presentation
8:10-8:40 PM Draft Final Stationwide FS Discussion
8:45-9:00 PM Agenda/Schedule for the next RAB Meeting

If you have any questions or comments, please contact me at (650) 244-2563, Mr. Hubert Chan of my staff at (650) 244-2562, or Mr. David Glick, Moffett's Community Co-Chair, at (408) 987-0210,

Sincerely,

ORIGINAL SIGNED BY:

STEPHEN CHAO
BRAC Environmental Coordinator
Moffett Federal Airfield

5090
Ser 6421/8028
November 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:

10A, 642, 6421, 6426, 6422, 09CMN, 60B
Tetra Tech EM Inc. (Attn: Tim Mower)
Montgomery Watson (Attn: Kim Walsh)
NFESC (Attn: Maureen Little)
Information Repository (2 Copies)
Chron, green
File: Moffett

Moffett RAB Members:

Ann	Coombs	Alternate Member
Russ	Frazer	Alternate Member
Stewart	McGee	Alternate Member
Maurice	Ancher	Community Member
John	Beck	Community Member
Robert	Davis	Community Member
David	Glick	Community Member
John	Gurley	Community Member
Paul	Lesti	Community Member
Bob	Moss	Community Member
Edwin	Pabst	Community Member
Richard	Schuster	Community Member
Lenny	Siegel	Community Member, Pacific Studies Center
Ted	Smith	Community Member, Silicon Valley Toxics Coalition
Steve	Sprugasci	Community Member
Robert	Strena	Community Member
Mary	Vrabel	Community Member
Alex	Terrazas	Community Member, Mountain View Representative (Interim)
Jack	Walker	Community Member, Sunnyvale Representative
James	McClure	MEW Representative
Sandra	Olliges	NASA Representative
Steve	Chin	Regulatory Member
Scott	Flint	Regulatory Member
Michael	Gill	Regulatory Member
Jim	Haas	Regulatory Member
Loren	Henning	Regulatory Member
Bob	Holston	Regulatory Member
Thomas	Iwamura	Regulatory Member
Michael	Rochette	Regulatory Member
Joyce	Whiten	Regulatory Member
Peter	Strauss	Silicon Valley Toxics Coalition TAG Consultant

**MOFFETT FEDERAL AIRFIELD
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING**

MINUTES

**CITY OF MOUNTAIN VIEW SENIOR CENTER
266 Escuela Street
Mountain View, California 94041**

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 9, 1997

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 reviewed the following agenda items for this meeting:

- Minutes approval
- Remedial project managers (RPM) meeting report
- Middlefield-Ellis-Whisman (MEW) meeting report
- Committee reports
- Presentation: "Fiscal year 1998 and 1999 budgets"
- Discussion: "Stationwide feasibility study (FS) field trip"
- Agenda and schedule for next RAB meeting

II. MINUTES APPROVAL

Mr. Chao solicited comments on the minutes of the August 14, 1997 RAB meeting. Mr. Michael Gill, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), noted that the units listed in paragraph 3 on page 2 and paragraph 2 on page 3 should be micrograms per liter ($\mu\text{g/L}$), not grams per liter (g/L). The minutes were approved as corrected.

III. RPM MEETING REPORT

Mr. Gill provided a report of the October 8, 1997 RPM meeting held at the Navy offices in San Bruno.

Mr. Gill reviewed action items from the previous meeting. The RPMs discussed the Navy's proposal to destroy nine C-aquifer groundwater monitoring wells. Groundwater samples from these wells have not shown detections of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) since they were installed in 1989. The regulatory agencies suggested retaining two wells on the western side and two wells on the eastern side of Moffett Field for long-term monitoring of the C aquifer. Dr. James McClure, Harding Lawson Associates and consultant to the MEW companies, added that the MEW companies have also installed C-aquifer groundwater monitoring wells at Moffett Field. Mr. Lenny Siegel, Pacific Studies Center, asked how many C-aquifer monitoring wells have been installed at the MEW site. Dr. McClure responded that about a dozen C-aquifer wells and a total of about two dozen C- or deeper aquifer wells were installed at the MEW site. Mr. Gill noted that the average depth to the C aquifer at Moffett Field was about 130 to 160 feet below ground surface. Mr. Chao added that the wells to be destroyed had been recently resampled and that the results indicated no detections of VOCs. Mr. Paul Lesti, Mountain View resident, asked why the wells were being destroyed. Mr. Chao replied that the artesian conditions at these wells create ongoing maintenance problems and that the wells were no longer used for groundwater monitoring. Ms. Leslie Byster, Silicon Valley Toxics Coalition (SVTC), asked whether the wells to be retained were downgradient of existing contaminant plumes. Mr. Chao responded that this was correct. Mr. Tim Mower, Tetra Tech EM, Inc. (TtEMI), consultant to the Navy, showed the locations of the four C-aquifer monitoring wells that were not planned to be destroyed and their locations relative to contaminant plumes at Moffett Field.

Mr. Gill continued his report by noting that the Navy was coordinating with the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC) on issues related to the Site 1 landfill cap and potential access by future alignments of the Bay Trail. Mr. Gill reported that the Navy was working with Mr. Michael Rochette, California Environmental Protection Agency (Cal/EPA), San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) on treated water discharge requirements. He added that the requirements will be similar to those established for the MEW companies for discharge at Moffett Field.

Mr. Gill stated that the Building 6 and 12 (Site 9) source control treatment systems had been taken off line for reconditioning for reuse with the east-side aquifer treatment system (EATS). The remaining Building 45 treatment system treated approximately 500,000 gallons during the previous month at an average flow rate of about 15 gallons per minute. Mr. Gill reported that a round of groundwater sampling was scheduled at the Iron Curtain for the end of October 1997. He stated that the second bromide tracer at the Iron Curtain had uncertain results. The tracer was injected about 10 feet upgradient from the reaction cell but was not detected at the downgradient monitoring points. It is possible that the tracer moved around or beneath the monitoring points or became too dilute to be detected by the time it reached the monitoring points. This test is part of a larger evaluation to assess the feasibility of installing a full-scale reactive wall to treat A1-aquifer zone groundwater. The Navy is also beginning to study the use of sodium dithionite to create an in situ reactive zone for groundwater treatment in deeper aquifer zones. Mr. Lesti asked whether the first bromide tracer test was successful. Mr. Chao responded that this test involved tracer injection in the pea gravel on the upgradient side of the reaction cell and that the test was successful.

Mr. Gill reported that excavation and consolidation activities at the Site 2 landfill were essentially complete and that approximate 20,000 cubic yards of waste had been moved to the Site 1 landfill. The Site 2 area has been backfilled and regraded. Site 1 landfill cap construction is continuing and is expected to be complete in November 1997. Mr. Gill stated that construction activities at the west-side aquifers treatment system (WATS) and EATS were continuing. Eight groundwater extraction wells have been installed for the WATS; five extraction wells have been installed for the EATS. Current activities include preparations for the concrete pads that will support the treatment system equipment and pipeline trenching. Completion of construction at both WATS and EATS is scheduled for January 1998.

Mr. Gill reported on National Aeronautics and Space-Administration (NASA) activities. NASA is working with Santa Clara County inspector Bob Holston on alarm system problems at the fuel farm (area of interest [AOI] 1). NASA is revising a removal action work plan (RAW) for fuel- and solvent-related contamination at AOI 4 to address Cal/EPA Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) comments. NASA will prepare a RAW for AOIs 5 and 8 after the RAW for AOI 4 has completed the public comment phase. Results from surface soil samples collected adjacent to the former Lindbergh

Avenue storm drain channel (AOI 6) indicate little remaining polychlorinated biphenyl (PCB) contamination. NASA has proposed a PCB soil cleanup level of 10 parts per million (ppm) for other sites at the facility and is working with DTSC on this issue.

Mr. Robert Strena, Stanford University, asked what state standard is used for PCB cleanup. Mr. Gill responded that 1 ppm is the federal standard for cleanup to residential use. However, many of the PCBs are found much deeper than would be a concern for residential exposure. Mr. Gill added that the Lindbergh Avenue storm drain channel was cleaned to 1 ppm, but that NASA was proposing 10 ppm for other sites on the facility.

Mr. Gill announced that Mr. Joseph Chou would be leaving DTSC to accept a position at RWQCB by the end of October 1997. Mr. Siegel asked whether Mr. Chou's position at DTSC would be filled by a new staff member. Mr. Rochette replied that RWQCB would be the lead state agency for Moffett Field oversight and that Mr. Chou's position at DTSC would not be filled. Mr. Thomas Iwamura, Santa Clara Valley Water District (SCVWD), asked whether DTSC was responsible for all closing bases. Mr. Gill responded that reductions in Defense-State Memorandum of Agreement (DSMOA) funding levels have caused refocusing of responsibilities among state agencies. Mr. Chao added that many sites will continue to have both DTSC and RWQCB oversight. Mr. Rochette stated that RWQCB will have the same ability as DTSC to request assistance from other state agencies such as the Department of Fish and Game (DFG) and the Integrated Waste Management Board (IWMB). He added that Mr. Chou will remain involved on stationwide FS issues although he will no longer represent DTSC.

IV. MEW MEETING REPORT

Mr. Mower provided a report of the September 11, 1997, MEW all parties meeting held at the Landels, Ripley, and Diamond offices in San Francisco. Construction is continuing on the regional groundwater remediation system south of U.S. Highway 101. Activities include installation of groundwater extraction wells, construction of a treatment system concrete pad, and installation of two portions of the groundwater pipeline system. The baseline sampling for the area south of U.S. Highway 101 began in September and will continue through November 1997. The MEW companies are coordinating with NASA on construction planning for the regional remediation system north of

U.S. Highway 101. The MEW companies have been working with EPA to resolve comments on the construction operation and maintenance plan (COMP) for the system north of U.S. Highway 101. EPA is expected to approve the COMP during October 1997. Individual companies at the MEW site continued construction and operation of soil and groundwater source control measures. The meeting frequency for the all parties meeting was changed to every 4 months instead of every 3 months. The next MEW all parties meeting is scheduled for 9:30 a.m. January 15, 1998, at the offices of Landels, Ripley, and Diamond in San Francisco.

Ms. Byster asked if a construction schedule was available. Dr. McClure replied that he could get a schedule and forward it to Ms. Byster and Mr. Peter Strauss, consultant to SVTC. Ms. Byster asked if groundwater monitoring wells had been destroyed in the area south of U.S. Highway 101. Dr. McClure responded that well closures have occurred over several years as wells are no longer needed. Mr. Gill noted that the closures received regulatory approval. Dr. McClure added that SCVWD also requires permits and oversees all well destruction activities. The monitoring well network for the regional groundwater remediation system is a subset of the total number of wells at the MEW site. Ms. Byster commented that well closures seemed driven by land reuse activities and asked whether the public can be informed and comment on the well closure decisions. Mr. Rochette responded that he could provide additional information after the meeting.

V. COMMITTEE REPORTS

Mr. Chao asked the committee chairs to deliver their reports. Dr. McClure reported that the technical, historical, and educational (THE) committee met on October 8, 1997. Dr. McClure said that the committee had discussed the Iron Curtain bromide tracer test. The committee also discussed the status of the shallow seismic reflection survey and noted that a draft report is scheduled to be submitted to the Navy in the coming several weeks. Ms. Byster asked whether an objective of the survey was to locate subsurface sand channels and lenses. Mr. Mower responded that this was correct. Mr. Siegel asked who conducted the survey. Mr. Mower replied that Resolution Resources, Inc. conducted the survey.

VI. FISCAL YEAR 1998 AND 1999 BUDGET PRESENTATION

Mr. Chao stated that the budget control numbers for Moffett Field will be adequate to cover all activities planned for fiscal years 1998 and 1999. Mr. Hubert Chan, Navy, reviewed activities funded during previous years as well as those scheduled to be funded in fiscal years 1998 and 1999. A list of these activities is attached to these minutes. Ms. Byster asked what was the funding allocation for Moffett Field for fiscal year 1998. Mr. Chan replied that the facility was expected to receive about \$3 million in both fiscal years 1998 and 1999. Mr. Chao added that the letters the RAB sent to Navy headquarters helped secure Moffett Field funding. Mr. Siegel added that Congress did not propose significant cuts to the President's proposals for environmental funding for the Department of Defense. Mr. Siegel asked whether decisions yet to be made on the stationwide FS might affect whether the planned budget is adequate. Mr. Chao responded that this was a possibility, but not a current concern. Ms. Byster asked what happens to funds that are left unspent. Mr. Chao replied that other facilities within the Navy use the funds. Mr. Lesti asked whether copies of the list of projects could be included with the next meeting announcement. He also asked whether approximate costs for the more expensive projects could also be provided. Mr. Chao responded that the list with some approximate costs would be included with the minutes of the meeting in the next meeting announcement letter.

VII. STATIONWIDE FS FIELD TRIP DISCUSSION

Mr. Chao reported that the Navy conducted a field trip to Moffett Field wetland areas on October 9, 1997 for staff from NASA and various regulatory agencies including EPA, DTSC, RWQCB, DFG, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). Mr. Chao introduced Dr. Ted Ball, TtEMI, who presented slides taken from the locations of stops on the field trip. The presentation focused on water flow directions and vegetation in the stormwater drainage areas in the northern portion of Moffett Field. Mr. Siegel asked whether the Northern Channel was government property. Mr. Chao responded that this issue was being investigated. Ms. Mary Vrabel, League of Women Voters, asked whether the Navy had any plans to expand the salt marsh habitat. Mr. Chao replied that flooding a portion of the stormwater retention pond may be considered. Ms. Vrabel asked whether the previous use of the stormwater retention pond as a saltwater evaporation pond would decrease its value as habitat. Mr. Siegel responded that this would depend in part on whether the pond was flooded with fresh water or saltwater. Ms. Byster asked when the next version of the stationwide FS report was scheduled to be submitted. Mr. Chao replied that the revised draft final stationwide FS report was scheduled to be submitted on January 9,

1998 and that comments on the report would be due in mid-February 1998. Ms. Byster asked whether progress was being made to resolve issues related to the hazard quotient (HQ) values used to describe ecological risks. Mr. Chao responded that the issues were not yet resolved, but that progress was being made and that the issues would be settled before the stationwide FS report is finalized.

Mr. Siegel asked whether the Navy was seeking funding from other sources for wetlands restoration. Mr. Chao responded that the Navy was investigating other funding sources. Mr. Siegel stated that funds from the federal Land and Water Conservation Fund and from the sale of surplus government property may be available. He added that the wetland areas at Moffett Field are part of long-term wetlands plans for the San Francisco Bay area. Ms. Byster asked whether DFG comments could be distributed to the RAB. Mr. Chao replied that the comments would be sent with the minutes of the meeting. Mr. Lesti asked whether the 1:1 wetlands replacement issue had been addressed. Mr. Chao responded that a specific formula has not been discussed. Mr. Lesti stated that this could be an issue if a large, continuous area is proposed to be replaced by many smaller, discontinuous areas that have lesser individual value. Mr. Chao replied that the issue was not discussed during the field trip. He added that Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) funds cannot be used to purchase off-site lands and that he was working with Navy legal counsel on this issue. Mr. Lesti asked how much wetland area was under consideration. Mr. Ball responded that the area will depend on the HQ issue resolution and on final cleanup scenarios. Mr. Siegel asked whether the Navy policy against using BRAC funds for mitigation was available in writing. Mr. Chao replied that he did not have the policy available. Mr. Rochette added that restoration is different from mitigation. He stated that mitigation can be considered as payment for lost use as well as to account for contamination that may be left in place after remediation.

Mr. Lesti asked what area was covered by Moffett Field and what part of that area was wetlands. Mr. Chao responded that Moffett Field covers approximately 2,200 acres and about 240 acres of that total are wetlands. Mr. Chao added that one idea suggested during the field trip involved removal of cattails in the eastern diked marsh and removal of PCB-contaminated sediment and subsequent restoration of the area to pickleweed habitat. Cattails are not a native species and not considered of high value. Dr. McClure asked whether replacement of cattails with native pickleweed would be counted as mitigation for another area. Mr. Chao replied that the removal of the cattails was proposed not because this is a non-native species but because this is part of the removal of contaminated

sediment. Mr. Rochette added that knowledge of cattails being indicative of a low quality habitat was new information for most of the field trip participants. Mr. Bob Moss, Palo Alto resident, asked whether any areas of general agreement on remediation strategies were evident during the field trip. Mr. Chao responded that no obvious areas of agreement emerged during the field trip.

VIII. AGENDA AND SCHEDULE FOR NEXT RAB MEETING

Mr. Chao proposed that the next RAB meeting be scheduled for January 15, 1998, at the Mountain View police and fire administration auditorium. This date is after the scheduled submittal of the revised draft final stationwide FS report and also the same day as the next MEW all parties meeting. He stated that the agenda for the next meeting would include discussion of the stationwide FS report and a report of the MEW all parties meeting. Mr. Chao noted that DFG comments and the budget information presented at this meeting would be included with the meeting minutes with the announcement letter for the next meeting. Dr. McClure stated that the next THE committee meeting would be January 14, 1998. Mr. Chao closed the meeting at 8:50 p.m.