

5090  
Ser 6421/8158  
July 1, 1998

Dear RAB Member:

The Moffett Federal Airfield (MFA) Base Closure Team and the Community Co-Chair wish to invite you to attend our next Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) meeting.

No RAB meetings are scheduled in June and July. Our last RAB meeting was held on May 14, 1998 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 August 13, 1998 at the Mountain View Fire and Police Auditorium. 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 May Minutes Approval  
7:10-7:40 PM Remedial Project Managers Meetings Report  
7:40-7:50 PM Subcommittee Reports  
7:50-8:10 PM Site 22 FS Update Presentation  
8:10-8:30 PM Site 22 FS Update Discussion  
8:30-8:40 PM Stationwide FS Update Presentation  
8:40-8:55 PM Stationwide FS Update Discussion  
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 Ms. Cathrene Glick, Moffett's Community Co-Chair, at (408) 987-0210.

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  
Eric Ortega, Onizuka Air Station

Blind copy to:  
10A, 642, 6421, 6422, 6423, 6426, 09CMN, 60B  
Tetra Tech EMI (Attn: Tim Mower)  
Montgomery Watson (Attn: Kim Walsh)  
NFESC (Attn: Maurcen Little)  
Information Repository (2 Copies)  
Chron, RF  
File: Moffett

5090  
Ser 6421/8158  
July 1, 1998

Moffett RAB Members:

Ann	Coombs	Alternate Member
Russ	Frazer	Alternate Member
Kevin	Woodhouse	Alternate Member
Stewart	McGee	Alternate Member
Tina	Pelley	Alternate Member
Maurice	Ancher	Community Member
John	Beck	Community Member
Robert	Davis	Community Member
Cathrene	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
Rosemary	Stasek	Community Member, Mountain View Representative
Jack	Walker	Community Member, Sunnyvale Representative
James	McClure	MEW Representative
Sandra	Olliges	NASA Representative
Steve	Chin	Regulatory Member
Joseph	Chou	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
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, MAY 14, 1998**

**I. INTRODUCTION AND MEETING OVERVIEW**

Mr. Stephen Chao, Navy co-chair, opened the meeting of the Moffett Federal Airfield (MFA) 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
- Committee reports
- Presentation: "Site 22 landfill field work update"
- Presentation: "Remedial action construction update"
- Discussion of new RAB memberships
- Community co-chair solicitation
- Agenda and schedule for next RAB meeting

**II. MINUTES APPROVAL**

Mr. Chao announced that Ms. Mary Vrabel, an active, founding member of the RAB, was very ill. He provided Ms. Vrabel's address to the members. Mr. Chao solicited comments on the minutes of the March 12, 1998, RAB meeting. Mr. Paul Lesti, community member, asked which individual naturally occurring metals were the subject of the discussion concerning the stationwide feasibility study (FS) report in Section 3.0 of the minutes (page 2, fourth paragraph). Mr. Tim Mower, Tetra Tech EM Inc. (TtEMI) and consultant to the Navy, responded that lead and zinc were two of the metals discussed. Mr. Michael Gill, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), added that concentrations of mercury, lead, zinc, chromium, beryllium, and nickel in soils do not show changes laterally across the station or vertically and so are considered to be naturally occurring. There were no other comments and the minutes were approved without correction.

**III. RPM MEETING REPORT**

Mr. Joseph Chou, San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), provided a report of the RPM meetings held on April 9 and May 13, 1998. Mr. Chou reported on recent field activities. He said that the Site 9 source control measure treatment system was still operating and treating water from the storm drain system and one groundwater extraction well. The system has been restored to its original configuration in which extracted groundwater is first treated by an air stripper and then by granular activated carbon units. Mr. Chou said that Battelle was preparing a report summarizing the 2-year

operating history of the Iron Curtain pilot test. He reported that Resolution Resources was preparing the final seismic survey report and that the report was expected at the end of May 1998. Mr. Chou stated that the Navy's responses to regulatory agency comments on the revised draft final stationwide FS report were scheduled to be submitted in mid-May and that the draft final Site 22 FS report and final Site 1 maintenance plans were scheduled to be submitted in July 1998.

Mr. Chou reported that construction at OUI continues to be on hold due to the rainy weather and is approximately 95 percent complete. Tasks remaining at Site 1 include installation of rip rap along the perimeter road adjacent to the stormwater retention pond, placement of gravel on the perimeter road surface, and installation of one gas monitoring well and 15 gas vents. Remaining tasks at Site 2 include minor grading and installation of a storm drain inlet. Grass is growing at both sites from the hydroseeding completed in November 1997.

Mr. Chou stated that the Navy's responses to regulatory agency comments on the revised draft final stationwide FS report were expected soon. The next version of the FS report will present risks more simply by presenting only hazard quotient (HQ) values greater than one. For example, for protection of birds and mammals from exposure to polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), the  $HQ_3 > 1$  value is approximately 150 parts per billion (ppb). The regulatory agencies and the Navy continue to address issues related to benthic receptors. Dr. Keith Miles of the U.S. Geological Survey, Biological Resources Division, will visit the facility to view the potential cleanup areas and discuss the benthic community with Clarence Callahan of EPA, the Navy, and other regulators. Mr. Chou said that the site visit and discussion of benthic receptors will occur in late May or early June and that discussing cleanup levels would be the next step in the process.

Mr. Bob Moss, community member, asked whether the Navy could report the number of deaths or cancers instead of the more abstract HQ value. Mr. Chou responded that this would be very difficult due to the variety of ecological receptors. Consequently, comparisons are made to benchmark risk values such as effects range-low (ER-L) and effects range-medium (ER-M) values. Mr. Chao added that HQs represent any effect on an organism, not only cancer. Mr. Moss asked whether specific effects to types of organisms, for example clams or worms, could be identified. Mr. Gill replied that the effect could be any effect including weight loss or reproductive success. He stated that at the ER-L concentration, approximately 20 percent of the population is affected; at the ER-M concentration, about 50 percent of the population shows an impact. Mr. Chao added that only potential effects can be listed because specific effects cannot be accurately predicted. Mr. Moss asked whether representative species could be selected and specific effects identified for them. He noted that the average member of the public needs to be able to understand how the receptors may be affected. Mr. Chou replied that the regulators will work with the Navy to find example effects for ER-L and ER-M concentrations.

Mr. Chou reported that the west-side aquifers treatment system (WATS) was scheduled to begin startup testing in late June and that the east-side aquifer treatment system (EATS) was expected to begin startup activities in early June. He stated that the Navy and RWQCB were discussing details of the discharge method for treated groundwater. The WATS will discharge approximately 70 to 100 gallons per minute (gpm) to the stormwater retention pond. Treated water from EATS will flow at about 30 to 50 gpm to the Building 191 lift station and, ultimately, to San Francisco Bay.

Mr. Chou summarized activities conducted by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA). NASA continues to work on the alarm system at the area of interest (AOI) 1 fuel farm. NASA is finalizing the removal action work plans (RAWs) for AOIs 4 and 5. Further activities at AOI 6, the former Lindbergh Avenue storm channel, await development of cleanup levels for ecological receptors

which will occur as part of the stationwide FS. NASA plans to submit the 30-percent completion design for four groundwater extraction wells and a treatment system in June. These wells will be located at AOIs 7 and 9 and will be part of the cleanup of the regional volatile organic compound (VOC) plume in groundwater on the western side of MFA.

#### IV. COMMITTEE REPORTS

Dr. Jim McClure, Harding Lawson Associates and consultant to the Middlefield-Ellis-Whisman (MEW) companies, reported that the technical, historical, and educational (THE) committee met on May 13, 1998. Dr. McClure noted that the committee distributed several documents including two quarterly monitoring reports and the final Site 22 additional investigation field work plan. He said that the committee also distributed RWQCB comments on the stationwide FS report and comments on various landfill reports. The committee discussed general progress on construction activities and the shallow seismic survey report.

#### V. SITE 22 FIELD WORK AND REMEDIAL ACTION CONSTRUCTION UPDATE PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION

Mr. Mower summarized the results of the field activities conducted at the Site 22 landfill during the week of April 27, 1998 and showed photographs of some of the activities. TtEMI's subcontractor excavated 17 trenches around the landfill on April 28 and 29, 1998. Representatives from the regulatory agencies, the Navy, and NASA observed the activities. Wastes encountered included paper, plastics, glass, metallic debris, wiring, construction debris, and yard waste and were clearly municipal-type wastes. The waste layer was easily distinguished from overlying soil and underlying native black clay. Waste thicknesses varied from 6 inches on the western side to more than 10 feet in the center of the fill. Fill soil over the waste ranged in thickness from approximately 6 to 24 inches. Black, plastic clay was encountered beneath the waste in all the trenches. Water seeps within the waste layer were found in several trenches. This perched water is likely the result of golf course irrigation or rainfall that is trapped in voids within the waste.

The locations of the trenches were recorded by a surveyor. TtEMI also mapped the locations of trees and burrowing owl burrows using global positioning system (GPS) equipment. Over 100 mature trees exist within the perimeter of the landfill. Only one nesting burrowing owl pair is present in the vicinity of the landfill. Dr. Lynne Trulio identified the active owl burrows during a site visit on April 24, 1998. The next step for Site 22 includes revising the FS report to incorporate the information from the field activities. The draft final Site 22 FS report is scheduled to be submitted on July 1, 1998.

Mr. Mower also summarized the progress of construction activities at WATS and EATS and showed photographs of the system equipment. The treatment process at WATS includes initial treatment using hydrogen peroxide and ozone oxidation followed by an air stripper. EATS will treat water using an air stripper followed by two granular activated carbon (GAC) units in series.

#### VI. NEW RAB MEMBERSHIP AND COMMUNITY CO-CHAIR SOLICITATION

Mr. Chao stated that the Navy was preparing an advertisement to encourage new members to join the RAB. He added that he would have the community co-chair, Ms. Cathrene Glick, and the THE committee review the advertisement. The advertisement will be placed in the *San Jose Mercury News*, *Sunnyvale Sun*, and *Mountain View Voice*.

Mr. Chao reported that he had received no responses to the solicitation for the community co-chair

position. Mr. Stewart McGee, City of Sunnyvale, nominated Ms. Glick to serve another term. Mr. Lesti stated that the RAB bylaws did not limit the number of terms a member could hold the co-chair position. There were no further nominations and Ms. Glick was elected by acclamation.

Mr. Chao stated that upcoming tasks for the RAB in the next year will include review of the final stationwide FS and the FS, proposed plan, and record of decision (ROD) for Site 22. Mr. Lenny Siegel, Pacific Studies Center, asked how the RAB will operate when cleanup activities are in the operation and maintenance (O&M) phase. Ms. Glick replied that this was discussed during the organizational meetings for the RAB and that meetings would probably be held less frequently, perhaps semiannually. Mr. Chao added that the Navy definitely will encourage public participation during the O&M phase. Mr. Moss asked whether 5-year reviews would be conducted. Mr. Chao responded that reviews would be conducted every 5 years or more often, if necessary.

Mr. Siegel said that a national task force including Department of Defense (DoD), EPA, and some states was studying the issues involved in site closeout and trying to develop guidelines. Mr. Chao added that the Navy was developing policies for implementation of institutional controls. Mr. Siegel noted that the California Military Environmental Coordination Committee (CMECC) has prepared guidance for implementing institutional controls at military sites that do not have deeds. Adding binding restrictions to base master plans is one technique under discussion. Mr. Gill said that EPA also has discussed this topic. He added that institutional controls have not always proven to be effective.

Mr. Lesti suggested that adding the RODs to the environmental resources planning documents, or at least appropriate references, might be useful since all environmental documents would then be in one location. Mr. Moss suggested that delegating the responsibility for enforcing institutional controls to local governments, for example building permitting departments, could be effective. Mr. Siegel replied that local laws do not currently address this transfer of responsibility. Mr. Lesti asked where MFA environmental information was archived. Mr. Chao responded that the Navy maintains an administrative record at its offices in San Bruno and that files are also located at the station. EPA also maintains files; the information repository at the Mountain View Public Library is another source.

Mr. Siegel said that attempts are underway to create a national registry of institutional controls similar to existing databases of underground utilities. Dr. McClure added that the traditional approach to institutional controls is to record them on the deed, but this approach is problematic when no deed exists. Mr. Siegel commented that deed restrictions have been ineffective because they lack an enforcement mechanism. Mr. Chao stated that the Navy and the regulators have discussed posting appropriate information on the county planning and assessment maps so that potential land users would be aware of restrictions even if no deed was available. Mr. Siegel suggested that, if it could be maintained, community involvement could help preserve this awareness. Mr. Moss asked what policies the Navy had developed to maintain the institutional knowledge about a facility. Mr. Chao responded that outgoing project managers pass on their knowledge to their replacements and supervisors, but that DoD headquarters staff also were studying physical methods, such as monuments, to maintain some information about a facility.

Mr. Siegel noted that maintaining institutional controls would be easiest at sites where development pressure is lowest. He added that Section 120(h) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) is intended to address federal to nonfederal land transfer, but facility transfers, especially after a remedy is in place, have not yet been clearly defined. Mr. Lesti commented that if the Navy and NASA work with the local city and county governments, then at least an awareness of necessary controls should be passed on. A RAB member added that as geographic information systems (GIS) become more widely used, the ability to transfer this information should become

easier. For example, the City of Mountain View has a database to monitor contaminated sites. Mr. Lesti added that the database could contain markers to refer to the RODs that apply to various land parcels.

## VII. AGENDA AND SCHEDULE FOR NEXT RAB MEETING

Mr. Gill announced his departure from the MFA project to accept another position within EPA. He also introduced Ms. Eugenia Chow as the new EPA project manager for the MEW site. Mr. Gill noted that his replacement had not yet been selected, but would be by mid-June.

Mr. Moss announced a meeting to discuss the 640 Page Mill Road site. The meeting will be held at 7:30 p.m. on May 21, 1998 at 4100 Orme Street in Palo Alto. Meeting topics will include a summation of all activities and operations at the site.

Mr. Chao proposed that topics for the next RAB meeting could include discussion of the draft final Site 22 FS report and final stationwide FS report. Mr. Chao proposed that the next meeting be scheduled for July 9, 1998. He added that the meeting date may be moved to August if the submittal of these reports is delayed. Mr. Chao closed the meeting at 8:50 p.m.