

FINAL

**FORMER NAVAL AIR STATION MOFFETT FIELD
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING
MOUNTAIN VIEW SENIOR CENTER
MOUNTIAN VIEW, CALIFORNIA**

NOTE: An acronym list is provided on the last page of these minutes.

Subject: RAB MEETING MINUTES

The Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) meeting for former Naval Air Station (NAS) Moffett Field was held on Thursday, November 3, 2011, at the Senior Center in Mountain View, California.

Community RAB Members in attendance:

Bill Berry, Gabriel Diaconescu, Linda Ellis, Rebecca Feind, Libby Lucas, Bob Moss, Arthur Schwartz, Lenny Siegel, Steve Sprugasci, Peter Strauss, Dan Wallace, and Steve Williams

Regulatory Agency and Navy RAB Members in attendance:

Scott Anderson (Navy), Melinda Dragone (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency [EPA]), Alana Lee (EPA), and Elizabeth Wells (San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board [Water Board])

Other Navy, Regulatory Agency, National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), City, Army, and Consultant Representatives in attendance:

Bryce Bartelma (Navy), Don Chuck (NASA), Dr. Ann Clarke (NASA), Deb Feng (NASA), Mark Hightower (NASA), Andy Hocker (NASA), Carolyn Hunter (Tetra Tech EM Inc. [Tetra Tech]), Andrew Maly (Army) Mike Mewhinney (NASA), Amanda Michels (Army), Mike Schulz (AMEC Environmental [AMEC]), George Sloup (NASA), Dan Stralka (EPA), Dan Walsh (Army contractor), Kevin Woodhouse (City of Mountain View), and Tommie Jean Valmassy (Tetra Tech)

Other Community Members in attendance:

Larry Ellis (Air and Space West Foundation for Education), Georgina Hymes, Carole Pappas, Marty Rawson, Tammy Skoog, Jim Van Pernis, Greg Unangst, Bill Wissel, Bill Wormbrodt, and Susan Wormbrodt

WELCOME

Bill Berry (RAB Community Co-Chair) and Scott Anderson (Navy RAB Co-Chair) opened the meeting at 7:00 p.m. and welcomed everyone in attendance. Mr. Berry reviewed the agenda for the RAB meeting. Mr. Berry said that the NASA update will be moved up in the meeting agenda to accommodate Deb Feng (NASA), who must leave early.

NASA UPDATE

Ms. Feng provided an update on NASA's Condition Assessment and Rehabilitation Plan (CARP) assessment for Hangar 1 for re-siding the hangar. CARP is a study that investigates current conditions and the expected condition after the remediation project by the Navy. Ms. Feng said the CARP document will list the dollar amounts associated with each option discussed. Ms. Feng reviewed all of the options being assessed in the CARP study:

Option A: Basic re-skinning and maintain existing occupancy as a hangar

- Re-skinning for future use and for preservation of the historic building
- Structural modifications only where necessary as a result of hazardous conditions

FINAL

- Provide basic services such as lighting, power, and bathrooms to continue use as a hangar.

Option B: Re-skinning with structural and other upgrades for re-use as a hangar

- Provides all items noted in Option A
- In addition, analyze geotechnical improvements and structural upgrades per life safety performance levels

Option C: Re-skinning with structural and other upgrades for re-use as a hangar

- Provides all items noted in Option B
- In addition, calls for rehabilitation with historic considerations required by California Historic Building Code

Option D: Adaptive re-use, re-skinning with upgrades (geotechnical, structural) and re-use as a higher occupancy level (from hangar to assembly or mixed use)

- Provides all items noted in Option B.
- In addition, complies with all California codes for life safety aspects for higher occupancy use, such as sporting fields, training space, temporary movie sets, office space, museum, conventions and retail space

Option E-1: Layaway plan (maintenance without occupants) after re-skinning

- Includes annual cost and maintenance requirements associated with the re-skinned hangar per Option A
 - Electrical power for basic lighting and hangar door operation, annual roof inspection

Option E-2: Layaway plan (maintenance without occupants) while structure is exposed

- Includes annual cost and maintenance requirements associated with the un-skinned hangar based on the exposed steel structure remaining in place
 - Ground maintenance for vegetation and weed control, potential ongoing remediation of sediment ponds

Option F: Demolition costs

- After remediation efforts currently in progress by the Navy, the remaining portion of the facility requiring demolition includes the existing steel frame, concrete foundation, concrete slab, hangar doors and components (motors, trucks, pivots), miscellaneous site utilities plus the contaminate materials

Ms. Feng said that the final CARP document will be completed on November 30, 2011, and available to the public. NASA will post the CARP document on their website and provide it to the Navy.

- Lenny Siegel (RAB member) asked if the public will be able to provide comments on the CARP before it is finalized on November 30, 2011. Ms. Feng said that she will ask NASA about receiving public comments on the CARP before it is finalized and provide an update to the RAB, Navy, and community co-chair. Mr. Siegel said that he will arrange a RAB subcommittee meeting to review and comment on the CARP.
- Linda Ellis (RAB member) said that she would like the opportunity to comment on the CARP before the document is finalized.

- Mr. Siegel asked if the CARP will study costs for other options for the hangar besides the options discussed at the meeting. Ms. Feng said that NASA will assess only the options she outlined during the presentation that are listed in the CARP.
- Bob Moss (RAB member) said that NASA should also consider the possibility of income to the hangar once a reuse is determined, and that information should be included in the financial analysis in the CARP.
- Mr. Berry asked what the \$32.8 million that NASA requested from Congress to re-skin the hangar would specifically purchase. Ms. Feng said that \$32.8 million would only make the hangar water tight – essentially, it would cover Option A. It would not include any of the necessary electrical upgrades to make the hangar functional. Mr. Berry asked if a transfer to another federal agency has been considered. Ms. Feng said that the CARP considers transfer to another federal agency through the historic surplus property program.
- Libby Lucas (RAB member) asked if NASA has considered what material it is using for sheathing the hangar since the redwood will not be reused. The sheathing material will have to be the same weight to maintain structural integrity. Ms. Feng said that a similar weighted material will be considered to sheath the hangar. The redwood will not be reused because of fire codes. NASA will not use the redwood for any construction purposes because of the fire codes.
- Steve Williams (RAB member) said that the Navy provided a response to the RAB regarding its request to assess the reuse of the redwood via e-mail. The response stated that the redwood cannot be reused since it would need to be planed to be decontaminated, which would change the dimensions. Mr. Williams stated that if the redwood is structurally sound, engineers should be able to find a reuse for it within the hangar. Ms. Feng said that NASA cannot reuse any of the redwood for construction because of fire codes.

APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

Mr. Anderson asked for corrections to or comments on the minutes for the September 8, 2011, RAB meeting. Ms. Lucas provided comments via e-mail on the meeting minutes, which will be incorporated into the final version. The RAB voted to finalize the minutes for the September 8, 2011, meeting with RAB comments incorporated. Final RAB meeting minutes are posted to the former NAS Moffett Field project website at: <http://www.bracpmo.navy.mil/basepage.aspx?baseid=52&state=California&name=moffett>.

DOCUMENTS FOR REVIEW

Documents are available in compact disk (CD)-ROM format. A sign-up sheet for the documents listed below was circulated during the meeting to the RAB members.

<u>#</u>	<u>DOCUMENT</u>	<u>APPROXIMATE SUBMITTAL DATE</u>
1.	Final 2010 Annual Report of Landfill Sites 1 and 22	November 2011
2.	Draft Site 26 East-side Aquifer Treatment System (EATS) Focused Feasibility Study (FFS)	November 2011
3.	Draft Site 28 West-side Aquifers Treatment System (WATS) Pilot Test Summary Report	December 2011

2012 RAB MEETING QUARTERLY SCHEDULE

Mr. Anderson said that the Navy is moving to a quarterly RAB meeting schedule throughout the Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) program. Mr. Anderson proposed holding the Moffett RAB meetings during February, May, August and November in 2012. With fewer meetings during the year, the Navy will provide the RAB more updates on the environmental restoration program via e-mail between meetings. Mr. Anderson said that the Navy will continue to meet with the regulatory agencies and NASA on a regular basis and will send e-mail updates about those meetings to the RAB.

- Mr. Siegel said that he does not have an issue with moving to a quarterly meeting schedule. He said that he is concerned that the decision to switch to a quarterly meeting schedule was not made in collaboration with the RAB. In the future, if there is a need to discuss meeting frequency, Mr. Siegel requests that the Navy discuss it with the RAB before a decision is made.
- Mr. Moss said that if the meetings are moving to a quarterly basis, the Navy should be prepared to hold longer RAB meetings. He asked whether the Navy will be able to accommodate the request if there is a need for the RAB to meet more frequently to discuss issues that need to be addressed. Mr. Anderson said that the Navy will talk about adjusting the schedule if the need for additional RAB meetings arises during the year.
- Mr. Williams said that going to a quarterly meeting schedule BRAC-wide appears to be a reduced commitment from the Navy to environmental restoration and the RABs. Mr. Anderson said the Navy will continue to partner with the community.

RAB APPLICANT REVIEW

Mr. Anderson said that the Navy received an application from Rebecca Feind (Santa Clara Audubon Society) to join the RAB. Ms. Feind introduced herself and said that she is a librarian at San Jose State University and belongs to the Santa Clara Audubon Society. Ms. Feind said she has interest in the burrowing owl population at former NAS Moffett Field. The RAB voted and approved Ms. Feind's application. Mr. Berry welcomed Ms. Feind to the RAB.

REGULATORY AGENCIES UPDATE

U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY (EPA) TRICHLOROETHENE (TCE) UPDATE

Dan Stralka (EPA Regional Toxicologist) provided an update on EPA's TCE toxicity assessment, which includes new TCE inhalation toxicity values. Mr. Stralka said that EPA finalized the TCE toxicity assessment on September 28, 2011, using the Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) process. See Toxicological Review for Trichloroethylene (TCE) [see <http://www.epa.gov/iris/subst/0199.htm>] The IRIS assessment included the following steps: review of existing scientific literature for toxicity data; analysis of the relevant data; preparation of a toxicological review; calculation of toxicity values for the risk assessment; and posting in the IRIS database.

Mr. Stralka said that TCE is unique because it has both cancer and noncancer effects. EPA also takes into account the effects of TCE exposure on early life development. There is a greater risk for kidney cancer if a child is exposed to TCE. Mr. Stralka said that the EPA Science Advisory Board thought kidney cancer was too heavily weighted by EPA so it was recalculated and the reference doses and reference concentrations were changed. Mr. Stralka said that all of the EPA programs are looking at the new TCE toxicity values and how to implement any changes. In the Superfund program, EPA will assess the impact of the new TCE toxicity values

FINAL

at sites with TCE contamination as part of the Superfund process (investigation, risk assessment, remedial design, remedial action, Five-Year Reviews) to see if anything needs to be altered.

- Ms. Ellis asked if the difference between industrial versus residential risk exposure to TCE increases based on length of exposure. Mr. Stralka said that if exposed to the same concentration, then the longer the exposure, the higher the potential risk.
- Mr. Moss asked how many buildings have been tested and have TCE levels in the 4 to 5 micrograms per cubic meter range. Ms. Lee said that of the buildings that have been sampled, she is not aware of any specific buildings that have indoor air concentrations at those concentrations that have not been mitigated.
- Mr. Siegel asked if the non-cancer commercial TCE screening levels will be resolved. Mr. Stralka said that EPA is interpreting the noncancer commercial TCE levels, which will be reflected in EPA's health risk-based Regional Screening Levels. Mr. Siegel asked if EPA is calculating TCE non-cancer screening levels based on residential or commercial at the site. Mr. Stralka said that EPA is using residential calculations for screening but adjusting using the applicable exposure scenario if not residential (24-hour) exposure s.
- Ms. Ellis said that some commercial buildings in Silicon Valley have daycare centers where children are on site all day. She asked if EPA has taken the daycare centers into consideration in looking at TCE risk in commercial buildings. Mr. Stralka said EPA acknowledges that commercial buildings may have daycare centers and would take that use into account when evaluating the potential health risks. Gabriel Diaconescu (RAB member) asked if EPA will establish a health-related screening program to test for kidney cancer at former NAS Moffett Field. Mr. Stralka said that California is part of the National Disease Registry and an assessment of kidney cancer data was reviewed during the literature review. Mr. Stralka said he was not aware of any cancer clusters in the MEW and Moffett Field area based on the research conducted.
- Lili Pirbazari (NASA) asked how pregnant women in the commercial buildings who are in their first trimester (and may not yet know they are pregnant) are being addressed. Mr. Stralka said pregnant women are part of the sensitive receptors, and will be taken into account for the non-cancer risk screening calculations.

EPA UPDATE

Alana Lee (EPA) provided an EPA update on recent groundwater and vapor intrusion activities. Ms. Lee said that EPA collected additional groundwater data in the U.S Highway 101 and Moffett Boulevard Study Area to assess potential source areas and fill some data gaps on the extent of groundwater contamination in the area. The groundwater results will be presented at the February 2012 RAB meeting. Ms. Lee said that earlier in 2011 the Army conducted an investigation at the former Orion Park area, and the results will also be presented at the next RAB meeting. Ms. Lee said that the *Site-wide Sampling Work Plan to Determine the Response Action Tier* for the MEW Site was issued for review on September 29, 2011. See www.epa.gov/region9/mew under Technical Documents. If anyone is interested in providing comments on the work plan, then they should provide their comments to Ms. Lee (Lee.Alana@epa.gov).

HANGAR 1 UPDATE

Bryce Bartelma (Navy) provided an update on the Navy's work at Hangar 1. There have been no issues with air emissions or wildlife during the removal action. Mr. Bartelma said that the burrowing owls have left the area for the season but will likely be back in the spring. Mr. Bartelma said that the Navy and NASA are completing the history of Hangar 1 Interactive CD, which will be both web-based (hosted by NASA website) and an interactive CD. The RAB will receive the history of Hangar 1 on a CD once it is completed. The Navy is

continuing the removal action through the six zones of the hangar and is on track to complete the field work, confirmation sampling, and demobilization in the summer of 2012. Once the work is completed, a completion report will be issued in the winter of 2012.

- Ms. Feind asked if the Navy did a population survey for the biological abatement plan and if another survey will be conducted once the removal action is complete. Mike Schulz (AMEC) said that a biological survey of the area surrounding the hangar was conducted. The purpose of the biological survey was to make a plan during the removal action to ensure there are no impacts. A post-removal action survey is not planned. Ms. Feind said that she requests a post-removal action biological survey be conducted around Hangar 1. Mr. Bartelma said the Navy will consider a post-removal action biological survey but that she should contact NASA about their routine biological surveys for the facility.
- Mr. Williams requested that the Navy use its influence over its contractor to allow the community additional time to find a way to purchase and reuse the redwood. The Navy's letter regarding the RAB's concern about the redwood did not address the request for additional time for the community. The Navy's letter said that the redwood is not of historical significance; however, it is considered so by the community. Mr. Williams asked that the Navy respond to the community's perspective and not just the regulations on historical significance and requested a new response from the Navy on the community's opinion of the redwood's historical significance. Mr. Bartelma said that the Navy's contractor reported that the community has until late January 2012 to identify a funding source for reuse of the redwood. Mr. Williams said that 2 months to find a funding source for the redwood is not enough time for the community.
- Ms. Ellis said that this response is the same the community received from the Navy when the historic importance of the windows and the cork room was brought up.
- Community member Larry Ellis said that the response received from the Navy on the redwood was not on Navy letterhead and was not put through official review. Mr. Ellis said that it appears that the community's issue on saving the redwood was kept at only the Navy's local level and not sent to management. Mr. Anderson said that the Navy's response to the community's concern about the redwood was an official response that was vetted through management but was sent in a memorandum format instead of on official letterhead. Mr. Anderson said that the Navy will provide the RAB a response on its concerns about the redwood on official letterhead.
- Mr. Williams requested that the Navy take the RAB's concerns on the sentimental value of the redwood back to management and provide the community a meaningful response. Mr. Bartelma said that he will take the concerns from the community on the significance of the redwood back to Navy management. Mr. Berry suggested that the Hangar 1 Subcommittee meet in December 2011 and discuss the CARP and the revised redwood response the Navy provides the RAB. Mr. Siegel suggested December 8, 2011, for the Hangar 1 Subcommittee meeting. Mr. Siegel will reserve a room at the Mountain View City Hall and notify the RAB.
- Mr. Moss said that the Navy's contract with AMEC indicates it can sell scrap from the removal action. Redwood is not specifically called out in the contract to be sold, and he wonders if the redwood can be alternatively classified so it is not scrap. He asked that the Navy look into the issue and provide a response to the RAB. He also asked that the Navy provide the contract for the Hangar 1 removal action to the RAB. Mr. Moss noted that the City of Mountain View has shared contracts with the community when requested, and he asked that the Navy do the same.
- Mr. Moss asked that if NASA has tried to find a new tenant for the hangar. He noted Google is looking for office space, which may be a good fit for reuse of the hangar. NASA needs to look for new tenants

FINAL

for the hangar as soon as possible because future rental costs can be considered in the upgrade of the hangar. Mr. Siegel said that his understanding is that NASA has been looking for new tenants for the hangar. It is a complicated process to locate a tenant for the hangar.

- Ms. Lucas suggested the Federal Emergency Management Authority and Homeland Security be approached to see if they are interested in leasing the hangar.
- Mr. Berry suggested that the RAB make a Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request for the Hangar 1 removal action contract because the Navy has not provided it. Mr. Anderson said that he will check with the Navy contracting officer to see if the removal action contract is a document that can be made available without needing to complete a FOIA request.
- Arthur Schwartz (RAB member) said the RAB has been requesting the removal action contract from the Navy for the past 8 months. The RAB never received an official response from the Navy on the request for the removal action contract. He asked that an official response on Navy letterhead be provided to the RAB regarding its request for the Hangar 1 removal action contract.
- Mr. Williams asked why the response that was provided to the RAB via e-mail was not on official Navy letterhead. Mr. Anderson said that the redwood response was official but was sent as a memorandum. The Navy will provide an additional response about the redwood to the RAB on official Navy letterhead.
- Ms. Ellis said that the RAB requests a reasonable amount of time to get funding in place to reuse the redwood. The January 2012 deadline does not allow the community enough time to get funds together to purchase the redwood.

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

Mr. Anderson opened the meeting for questions or comments from the public.

- A community member said that Hangar 1 is significant to the area and other channels for funding need to be accessed besides Congress to save it.
- Mr. Ellis said that his company, as a potential future tenant of Hangar 1, will submit a FOIA request for the removal action contract.

Future RAB Meetings

Mr. Anderson said that the next scheduled RAB meeting will be on February 9, 2012. The tentative schedule for RAB meetings in 2012 is:

- February 9, 2012
- May 10, 2012
- August 9, 2012
- November 8, 2012

FINAL

Mr. Anderson said that EPA and the Army will be providing presentations on the former Orion Park area and the Highway 101 and Moffett Boulevard Study Area at the next RAB meeting.

Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 9:00 p.m., and Mr. Anderson thanked all present for attending. The Navy can be contacted with any comments or questions:

- Mr. Scott Anderson
Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Environmental Coordinator, Former NAS Moffett Field, BRAC Project Management Office West;
1455 Frazee Road, Suite 900, San Diego, CA 92108; Phone: (619) 532-0938; Fax: (619) 532-0940;
E-mail: scott.d.anderson@navy.mil

ACRONYM LIST

- AMEC – AMEC Environmental
- BRAC – Base Realignment and Closure
- CARP - Condition Assessment and Rehabilitation Plan
- CD – Compact disc
- EATS – East-side Aquifer Treatment System
- EPA – U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
- FOIA — Freedom of Information Act
- FFS – Focused Feasibility Study
- IRIS — Integrated Risk Information System
- MEW – Middlefield-Ellis-Whisman
- NAS – Naval Air Station
- NASA – National Aeronautics and Space Administration
- RAB – Restoration Advisory Board
- TCE — Trichloroethene
- WATS — West-side Aquifers Treatment System

RAB meeting minutes are posted on the Navy’s environmental Web page at:
<http://www.bracpmo.navy.mil/basepage.aspx?baseid=52&state=California&name=moffett>

Respectfully Submitted,

Scott Anderson
Navy Co-Chair,
Former NAS Moffett Field RAB