

**FORMER NAS MOFFETT FIELD
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD
MOUNTAIN VIEW CITY HALL, FOURTH FLOOR GALLERY
MOUNTAIN VIEW, CALIFORNIA 94041**

NOTE: A glossary is provided on the last page of these minutes.

Subject: RAB MEETING MINUTES

The Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) meeting for the former Naval Air Station (NAS) Moffett Field was held on Thursday, 12 January 2006 at the Mountain View City Hall, Fourth Floor Gallery, in Mountain View, California. Mr. Bob Moss, RAB community co-chair, opened the meeting at 7:10 p.m.

WELCOME

Mr. Moss introduced himself, welcomed everyone in attendance, and asked for self-introductions of those present. He notified attendees that sign-up cards for the Moffett Field mailing list were available. The Moffett Field RAB meeting was attended by:

RAB Members	Regulators	Navy	Consultants & Navy Support	NASA	Public & Other
13	4	3	2	2	17

Mr. Moss reviewed the agenda and said the RAB election is typically held at the first meeting of the year. Mr. Lenny Siegel, RAB member, asked for a brief report from the Army about the civilians being required to move out of Orion Park housing. Mr. Moss described the Orion Park housing situation and recent media coverage. This topic was added as the first discussion item on the agenda.

DOCUMENTS FOR REVIEW

Sign-up sheets for the following documents were circulated during the meeting:

#	<u>DOCUMENT</u>	<u>APPROXIMATE SUBMITTAL DATE</u>
1	Site 27 Draft Final Remedial Design	January 2006
2	Building 88 Investigation Report	January 2006
3	Site 29 (Hangar 1) EE/CA Report	February 2006
4	Final Site 22 Landfill Post-Construction Operations, Maintenance, and Monitoring Plan Addendum	March 2006

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ms. Alana Lee, remedial project manager for the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), requested the minutes related to the EPA Air Sampling presentation and the EPA regulatory update at the 17 November 2005 RAB meeting be revised and provided language to clarify the minutes. The 17 November 2005 meeting minutes were approved as corrected. Revised meeting minutes are posted on the project website at www.navybracpmo.org/bracbases/california/moffett/.

RAB ELECTION

The candidates for RAB membership were Mr. Jack Gale, Ms. Lynnze Nelson, Mr. Arthur Schwartz, and Mr. Dan Wallace; Ms. Nelson and Mr. Wallace were not present, but will be contacted to make their presentations at the next RAB meeting. Each candidate in attendance made a brief self-introduction and stated their interest in serving as a member of the RAB. The RAB members present voted and approved Mr. Gale and Mr. Schwartz as new RAB members.

ORION PARK PRESENTATION

Per Mr. Siegel's request, Colonel (Col.) Earl Scott Wood, U.S. Army, gave a brief explanation of the current situation surrounding civilian tenants of Orion Park housing. He began by describing his position with the Combat Support Training Center and the Center's primary functions.

Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) determined that since Moffett Field has excess land and old infrastructure at Orion Park, the housing will be torn down and the site will be used to build a facility for the newly consolidated western region headquarters.

The Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE) allowed civilians to live in Orion Park military housing on a one-year lease, which was renewed each year. Col. Wood explained that the resident civilians paid reduced rental rates (rent was not adjusted for inflation) and did not pay utility costs. A market analysis conducted to determine if there were sufficient housing in the area for civilians to relocate found there is more than ample housing available. Civilian tenants have subsequently been notified of the BRAC decision and given notice they must find new housing. Although the lease states the Army is required to give a 30-day move-out notice, the Army is giving residents 60 days to relocate.

The development of the new western region facility will benefit the local economy by creating \$70 million of new construction and 256 new jobs in Mountain View. There will also be new housing constructed for enlisted personnel.

The following questions followed the presentation:

- Mr. Siegel asked if the Army was conducting an environmental impact study for the proposed new facility. Mr. Gary Houston, environmental officer for the Army, said there will be an environmental assessment (EA) instead, funded by BRAC. One is already complete for the housing area, and the EA for the construction site should be done by June 2006.
- In response to Mr. Siegel's inquiry, Col. Wood said the developed site would be commercial, like office space, rather than housing.
- Mr. Houston added that the new facility will be engineered with all safety requirements.
- Mr. Siegel asked if regulatory agencies will be reviewing the plans. Ms. Adriana Constantinescu, project manager for the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Francisco Region (Water Board), and Ms. Lee affirmed they would.
- Ms. Jane Turnbull, RAB member, said California buildings have to meet green energy standards. Mr. Houston said this would be ensured as the design standards are put together by the appropriate district's ACOE.
- Mr. Peter Strauss, RAB member, asked if the EA and other associated documents will be made available to the public. Mr. Siegel added that the RAB would be an easy forum to make the information available. Mr. Houston said interested parties would get a copy during the comment period. There will also be notices in the newspaper and on the project website. Mr. Houston added that it is Army policy to also make the document available in the library.

Col. Wood and Mr. Houston circulated a mailing list sign-up sheet for those interested in receiving the EA and associated documents.

HANGAR 1 EE/CA SCHEDULE

Mr. Rick Weissenborn, BRAC environmental coordinator for Moffett Field and RAB co-chair, said the Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis (EE/CA) is slated to be distributed in February for public review.

SITE 27 REMEDIAL DESIGN

Mr. Scott Gromko, U.S. Navy remedial project manager for Site 27, provided an update on Site 27 activities. The Navy is preparing the remedial design, which will be implemented this year.

Mr. Gromko described the Site 27 background, remedial design process, remediation approach, and project schedule. He pointed out features on the aerial map while showing flow patterns and reviewed the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) process. Site 27 is currently in the remedial design stage of the CERCLA process, which outlines how cleanup will be completed at the site.

Mr. Gromko described the remedial action objectives and explained that this site has no human health risk, but does have ecological risk. There will be excavation and off-site disposal of material at an approved CERCLA facility. He described the pre-design field activities, pre-construction activities, and explained the project's short timeframe. Because the site is used for storm water control, all construction activities must be completed in the dry season, March through October. Mr. Gromko described the sediment removal stages/areas and the truck turnout feature, which allows access for more than one sediment transport truck at a time. Because the channel is not federally owned, the Navy must obtain access agreements, which will be received by the end of January.

The following questions followed the presentation:

- Mr. Kevin Woodhouse, RAB member, asked Mr. Gromko to provide further explanation regarding the 10-day limit on stockpiling. Mr. Gromko explained that to complete the construction in the short timeframe, there are only 10 days available from when the sediment is scooped from the channel and brought to the stockpile area to when this sediment needs to be moved off-site in order to make room for newly removed sediment. Mr. Gromko further clarified that the number of vehicles and truck traffic per day includes bringing equipment to the site and removing the sediment.
- In response to Mr. Woodhouse's question about truck traffic, Mr. Gromko said the Navy has spoken with the city of Mountain View regarding a truck traffic management plan. The trucks are requested to avoid Mathilda Avenue and leave from Moffett Field's south gate.
- A community member asked if the Navy has consulted with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) about the proposed wetlands at the end of the runway and whether this would be a bird strike hazard. Mr. Gromko said the Navy has discussed this with NASA, but no determination has been made. Because the Western Pond Turtle is thriving in the Northern Channel, it is proposed that the wetlands be designed for the species in the channel.
- A community member asked if the berm improvements would remain after construction. Mr. Gromko said the Navy has spoken with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and is planning to leave the improvements made to the berms. Because the new berms will be gravel, less maintenance will be required by the USFWS. The berms are also planned to be accessible by the public.
- In response to Mr. Siegel's question about Navy activities to protect wildlife during construction, Mr. Gromko said the Navy is working with NASA biologists, who are capturing turtles and placing them in a safe area. The biologists are also monitoring the captured turtles to make sure they are not harmed in the safe area.
- Mr. Strauss asked if the remedial design document will have a section on ecological restoration. Mr. Gromko said the site's ecological restoration is handled by NASA. The Navy will conduct a vegetation restoration, and NASA will return the turtles and any fish caught to the site.

- In response to a question about whether NASA has begun and/or completed a USFWS Section 7 consultation, Mr. Weissenborn said there has been informal consultation. The Navy is working closely with NASA on this requirement.

Mr. Gromko added that a California Clapper Rail (a bird species) survey will be conducted by NASA biologists in the next few weeks. NASA biologists and a California Fish and Game biologist have also visited the site to determine the type of habitat there. Because the vegetation at the site is mostly on the berms, there is not a lot of ideal habitat for species to thrive in. Through previous site visits, it appears that there are not many species in that area. For these reasons, the Section 7 consultation is considered informal.

- Ms. Libby Lucas, RAB member, said the turtle needs to dig for its nest and perhaps the berms can provide area for nesting. Mr. Gromko said this option was being looked into. In addition, NASA will possibly add a tracking device to the turtles to determine their habits and where they are breeding.
- A community member asked if there were still burrowing owls at the site. Mr. Gromko said the Navy will avoid the burrowing owl management areas as well as areas where burrowing owls are located. The Navy has also met with the California National Guard to discuss any restriction for working near the bunkers they manage.

MOFFETT FIELD HYDROGEOLOGY

Mr. Don Chuck of NASA gave an introductory presentation on Moffett Field hydrogeology. He began by defining vocabulary and the various types of aquifers at the site. Mr. Chuck described the regional hydrogeology and discussed the importance of knowing the area's history since soil boring analysis does not show a complete picture of what really exists under the ground. The soil borings allow for an interpretation of what is present. For more information, the site could be perforated, although this still would not give a complete picture. He also showed the formula for calculating the rate at which water flows underground at Moffett Field and showed diagrams of various aquifer types.

Mr. Strauss inquired about the previous use of radar to identify channels. Mr. Chuck said shallow seismic technique, not radar, was used for this purpose. Mr. Chuck explained the shallow seismic technique and said because of the technique's limitations, the interpretation was not used. While radar can be used, it is a difficult technique to operate.

The following questions followed the presentation:

- A community member asked about artesian flow and what caused the flooding on Highway 101 a few years ago. Mr. Chuck said the flooding was caused by abandoned agricultural wells and explained how the flooding occurred. To solve this, well locations must be identified and then capped or plugged. It is important to plug open wells because they could be conduits for contamination into an aquifer. The water district requires wells to be plugged after monitoring is completed.

RAB BUSINESS

- Mr. Woodhouse asked for a discussion of the Orion Park communication status between the Navy and Army at the next meeting. Mr. Weissenborn provided a brief update: The Navy asked the Army to assume responsibility for environmental activities at Orion Park since the Army is the property owner. The Army is considering this proposal and discussions are underway in Washington, D.C., at the Deputy Assistant Secretary level.

In response to a question about what would motivate the Army to agree to the Navy's proposal, Mr. Weissenborn speculated that there was none. Likewise there is no motivation for the Navy to clean up another Service's property since it is believed the Navy is not the cause of the contamination. However, the Navy is currently doing work in Orion Park and will make a report summarizing Navy, Army, and EPA data available for public review in March 2006. The report will be distributed on CD.

Mr. Woodhouse asked when a response from the Army was anticipated and asked how long EPA will allow the Army/Navy discussions to take place. Ms. Lee said EPA sent a letter in January 2005 and is expecting the Navy to conduct an appropriate environmental response. The issue is now being discussed at higher levels within both the Navy and EPA.

- Mr. James McClure, RAB member, inquired about the Building 88 schedule. Mr. Weissenborn said a detailed document will be released in mid-February or early March. However, the Navy is drafting an EE/CA report that will state where the contamination is originating and the alternatives proposed. The EE/CA, which summarizes the detailed document and will be “easier to read,” will be available for public comment.
- Mr. Strauss inquired about a schedule for the Site 25 documents. Mr. Gromko said the Navy released a revised draft of the feasibility study on 17 December 2005. There is a 60-day comment period and the Navy will address comments received then issue a draft final, which will have a 30-day review period. The Navy will then issue a final feasibility study addendum and a proposed plan, which would be available in the summer.

Mr. Strauss asked if there is an agreement with the regulators regarding the Site 25 schedule. Mr. Gromko said this schedule is estimated. The Navy was not anticipating a revised draft, so the original schedule has been delayed. Mr. Weissenborn said the revised draft feasibility study addendum is 60 days behind, but the remedial work is still on schedule due to accelerating preparation and procurement work, and a design/build contract helps speed up the process. The Navy has also tried to have this type of contract for Site 27. Mr. Siegel stated he thought that by law Site 27 could not have this type of contract. Mr. Weissenborn replied that he understood the contract law now allows design/build contracts.

- Mr. Strauss suggested having a Site 25 update presentation that would include the report revisions, areas of controversy, and a discussion on how the conclusions were derived at the next RAB meeting. Mr. Weissenborn said there is a separate memorandum describing the changes. He briefly described the changes as follows: an inclusion of the West-Side Aquifers Treatment System (WATS) discharge and diversion (the Navy is working with NASA); polychlorinated biphenyl (PCB) source areas up gradient of the site (other than Hangar 1); and removal of the PCB background discussion and its justification (there is not enough data to establish a background PCB - going to risk-based number).
- Mrs. Patricia Guerrieri, RAB member, asked if the Hangar 1 public meeting will be prior to 09 March, the date of the next RAB meeting. Mr. Weissenborn said the public meeting date was dependent on when the EE/CA will be made available to the public. The public meeting would ideally be held halfway through the comment period. In any event, the RAB meeting in March will be separate from the Hangar 1 public meeting.

RAB Schedule – The next meeting is scheduled for **Thursday, 09 March 2006, from 7 to 9:30 p.m.** at the Mountain View City Hall, Fourth Floor Gallery.

The RAB meeting schedule for 2006 is as follows:

May 11, 2006
July 13, 2006
September 14, 2006
November 9, 2006

Future RAB Topics – The following topics were identified as potential agenda items:

- It was suggested a more thorough presentation be made on the compilation of every well monitored- all data ever taken and all depths taken; the last RAB meeting had a presentation on EPA concentration levels. Mr. Weissenborn said this may not be possible, but all recent data will be available.

- Mr. Siegel suggested a Site 25 presentation from NASA. Mr. Chuck said NASA could only make a brief presentation since it will be doing additional sampling and the data or sampling analysis plan is not yet available. The sampling analysis plan underway will be made public.
- Action Memorandum for Hangar 1.
- Information on possible Hangar 1 cleanup remedies.
- Discussion/update on the Navy and Army agreement for Orion Park.
- Building 88 schedule.
- Site 25 update/schedule.

Adjourn – The meeting was adjourned at 9:10 p.m. and Mr. Weissenborn thanked everyone for attending.

Mr. Weissenborn can be contacted with any comments or questions:

Mr. Rick Weissenborn
 BRAC Environmental Coordinator, former NAS Moffett Field
 Department of the Navy
 BRAC Program Management Office West
 1455 Frazee Road, Suite 900
 San Diego, CA 92108-4310
Phone: (619) 532-0952 **Fax:** (619) 532-0995
E-mail: richard.weissenborn@navy.mil

GLOSSARY OF TERMS USED IN THESE MINUTES

- ACOE – Army Corps of Engineers
 BRAC – Base Realignment and Closure
 CERCLA – Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act
 Col. – Colonel
 EA – Environmental Assessment
 EE/CA – Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis
 EPA – U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
 NAS – Naval Air Station
 NASA – National Aeronautics and Space Administration
 PCB – polychlorinated biphenyl
 RAB – Restoration Advisory Board
 USFWS – U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
 Water Board – California Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Francisco Region
 WATS – West-Side Aquifers Treatment System

***RAB meeting minutes are located on the Navy’s Environmental Web Page at:
www.navybracpmo.org/bracbases/california/moffett/***