



Preserving America's Heritage

June 19, 2007

John M. Hill, PE
Base Closure Manager
Department of the Navy
Base Realignment and Closure
Program Management Office West
1455 Frazee Road, Suite 900
San Diego, CA 92108-4310

Ref: *Preliminary Response to Removal Action Alternatives
Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis (May 5, 2006)
Installation Restoration Site 29, Hangar 1, Moffett Field, CA*

Dear Mr. Hill:

For the past few months, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) has been in communication with your office regarding the Navy's Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) Non-Time Critical Removal Action responsibilities pursuant to section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) for the potential adverse effects to historic properties at the NASA Ames Research Center, Moffett Field, California. Specifically, we understand this CERCLA action has the potential to adversely affect Hangar 1 at Moffett Field, a property that is individually eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places and a contributing element of the U.S. Naval Air Station Sunnyvale Historic District, which is listed on the National Register.

Per your request for our preliminary response to the removal action alternatives listed in the Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis (EE/CA), dated May 5, 2006, for Hangar 1 at Moffett Field, California, we offer the following questions for further discussion. We have focused our review at this time to those alternatives that the Navy has identified as meeting the Removal Action Objectives listed in the EE/CA.

Considering proposed Alternative 2, Cover with Rubberized Material, how would this alternative treat the Hangar's existing windows and doors? Would the rubberized material cover the structure in its entirety, including the roof? Are there any photographs of this treatment, for instance, from the Lockheed Martin facility that might help illustrate how this alternative would affect the Hangar's integrity? Are there any lessons learned from the process as it was done at the Lockheed Martin facility?

For proposed Alternative 3, Coat with Asphalt-Emulsion, we are concerned that the short life span of this treatment option would only postpone the implementation of a more long-term alternative. That being

ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION

1100 Pennsylvania Avenue NW, Suite 809 • Washington, DC 20004
Phone: 202-606-8503 • Fax: 202-606-8617 • achp@achp.gov • www.achp.gov

said, however, is the treatment technology advancing in such a way as to reasonably expect there to be additional alternatives available for this discussion in the near future?

With proposed Alternative 4, Coat with Ceramic Cladding, are there any photographs or sketches available that might help illustrate what this treatment option would look like? Would the cladding cover the roof as well as the siding? How invasive does the Navy reasonably expect the required 2-year maintenance for this ceramic cladding to be, and what would be involved in any recoating of the structure? For example, would the previous coating need to be removed?

For proposed Alternative 6, Cover with New Visually Similar Siding, again, are there any photographs or sketches that might help illustrate the appearance of the new siding? What duration is this siding reasonably expected to have, and would the maintenance required for this treatment option be similar to that which is currently required? What affect would this alternative have on the roof, windows, and doors?

In consideration of proposed Alternative 10, Remove Siding and Clean Exposed Surfaces, would any additional interior features remain other than the frame and floor? What material would the potential replacement "skin" consist of? What interpretation might be incorporated for the interested public?

Finally, for proposed Alternative 11, Demolish and Remove Hangar, would any additional documentation be done, for instance, a context study of the historic district? Would there be any additional interpretation?

Thank you for providing us with this opportunity for review. We look forward to continuing to work with the Navy and discussing these, and any additional alternatives with the Navy and other consulting parties as this process moves forward. If you have any questions or require our further assistance, please contact Kelly Yasaitis Fanizzo at 202-606-8583, or by EMAIL at kfanizzo@achp.gov.

Sincerely,



Reid Nelson
Assistant Director
Federal Property Management Section
Office of Federal Agency Programs