



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
ENGINEERING FIELD ACTIVITY, WEST
NAVAL FACILITIES ENGINEERING COMMAND
900 COMMODORE DRIVE
SAN BRUNO, CALIFORNIA 94066-5006

IN REPLY REFER TO:

5090
Ser 1843.1/7297
July 14, 1997

Dear RAB Member:

On behalf of the Moffett Federal Airfield (MFA) Base Closure Team and the Community Co-Chair, you are invited to our next Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) meeting in August. The meeting in July was canceled because there was no significant events to discuss with the RAB.

June was Mr. Bob Moss' last meeting as the Community Co-Chair. On behalf of the Moffett Base Closure Team, the Navy would like to thank Mr. Moss for his service as our Community Co-Chair. We look forward to working with him as the new Community Vice Co-Chair.

The Navy also wish to welcome Mr. David Glick as the new Community Co-Chair.

Our last RAB meeting was held on June 12, 1997 at the City of Mountain View Police and Fire Auditorium in Mountain View, California. The meeting summary is provided as enclosure (1). Our next RAB meeting will again be held on the second Thursday of the month, August 14, 1997. It will be held again at our usual location, 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
7:10-7:30 PM Remedial Project Managers Meeting Report
7:30-7:45 PM Subcommittees Report
7:45-8:15 PM Bay Area Development Group Presentation
8:15-8:55 PM Review of OUI ROD & Final SWEA
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 my staff at (415) 244-2562, or Mr. David Glick, Moffett's Community Co-Chair, at (408) 987-0210.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Stephen Chao", written over a printed name.

STEPHEN CHAO
BRAC Environmental Coordinator
Moffett Federal Airfield

Ser 1843.1/7297
July 14, 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:

184, 1843, 1843.1, 1843.2, 1843.3, 09CMN, 60B
PRC Environmental Management Inc. (Attn: Tim Mower)
Montgomery Watson (Attn: Kim Walsh)
NFESC (Attn: Maureen Little)
Information Repository (2 Copies)
Chron, green
File: Moffett

Ser 1843.1/7297
July 14, 1997

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 |
| Cynthia | Sievers | Community Member |
| 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 |
| Elizabeth | Adams | Regulatory Member |
| Steve | Chin | Regulatory Member |
| Joseph | Chou | Regulatory Member |
| Michael | Gill | Regulatory Member |
| Jim | Haas | Regulatory Member |
| Bob | Holston | Regulatory Member |
| Thomas | Iwamura | Regulatory Member |
| Michael | Martin | 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 POLICE/FIRE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING
1000 Villa Street
Mountain View, California 94041**

THURSDAY, JUNE 12, 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 7:15 p.m. Mr. Chao reviewed the following agenda items for this meeting:

- Minutes approval
- Remedial project managers (RPM) meeting report
- Committee reports
- Co-Chair Election
- Presentation: "Land Use Assumptions"
- Discussion: "Land Use Assumptions"
- Agenda and schedule for next RAB meeting

II. MINUTES APPROVAL

Mr. Chao solicited comments on the minutes of the April 10, 1997 RAB meeting. There were no comments and the minutes were approved without correction.

III. RPM MEETING REPORT

Mr. Michael Gill, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), provided a report of the May 7, 1997, and June 11, 1997, RPM meetings held at the Navy's offices in San Bruno and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) offices at Moffett Field, respectively.

Mr. Gill reviewed the following three topics that were discussed at both meetings:

1. Long-term groundwater sampling for the west-side aquifers treatment system
2. Fact sheet discussing the site-wide ecological risk assessment
3. Potential for ethylene glycol to be present as an additive in jet fuel

For the long-term groundwater monitoring plan, the Navy proposed changes to the list of groundwater monitoring wells included in the sampling. EPA requested that the original list of wells be used for the initial sampling to provide a comprehensive baseline for the groundwater conditions prior to starting up the regional pumping system. This baseline sampling was conducted from May 19 through June 5, 1997.

The EPA has prepared a fact sheet on the ecological risk assessment. The fact sheet was reproduced by the Navy and was distributed at the RAB meeting.

The Navy and regulatory agencies have recently discussed the potential for the presence of ethylene glycol in jet fuel. Ethylene glycol may have been used as a fuel additive to prevent the formation of ice in fuel tanks on jet airplanes. However, ethylene glycol has not been included in the analytical suite during the evaluation of fuel contamination in groundwater at Moffett Field. Ethylene glycol will be added to the analytical suite for future groundwater sampling to be conducted by NASA. Methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE) will also be added to the analyte list for future groundwater sampling.

Mr. Peter Strauss, MHB Associates and consultant to the Silicon Valley Toxic Coalition (SVTC), asked whether MTBE was a known jet fuel constituent. Mr. Don Chuck, Navy, responded that he

believed it was not an additive of jet fuel but that the Navy had added MTBE to the analyte list for groundwater samples collected in areas of fuel contamination during the recent baseline sampling.

Mr. Lenny Siegel, Pacific Studies Center, asked how many groundwater contamination plumes contained gasoline. Mr. Chuck responded that the current Naval exchange (NEX) gas station, Site 14 South, and the former NEX gas station at Building 31 had gasoline-contaminated groundwater. Mr. Siegel stated that he was concerned that MTBE moves faster in groundwater than other fuel components. In addition, he stated that the California State Legislature is considering a bill to ban the use of MTBE. Mr. Michael Rochette, Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), stated that the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory study, which recommended natural attenuation for low-risk fuel contamination sites, would be revisited in light of the MTBE issue.

Mr. Bob Moss, a community member, asked what was known about the toxicity of MTBE. Dr. James McClure, Harding Lawson Associates and consultant to the Middlefield-Ellis-Whisman (MEW) companies, stated that the toxicity of MTBE is not yet known. Mr. Siegel stated that it is a suspected carcinogen. Mr. David Glick, a community member, stated that MTBE can be tasted in water at 35 parts per billion (ppb) and can be smelled at 10 ppb. He added that the EPA interim guidance maximum contaminant level (MCL) is 70 ppb in drinking water and that the California MCL is 35 ppb. Therefore, people will likely stop drinking MTBE contaminated water due to taste.

Mr. Strauss asked Ms. Sandra Olliges, NASA, whether NASA had ever used MTBE in its gasoline. Ms. Olliges replied that one tank in the motor pool area contained gasoline and that wells in the area of the motor pool would be sampled for MTBE in the next round of groundwater sampling. Mr. Strauss questioned whether any of the tanks that have been closed were sampled for MTBE at the time of closure. Mr. Chao stated that these areas would be resampled for MTBE.

Mr. Gill then continued with his review of the past RPM meetings with a summary of the field work and documents that had been discussed at the RPM meetings. He stated that the Site 9 groundwater pumping rates have been consistent at about 18 gallons per minute (gpm), the majority of which comes from the Building 45 storm drain system. At the end of June 1997, two wells contributing about 3 gpm to the total of 18 gpm will be shut down as construction of the west-side aquifers treatment system

(WATS) begins. This groundwater will be captured and treated by the regional groundwater treatment system.

The Iron Curtain tracer test has been completed and the data are now being analyzed. The data show that the Iron Curtain is still working. The seismic reflection survey to evaluate subsurface conditions has been completed. A report will be produced by the contractor in about 1 to 2 months. Groundwater well W9SC-10 will be destroyed because it damaged a sewer line lateral from Building 29. The damaged sewer line will also be repaired.

Mr. Gill noted that several design documents related to the east-side aquifer treatment system (EATS), WATS, and Site 2 landfill were completed by the Navy. In addition, the redline/strikeout version of the Operable Unit 1 (OU1) Record of Decision (ROD) will soon be completed and the ROD should be signed during July 1997.

Mr. Chao then discussed the landfill remedial action. He stated that the Navy plans to finish the consolidation and cap construction before the wet season begins. By using the soil from the Palo Alto yacht harbor and the light rail excavation soil the Navy may save enough money to be able to consolidate both sites and cap Site 1 this year. Ms. Cynthia Sievers, League of Women Voters, asked whether the soil from Palo Alto will meet the cap barrier layer permeability requirements. Mr. Chao responded that it will meet the low permeability requirements.

Mr. Strauss asked Mr. Chao what the Navy planned to do about the one or two measurement locations that the gamma radiation survey of OU1 identified as being above the action level. Mr. Chao said the Navy would provide further information. Mr. Joseph Chou, California Environmental Protection Agency (Cal/EPA) Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), stated that DTSC had also provided comments to the Navy on this issue.

Mr. Gill reviewed the plan for the landfill excavation and consolidation. The plan is to excavate Site 2 with the hazardous waste to be taken off site to a permitted landfill and the rest of the material to be taken to Site 1 and put under the cap. Mr. Gill stated that there are still two outstanding issues with the ROD for OU1. One issue is that NASA and the Navy still need to work out a way to ensure

institutional controls are maintained for Site 1 and the pump station at Building 191, especially if the property changes ownership.

Mr. Strauss asked if it was an issue of maintaining the pump. Mr. Chao responded that the issue was actually setting up a mechanism so that the knowledge that the Building 191 pump needs to remain in use is recorded and preserved in the future. Ms. Sievers asked if maintaining the pumping is a post closure maintenance requirement. Mr. Siegel asked whether turning off the Building 191 pump would require a modification to the remedy or documentation that the landfill would not be affected. Mr. Strauss asked whether someone else would be responsible if the pump is turned off. Mr. Chao responded that if the Moffett Field property is transferred, consent to operate the Building 191 pump must be included in the transfer documents and would be part of the notification for sale announcement. He added that who actually operates and maintains the pump in Building 191 could be negotiated at that time.

Mr. Moss asked who could give permission to turn off the Building 191 pump. Mr. Chao responded that the regulatory agencies would be responsible for this decision. Mr. Moss asked whether the pump could be turned off if contaminant levels are shown to be below required levels. Mr. Chao said that operation of the pump is needed to keep the landfill dry. Ms. Sievers asked whether other options such as a dike might be possible. Mr. Gill stated that the EPA would need to be assured that whatever alternative is selected is protective of the environment.

Operating the Building 191 pump is important to keep additional leachate from forming inside the landfill. The current plan is for 30 years of post-closure monitoring and operation of the Building 191 pump is part of this monitoring.

Mr. Strauss asked if the California Department of Fish and Game wants to restore the area to a wetland could pumping be stopped or would the Navy pay the additional cost to change the remedy. Mr Chao responded that the Navy would not pay any additional costs to change the remedy. Mr. Gill added that though this may make it more difficult for future wetlands restoration, the remedy was the best decision based on present knowledge about the future use of the site. The most likely future use is still industrial.

Mr. Gill reported that the second issue related to the Site 1 Landfill construction is the destruction of about 0.5 acre of marginal quality wetlands. Mr. Rochette stated that the RWQCB was concerned about this issue because it may affect future decisions related to wetlands in the station-wide feasibility study. Ms. Leslie Byster, SVTC, asked whether the EPA has concerns on this issue. Mr. Gill stated that activities conducted at Moffett Field under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) do not need a permit but must meet the substantive requirements of the regulations and that they are still looking into the requirements. The Navy would like to start on the field work in June 1997 in order to have it completed before the rainy season begins. Mr. Rochette added that there will be an additional opportunity for public comment at the RWQCB meeting on July 16. Mr. Gill noted that RWQCB should sign the ROD for OU1 before the field work begins and that the schedule is tight.

The third subject was station-wide issues. The final site-wide ecological assessment (SWEA) is due in July 1997. The results of this report will be incorporated in the station-wide feasibility study.

IV. 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 June 11, 1997. Dr. McClure said that the committee had not received many new documents. The following four documents were received for review:

- Final design for Site 2 landfill consolidation with drawings
- Navy responses to DTSC comments on the SWEA
- Navy responses to agency comments on the landfill consolidation design
- Letter from DTSC to Navy dated May 30, 1997. The letter contained comments on the OU1 technical memorandum, including the issue of the potential gamma anomalies

In addition, the THE committee discussed the possibility of reducing or modifying its meeting schedule to follow that of the RAB, assuming the RAB may reduce or modify its meeting schedule.

There were no reports from the cost, organizational, or communications, media, and outreach committees.

V. ELECTION FOR RAB COMMUNITY CO-CHAIR

Mr. Chao noted that a quorum of community members was present at the meeting and that the election for community co-chair would be conducted. Mr. Moss and Mr. Glick were candidates for the position. Mr. Glick was elected as the new co-chair. Mr. Glick thanked Mr. Moss for his work as co-chair and nominated him for vice co-chair. Mr. Moss was accepted for the position by acclamation.

VII. LAND USE ASSUMPTIONS AND RISK ASSESSMENT PRESENTATION

Dr. Ted Ball of the Navy's contractor PRC Environmental Management Inc. gave a short presentation on the risk assessment process including exposure scenarios that include residential, occupational, and recreational. The residential scenario is the most conservative of the three. It assumes the person to be exposed lives at the site the longest and ingests more of the soil and groundwater from the site than in the other scenarios.

The Navy has used the residential scenario for remediation decisions made to date. Examples of the residential scenario guiding the remedial action objectives are the groundwater treatment systems for the east- and west-side aquifers. The groundwater and soil in these locations will be safe for residential use when cleanup is completed. For OU6 wetlands, the Site 1 landfill, and golf course landfill 2, the occupational scenario is the most likely because residential construction would not be allowed in wetlands or on the landfill caps. The area of Site 2 will be cleaned up to residential use standards.

Mr. Moss asked what effect using different lot sizes had on the risk assessment calculations. The effect was minimal as shown in the human health risk assessment portion of the station-wide remedial investigation report.

Mr. Siegel noted that many of the tanks were being cleaned up to occupational use rather than residential. Therefore, deed restrictions and institutional controls need to address the exposure

pathways to ensure controls are protective. Mr. Moss noted that specific actions at the site must be limited or restricted. Mr. Chao stated that the restrictions will be part of any federal documents included in the transfer of the property to nonfederal use.

VIII. AGENDA AND SCHEDULE FOR NEXT RAB MEETING

Agenda items suggested to be discussed at the next meeting included:

- Gamma radiation survey over OU1
- Review of upcoming design documents, the ROD for OU1, and the final SWEA report
- Review of a topographic map of Moffett Field

Mr. Chao proposed that the next RAB meeting be scheduled for August 14, 1997. If the reports scheduled for delivery in July are late, the RAB meeting could be delayed until September 1997. The Navy will consult with the co-chair if this occurs.

Mr. Chao closed the meeting at 8:55 p.m.