

5090
Ser 6421/8205
September 5, 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. We apologize for the late reminder.

Our last RAB meeting was held on August 13, 1998 at the Mountain View Fire and Police Auditorium in Mountain View, California. The meeting summary is provided as enclosure (1). Our next RAB meeting will be held on October 8, 1998 at the Mountain View Senior Center. 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 August Minutes Approval
7:10-7:40 PM Remedial Project Managers Meetings Report
7:40-7:50 PM MEW All Parties Meeting Report
7:50-8:10 PM Subcommittee Meetings Report
8:10-8:30 PM Treatment Systems Test Results
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,

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: Maureen Little)
Information Repository (2 Copies)
Chron, green
File: Moffett

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
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
Lynn	Suer	Regulatory Member
Jim	Haas	Regulatory Member
Eugenia	Chow	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
POLICE AND FIRE ADMINISTRATION AUDITORIUM
1000 Villa Street
Mountain View, California 94041**

THURSDAY, AUGUST 13, 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 7:15 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 feasibility study (FS) update"
- Presentation: "Stationwide FS update"
- Agenda and schedule for next RAB meeting

II. MINUTES APPROVAL

Mr. Chao solicited comments on the minutes of the May 14, 1998, RAB meeting. There were no comments and the minutes were approved without correction. Mr. Chao announced that Dr. Lynn Suer had replaced Mr. Michael Gill as the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) RPM for MFA. He added that Dr. Suer would attend the next RAB meeting.

III. RPM MEETING REPORT

Mr. Joseph Chou, Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Francisco Bay Region (RWQCB), provided a report of the RPM meeting held on July 8, 1998. He stated that no RPM meeting was held during August 1998. Mr. Chou reviewed action items from the July RPM meeting. The National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) and the Middlefield-Ellis-Whisman (MEW) companies signed an agreement concerning geographic allocation of responsibility for cleanup of the regional volatile organic compound (VOC) groundwater plume on the western side of MFA. The MEW companies prepared a similar agreement and forwarded it to the Navy during the week of August 3, 1998. The Navy is reviewing the agreement.

Mr. Chou reported that ownership of the Northern Channel, which conveys stormwater from MFA toward San Francisco Bay, is being investigated. Staff from NASA's planning division indicated that the station boundary is the fence line just north of North Patrol Road ditch (formerly the Navy ditch) and that the Northern Channel was owned by Cargill Salt Company. He added that Cargill's ownership of the Northern Channel would likely require increased coordination for future remediation of contaminated

sediments within the channel. Ms. Leslie Byster, Silicon Valley Toxics Coalition (SVTC), asked what problems might be expected. Mr. Chou replied that some form of agreement with Cargill would probably be necessary and added that, historically, Cargill has been reluctant to cooperate on cleanup actions. Mr. Chao stated that NASA is considering dredging the Northern Channel to increase its flow capacity and that the Navy is working with NASA on plans to handle contaminated dredge spoils. Mr. Lenny Siegel, Pacific Studies Center, asked how ownership of the Northern Channel changed east of MFA toward San Francisco Bay. Mr. Don Chuck, Navy, responded that he believed Cargill was the owner of the entire channel to its eastern end at the Sunnyvale publicly owned treatment works.

Mr. Chou reported on recent field activities. He said that the Site 9 source control treatment system was still operating and treating water from the storm drain system (Hangar 1 tunnel and electrical vault 5). Mr. Chou said that Battelle had prepared a report summarizing the 2-year operating history of the Iron Curtain pilot test. The Navy is reviewing an internal draft. The report should be available for public distribution in September 1998. Ms. Cathrene Glick, community co-chair and Geoplexus, asked that three copies of the report be sent to the technical, historical, and educational (THE) committee. Ms. Byster requested that one copy be forwarded to the SVTC consultant, Mr. Peter Strauss. Mr. Chou reported that the Navy had collected additional sediment samples from the in situ abiotic redox manipulation (ISRM) pilot test area during July 1998. These samples were forwarded to Battelle at the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory for column testing and to Tetra Tech EM Inc. (TtEMI) laboratories at the University of Colorado for batch testing. These sediment samples will replace earlier finer-grained samples that were unsuitable for column testing due to their low hydraulic conductivity. Mr. Chou stated that if sodium dithionite reduction testing during the ISRM laboratory tests is successful, a field trial will be planned. He added that the purpose of using sodium dithionite was to create an in situ reactive barrier similar to the Iron Curtain treatment zone.

Mr. Chou stated that the Navy submitted the draft final Site 22 FS report on July 10, 1998, and that comments on the report were due on August 10, 1998. He added that the regulatory agencies would likely need an additional 1 to 2 weeks to complete comments. Ms. Glick stated that the THE committee had reviewed the draft Site 22 FS report with Mr. Tim Mower, TtEMI and consultant to the Navy, and had not identified any major technical issues. Mr. Chou reported that the Navy conducted a site tour for the new EPA RPM, Dr. Suer, and her supervisor, Mr. Tom Hutteman, on July 28, 1998. Mr. Chou also attended the tour. The regulators visited Site 22 during the tour and discussed various remediation options for the landfill. Visual observations of Site 22 by EPA did not initially identify obvious problems requiring remediation. However, EPA was continuing to prepare comments on the draft final Site 22 FS report and may identify other issues that were not apparent during the site visit.

Mr. Chou reported that construction of the east-side aquifer treatment system (EATS) is essentially complete and that current activities are focused on adjusting the computer-based control system. EATS startup testing is expected to begin in late August or early September. Construction of the west-side aquifers treatment system (WATS) is scheduled to be completed by September 15, 1998. Mr. Chou stated that the Navy is working with RWQCB on treated water discharge requirements. One outstanding concern under consideration is the mechanism to handle the cleanup of petroleum compounds that are commingled with the VOCs of the operable unit (OU) 5 plume on the eastern side of the station. RWQCB has suggested that the Navy obtain a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit to address discharge limits and monitoring requirements for all contaminants. Navy and RWQCB legal counsel are discussing the issues related to treated water discharge. Ms. Byster asked about the discharge permit. Mr. Chou responded that the Navy would file a notice of intent to discharge and that the discharge would be under a general NPDES permit. This permit would be RWQCB's enforcement mechanism to ensure the discharge limits are met. He added that the MEW companies have

similar requirements under an NPDES permit for discharge of treated water from cleanup of the regional VOC plume on the western side of MFA.

Mr. Chou stated that the regulatory agencies provided additional comments on responses to comments on the revised draft final stationwide FS report. He added that RWQCB's main issues relate to several applicable or relevant and appropriate requirements (ARARs). Mr. Chou met with the Navy on August 13, 1998 to explain RWQCB's position that several additional regulations should be ARARs to protect surface waters during remediation activities.

Mr. Chou summarized activities conducted by NASA. NASA's alarm system at the area of interest (AOI) 1 fuel farm has been certified. NASA is finalizing the removal action work plans (RAWs) for AOIs 4 and 5.

IV. COMMITTEE REPORTS

Ms. Glick reported that the THE committee met on August 12, 1998. The committee discussed the shallow high resolution seismic survey report. The committee's opinion is that the seismic data collection appears reasonable, but that the interpretation of the data is questionable and the report conclusions are highly speculative.

V. SITE 22 FS AND STATIONWIDE FS UPDATE PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION

Mr. Mower summarized the status of the Site 22 landfill FS report and responses to comments. Comments on the draft final FS report were due on August 10, 1998, but comments would be accepted for 1 to 2 more weeks until all comments are received from the regulatory agencies. Mr. Mower summarized changes made to the FS report between the draft and draft final versions. The estimated waste volume has been reduced from 150,000 to 92,000 cubic yards based on trenching completed in April 1998. The draft final FS report contains additional information concerning the number, location, and types of trees at Site 22 and describes how the majority of these trees would likely be removed if a cap were constructed. The draft final FS report also contains an additional capping alternative that considers use of a geosynthetic clay liner cap material and contains a clean closure alternative in which waste would be excavated and disposed off site. The draft final FS report contains several new maps and cross sections that more clearly describe the location of the waste at Site 22. Mr. Mower presented maps and cross sections from both the draft and draft final versions to illustrate the changes in the areal extent and thickness of the waste. The area occupied by waste increased from 7 to nearly 9 acres based on the trenching results, but the volume decreased because the waste is much thinner on the southern and western edges than was originally believed.

Mr. Mower noted that some of the smaller trees at Site 22 might be donated to local municipalities if the trees must be removed from the landfill area. Ms. Byster asked whether birds or other wildlife use the trees as homes. Mr. Tom Engels, NASA, replied that although some birds use the trees, no endangered or special status species are known to inhabit the trees at Site 22. Ms. Byster asked whether trees could be replanted on the site after a cap was installed. Mr. Mower responded that deep-rooted vegetation such as trees would be discouraged to prevent damage to the cap.

Mr. Mower summarized activities related to the stationwide FS report. The Navy submitted responses to regulatory agency comments on June 9, 1998. EPA provided additional clarifications on these responses in a letter on July 31, 1998. RWQCB provided additional information on the responses on August 13, 1998. The Navy will revise the FS report and is scheduled to submit the final stationwide FS report on

October 16, 1998. In addition, Dr. Keith Miles of the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) Western Ecological Research Center at Davis visited the wetland areas of MFA with the regulators on May 27, 1998. The regulators also visited the wetlands as part of the overall site visit on July 28, 1998.

Mr. Mower described changes in major issues since the revised draft final FS report was submitted. The Navy will present risks using hazard quotient (HQ) values relative to 1 and not compared to 10 or 100. Cleanup levels corresponding to these risks also will be included. Both these changes were made as a result of feedback from the RAB. Future ecological monitoring will be included as a separate work plan and removed from the FS report. Issues currently under discussion between the Navy and the regulatory agencies include the presentation of risks resulting from naturally occurring metals in sediments and the content of the ecological monitoring plan. Mr. Chou added that the regulatory agencies prefer to separate the ecological monitoring tasks from the FS report so that technical details can be resolved without delaying the FS and the overall cleanup process. The Navy and the regulatory agencies expect to have the ecological monitoring plan completed before the public comment period on the proposed remedial action for the stationwide areas so that the public can comment on both the proposed remedial action and the monitoring strategy. Mr. Chao added that the Navy was drawing on Dr. Miles' expertise in wetland habitats in the San Francisco Bay area for comparisons between MFA and other wetlands. His insights may also be valuable in evaluating the need for remediation of MFA wetlands versus potential damage to habitats caused by remedial activities.

VI. AGENDA AND SCHEDULE FOR NEXT RAB MEETING

Mr. Kevin Woodhouse, City of Mountain View, asked whether an advertisement for new RAB members had been placed. Mr. Chao responded that TiEMI provided a draft advertisement and that he was consulting with Navy public relations staff to modify the advertisement. He stated that he expected to have the revised advertisement ready by the next RAB meeting. Ms. Glick announced that she had several copies of the Navy's environmental plan for fiscal years 1998 through 2002 if other members were interested.

Mr. Siegel announced that the Center for Public Environmental Oversight was sponsoring a national stakeholders meeting to discuss natural attenuation policies. The meeting will be held on August 31 and September 1, 1998 at the San Francisco airport. The intent of the meeting is to bring together people from many interest groups from across the nation. Mr. Siegel has registration forms for any members who are interested in attending the conference.

Ms. Byster announced that SVTC has posted maps of more than 180 contaminated sites in Santa Clara County on the Internet. She added that this new information is described in the SVTC newsletter, which she brought for distribution to RAB members. Mr. Chou announced that RWQCB offices had changed locations within Oakland and provided cards with his new telephone number and address.

Mr. Chao solicited topics for the next RAB meeting. Mr. Siegel suggested that a discussion of the final stationwide FS report might be useful. He added that the topics for upcoming meetings should be selected so that the RAB can provide timely input. Ms. Byster stated that a summary of initial treatment system operating results could be presented at the next meeting. She added that a report of the MEW all-parties meeting scheduled for September 10, 1998 would be useful. Ms. Glick noted that the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR) had issued a report about potential public health effects from MFA and that ATSDR had volunteered to present these results to the RAB. She added that local cities had received a copy of this report. Ms. Byster asked to receive a copy of the ATSDR report. RAB members indicated interest in a presentation by ATSDR.

Mr. Chao stated that he would review these potential topics and that some topics might be moved to another meeting if there were too many for the next meeting. He announced that the next RAB meeting was scheduled for October 8, 1998 at the Mountain View senior center. Mr. Chao closed the meeting at 8:30 p.m.