KELLY RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD

April 14th, 2009 6:30 p.m.
Port Authority of San Antonio
907 Billy Mitchell Boulevard
San Antonio, Texas 78226

RAB Community Members:
Rodrigo Garcia, Jr.
Nazirite Perez
Paul Person
Brian Skrobarcek

RAB Government Members:
Paul Carroll, Air Force Real Property Agency (AFRPA), Government Co-Chair
Rafael Aviles, Port Authority
Tommy Camden, San Antonio Metropolitan Health Department (SAMHD)
Kyle Cunningham, SAMHD, Alternate
Jorge Salazar, Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ), Alternate
Mark Weegar, TCEQ
Greg Lyssy, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), Alternate
Greg Miller, USEPA
Kathryn Thompson, USEPA

AFRPA Staff:
Elizabeth Coira, Contractor
Daniel Dunning, Contractor
Kenneth Grim, Contractor
Brian Howard, Contractor
Jose Martinez, Facilitator
Luis Medina, Contractor
Ginger Mullins, Contractor
Bill Norton, Contractor
Wendy Peacock, Contractor
Walter Peck, Staff Member
Armando Perez, Public Affairs Officer, AFRPA
Larry Tyner, Contractor

Elected Officials:
Stephanie Smith, Office of Charles A. Gonzalez

Public Attendees:
Alice Conde
Luis Cienfuegos
Jesse De Los Santos
Charles Gonzales
Juan Gonzales
Helen Hunter
Diana Ibanez
Diana Lopez
Christine Patmon, SAMHD
Eiginio Rodriguez
Greg Schwartz
Robin Sheer
Anthony Stinson
Genaro Zavala

RAB Members Not Present:
Beverly Abbott, Community Co-Chair
Daniel Gonzales

PROCEEDINGS BEGAN AT 6:38

MR. MARTINEZ: Good evening. Can everybody hear me, please? Somebody may not be able to hear me.

Good evening. Welcome to the April RAB meeting of the former Kelly Air Force Base. My name is Jose Martinez and as I have over the past couple of years, I will be your facilitator for this evening.

We have, as usual, a very lengthy agenda and we'd like to proceed as quickly as possible with the items on the agenda. The first thing I'd like to ask is for the members of the RAB to introduce themselves starting with Mr. Perez.

MR. NAZIRITE PEREZ: Yes. My name is Nazirite Ruben Flores Perez. I work for the City of San Antonio. I'm a regular advocate here on the (inaudible). And I'm with the River Authority and I'm a board member of the restoration -- Kelly Restoration. And I'm learning every day. I'm learning.

I'll be retiring the 30th of this month so I'm going to be putting more time, I guess be more active, watching things more often. And in fact, I got an appointment with Mr. Obama to (inaudible) to get -- to get the ball rolling.

MR. CAMDEN: My name is Tom Camden. I'm the Environmental Health Services Administrator for Bexar Metro Health District.

MR. MILLER: I'm Gary Miller with the EPA Region Six out of Dallas, former RAB member. Just here for the

presentation.

MR. CARROLL: I'm Paul Carroll. I'm the Air Force Environmental Coordinator for Kelly.

MR. ARMANDO PEREZ: I'm Armando Perez. I'm the Public Affairs Officer for Air Force Real Property Agency.

MS. THOMAS: I'm Kathy Thomas with EPA out of Dallas.

MR. SKROBARCEK: Brian Skrobarcek. I'm a community member and work in the affected area.

MR. GARCIA: Rodrigo Garcia. I'm a community member. I work for the Department of Transportation.

MR. MARTINEZ: I beg your pardon. We started the meeting.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'm trying to get the TCEQ member here. He's lost.

MR. MARTINEZ: Could I respectfully ask you do it outside, please?

The first thing I'd like to do as I have in the past is to remind everybody in the audience -- the board members already know -- that the purpose of the -- the meeting, the RAB, Restoration Advisory Board, and the whole function of the meeting tonight is described very, very well in a little pamphlet that is available at the front table and it says: The Air Force Real Property Agency oversees the environmental cleanup activities at the former Kelly Air Force Base. Our

goal is to complete the cleanup actions needed to protect human health and the environment and to transfer the property for reuse.

The key words here, our goal is to complete the cleanup activities; so therefore, the discussion this evening among members of the board and from members of the board and members of the general public is in fact that. It is literally restricted to the environmental cleanup at the former Kelly Air Force Base.

The next thing I'd like to do if I may, especially for the board members since you're the only ones that have the packet, you may have already seen that on the left-hand side of your packet, there's a very attractive, colorful little brochure, flier. This is a flier that staff has used, distributed among many venues in the immediate area around the former base to solicit participation, nominations of members of the community to join as community members of the RAB.

Following that is a draft copy of the minutes of the last board meeting and then following that is a set of documentation from the staff as to the publicity of -- for the meeting. Following that is a set of correspondence that members of the RAB might find of interest, information for -- for you for your information and I'd like to thank staff for putting them together in a very attractive little booklet.

The last -- next thing I'd like to do is to simply

very quickly go over the agenda. As I mentioned, there's a lot of very interesting topics.

You may be able to hear me very, very well right now. Obviously I'm standing before a microphone. But you will notice, those of you that have been with us before, this is much larger room, the ceiling is much higher so it is going to be more difficult for you to hear each other.

So I will ask you to speak as clearly as possible and as loudly as you can so that fellow members of the RAB can hear each other. And we will have, of course, a 15-minute section of the agenda where the members of the audience will have the opportunity to actually make comments, ask questions of the RAB. When you do that, I would like to ask for you to stand, introduce yourself and then clearly state the nature of your comment.

Over the next few minutes, Paul Carroll will have a series of three different presentations. The first one, the RAB administrative items, will deal with a tour training proposal by staff to the RAB. There will be some reports on administrative actions on the nominations for RAB and a brief report on environmental reporting that staff is making to the media. Paul will continue with the TCEQ Permit Compliance Plan Renewal Report followed by updates of the Building 360 and Building 301 we have heard before.

Following that, I believe Mr. Bill Norton from Tetra

Tech will make the third presentation of that metal -- former metal plating shop project.

Mr. Gary Miller is welcomed back. He will make a third presentation, a status report on the EPA soil vapor intrusion study and then we'll go to the public presentation. There is a maximum of three minutes per member of the audience, general public, and we will hold you to that, if we may. We do have a tight agenda.

As is the custom after that, we will have -- the RAB will have a discussion among themselves as to what items they would like to hear presented at the next RAB meeting and that will then wrap up the meeting.

So I will then ask Paul to come up and make his presentations. Thank you.

MR. CARROLL: Hello. I'm Paul Carroll, BRAC Environmental Coordinator for Kelly. Take me just a minute to get used to this microphone. If I'm too loud or too quiet, please raise your hand or something.

As Mr. Martinez said, on the 23rd of April, we're going to have a training session for RAB members and we want everybody who can and is available to mark your calendars and let the public affairs folks know if you can attend. That's going to be from 1:00 to 5:00, if you'd like to mark your calendars from 1:00 to 5:00.

We'll have training specifically on our

environmental status progress, the things that we're doing. We'll have a specific discussion on soil vapor intrusion as requested by the RAB, which will last about an hour, little bit -- maybe a little bit more than an hour.

And then we have a shuttle that will take everyone around and get to show everyone the main sites on Kelly, get a chance to take a look at the groundwater pump and treat systems, some of the PRB, the passive reactive iron filing walls that we've installed to clean up the groundwater and a few other things. The Site MP excavation that we've been talking about, that thing is well underway and there's a lot of progress there so it will be perfect timing to get to go see that. So we'd love for all of you RAB members to attend that and to be able to take advantage of that training.

I'd like to go back about three months because Gary Miller wasn't able to make it to the general RAB. I'd like to recognize Gary because of his years of service to the Restoration Advisory Board. Gary is sitting on the corner right there. EPA has been involved with the RAB since about 1995 and Gary since -- has been with the RAB since 2002 I believe. They've been of course highly valued government representatives on the RAB and also they work with us very closely in the BRAC cleanup team to keep us moving in the right direction in the cleanups.

Most recently, Gary has been proactive in

heightening public awareness of soil vapor intrusion studies in the area and conducting this investigation in the area homes that he's going to brief here in just a little while.

We do appreciate Gary's openness, his help, involvement in the community and with our agency to help us to have the best -- best cleanup that we can here. And Gary was replaced on the RAB and the BCT by Kathryn Thomas, who is sitting -- Kathy Thomas who is sitting right there. And we appreciate -- we appreciate Kathy here, too. And thank you, Gary, for your years of service. We certainly appreciate that. I think he deserves a round of applause.

(Applause)

MR. CARROLL: We have an update on RAB membership. Our public affairs folks back here at the back table and also Armando have been working diligently the last six -- about six months at least to recruit members for the RAB. Several of the things they've done, they've gone out, visited 15 libraries, community centers and churches in the affected area and they've distributed about 500 of these recruitment fliers over all these -- all these places. So they've been -- they've been doing some significant work there.

There was a recruitment announcement that was also placed in the membership directory of the South San Antonio Chamber of Commerce. That has a pretty large circulation. I think they have -- that goes to about 6,000 people and

businesses in the affected area and that will be in these businesses for about a year.

As a result of all these efforts, we've -- we've gotten three community -- new community members that have requested membership on the RAB. So we'll have an update for the RAB in July on the membership status of -- of these interested community members.

Let's see. I've got a slide on environmental transfer, cleanup, property transfer, highlights. The Air Force has successfully transferred 1017 acres in the last year, September of last year to the Port of -- Port San Antonio for beneficial reuse. That's the -- what we call Zones 4 and 5, East -- East Kelly, and the northern part of the main base. So those areas were transferred late last fiscal year.

The expenditures on the environmental cleanup so far is $280 million. To date, 81.9 percent of the environmental sites have been closed in accordance with federal and state regulatory standards. These posters that we have around here show the sites that have been closed and the blue indicates that they're closed all the way around to the back and then around here to the other side, things such as oil water separators, underground storage tanks, septic tanks, holding tanks, sludge pits, all kinds of sites. You're welcome after the RAB to go around and take a look at all these.

So we have a lot of them closed. We have some that are pending closure that we've done the cleanup and we're just doing -- finishing the paperwork on. Those will be I believe in the bronze color. And then the ones in the white are ones we're still working on.

Of the 52 IRP sites on Kelly, 17 of those were realigned to Lackland and they are now the responsibility of Lackland. Of the remaining 35 IRP sites at Kelly, 24 of those have been closed and eleven are still open.

We're currently working with EPA and TCEQ to demonstrate operating properly and successfully on Zone 2, which is the extreme southern part of the base. I'll point to that area. Right down here (indicating). That's the area that's south of Southwest Military Drive. And then Zone 3, which is the main industrial part of the base, which is this area right over here, in FY '09, this fiscal year and in FY 10, next fiscal year. So 77 acres in Zone 2, that area south of Military -- Southwest Military Drive and 363 acres in Zone 3 area, the industrial part of the base, that's scheduled for 2010.

I wanted to quickly point -- we always do this, but this is -- I believe we may or may not have had these maps because they're January maps and I wanted to show the cleanup progress. So if you'll look at these two maps over here, the one to your left is tetrachlorethylene, PCE, that is the blues

and the darker blues and purples are the current concentrations of PCE that are remaining in the groundwater.

The green outline -- these green outlines are the original extent of the plume when we investigated in 1998. As you can see, a lot of these plumes have really gone down. Overall, we've done an aerial survey and overall it's pretty close to 50 percent reduction since 1998.

Similar -- similar reductions in TCE, trichlorethylene, as you can see, the plumes are kind of shaped the same. They're not all -- everything is not in the same -- exact same location, but the reduction is there also.

MR. PERSON: What are you attributing to the reduction, the permeable barrier walls?

MR. CARROLL: It's a combination. The permeable barrier walls are reducing the contamination significantly and natural attenuation in addition to that. Source removal is a big jump toward reduction in contamination. One of -- couple of the source reductions that we've done are this Site E-3 here. S-8, we've done some excavation there and then this Site MP, this build -- near Building 171 where we're doing that excavation right now.

So the source removal, there's a Building 301 where we're doing this electrical resistive heating that we're calling -- which is the source removal, that will also help.

So the two keys are to get the source removed. That

stops the continuing addition to contaminants through the groundwater and then work on the groundwater through a combination of treatment methods including pump and treat, passive iron filing walls and we have a couple of horizontal wells -- areas that we're -- we're pumping groundwater and then natural attenuation.

MR. SKROBARCEK: Paul, I have a question for you.

MR. CARROLL: Yes, sir.

MR. SKROBARCEK: So it appears that in Zone 2 and in Zone 3 you have PCE in shallow groundwater; is that correct?

MR. CARROLL: That's correct.

MR. SKROBARCEK: And you're going to be able -- you believe that you're going to able to transfer those in August, at least Zone 2?

MR. CARROLL: That's right.

MR. SKROBARCEK: Okay.

MR. CARROLL: To enable us to transfer, we have to be able to have the remedial systems in place and we have to demonstrate that they've been operating properly and successfully for a period of time to U.S. EPA and U.S. EPA will grant us the concurrence to be able to transfer if they believe that our demonstration is adequate.

So once we've operated -- once we've installed the remedies and operate these systems for a period of time, we have to show that it's reducing the contaminants, the mass and

the area and that it will have the finite time to remedy the contaminants in the soils and groundwater. So once that's done, we're then able to transfer the property. The property, while it's still being cleaned up, will have to have use restrictions and protections to protect human health and the environment.

So until the entire plumes are cleaned up, there will be a restriction against installation of groundwater wells, things like that, or it will be restricted -- most of the base is going to be restricted to industrial use. So that will be a restriction that's in the deed, that's enforceable by the Air Force, United States government.

MR. SKROBARCEK: So define industrial use.

MR. CARROLL: Industrial use is the chosen reuse of the local community under BRAC law and that -- it shows right up in the front of the BRAC process so we're required to clean up to whatever that chosen reuse is. Industrial -- industrial/commercial, there's not a whole lot of difference in -- in those in most cases. And it -- you know, it's okay for industrial use or it could be okay for commercial use, depending on specifically what commercial use it is. But we have to evaluate those kinds of things in our risk assessments when we investigate the sites.

MR. SILVAS: What do you mean by approval by the community?

MR. MARTINEZ: I beg your pardon. The discussion, as I said before, now is among members of the RAB. There will be a 15-minute session for the public to speak. Thank you.

MR. SILVAS: So you just shut us off, huh?

MR. MARTINEZ: Mr. Garcia.

MR. GARCIA: Yes. You mentioned the PCE in the groundwater. Is there -- under BRAC law, is there a specific density or part per billion that has to be removed before it can be used for industrial/commercial use? And about the community, does it still having the high concentrate in parts per billion still affect the community like it has in the past?

MR. CARROLL: The cleanup level to completely clean up is five parts per billion for TCE -- TCE and PCE.

MR. GARCIA: Okay.

MR. CARROLL: In order to -- for an industrial use or even a residential use, you have to determine what kind of precautions you need to take to protect human health. So there could be -- there could be the precautions that, you know, no groundwater wells would be installed. If there's a vapor intrusion issue, you'd have to limit to industrial use only or, if you want a higher use than that, you'd have to put extra -- some kind of abatement of some sort to address that vapor in order to allow a higher use than that.

So we have to -- we have to ensure that when we

transfer the property, the proper use restrictions are placed on the property and those are maintained to protect human health in the environment.

MR. GARCIA: I'm worried that the turning them over too soon while there's still the high concentrate of PCE and all this will affect -- keep on affecting the community through vapor intrusion and might affect the people therefore that work in that industrial/commercial use because the concentration is too high, now there's going to be vapor intrusion into the commercial/industrial development that's going to go on to that land. You know, why can't we wait until they're completely clean and then turn them over?

MR. CARROLL: That's a common concern with the community. But there are a lot of sites all over the United States that EPA has placed -- has lots of good guidance and regulations to require -- to require those proper protections to be in place.

If you -- if you had to clean up every site before people could live over them, you wouldn't have a lot of people living anywhere near an old gas station or a lot of industrial areas without, you know, the cons -- because of that issue. There -- it's kind of like electricity, you know. If it's used properly and people are properly protected from like the outlet, it's okay to have it, even though it's dangerous, you know, if you misuse it. So these sites, there are -- there

are dangers if you misuse -- if you reuse it in the wrong way. So we have to protect against those potential dangers.

MR. GARCIA: Well, I'm just concerned about turning them over too soon. I understand about people understanding the electricity, but people not understanding something that they know nothing about like PCE and TCE and everything else that's in the groundwater and could affect them through vapor intrusion. That's why I'm very concerned about turning -- turning these properties over in that condition.

MR. CARROLL: That -- that is well-known by the regulatory and community and by our experts though. And I believe we know how to take care of it in a proper way and we're being watched by TCEQ and assisted by TCEQ and EPA in all this. Okay.

MR. NAZIRITE PEREZ: Is there a way that we can get the specification requirements and, you know, corrective pictures of what you're speaking of? I mean is there nothing in black and white specifications on the topographics of the area, the environment, the habitats?

MR. CARROLL: You're asking about the contamination and what the --

MR. NAZIRITE PEREZ: What you're referring to just now.

MR. CARROLL: The vapor intrusion?

MR. NAZIRITE PEREZ: Yes.

MR. CARROLL: The training next week will cover that and we -- we can definitely talk about that at length --

MR. NAZIRITE PEREZ: Okay.

MR. CARROLL: -- about what those protections need to be and how EPA has gone through and studied these things and -- and developed their risk numbers for vapor intrusion. Okay?

MR. MARTINEZ: While Paul is looking through his notes, I'd like to point out that I have so far two cards from members of the public that would like to speak during the 15-minute presentation period. Apparently we have more. If any -- if anyone wants to speak and has not filled out such a card, please do so. I will call on you as -- in the same order that I receive them. Thank you. Paul?

MR. CARROLL: Okay. As y'all know, we operate under a RCRA Compliance Plan Permit and Compliance Plan. That's how the cleanup is organized in Texas generally with a federal facility like Kelly. One of the things that we've had -- go on to the next slide, Elizabeth.

One of the things that we've had under -- been undergoing for the last year-and-a-half is the Class 3 Modification for Zone 2 and 3. That Class 3 Modification identified the remedy -- the selected remedy that the Air Force and EPA and TCEQ have gone through and the Air Force has chosen for those zones and that was approved finally in

February 2009:

The draft Semiannual Compliance Plan Report was submitted to the TCEQ in January 2009 and that -- that's currently under review. What that document does is it reports results of semiannual sampling of Leon Creek and also the basewide groundwater sampling.

And the third item on this slide is a final draft RCRA Permit and Compliance Plan, which is the big document that guides our cleanup. That was up for renewal this -- this past year. And we've gone through that entire process, submitting our application, TCEQ reviewing it, getting back with us to address any comments that we might have, to make any appropriate changes and then it went out for public comment. And that public comment period ended about March 4th of this year.

We didn't receive any comments and that permit is anticipated to be signed and renewed some time this month. That goes to -- that's entirely up to TCEQ now; however their process works, it may take longer, may take shorter. I don't know. But anything else on that, Mark?

MR. WEEGAR: No. Mark Weegar, TCEQ.

As Paul said, we received no comments from the public on the renewal so it will be remanded to the exec -- our executive director's agenda and will be placed on the agenda and -- and signed out by the commission as a

uncontested permit and I don't -- I do not have a time frame for that. I think April is probably a little optimistic. I'm not sure what the executive director's schedule looks like, but it will have to be placed on his schedule and worked through the process. I would think it would probably be some time after the end of April though.

MR. CARROLL: Okay. Any questions on permit compliance plan from the RAB?

MR. MARTINEZ: Mr. Garcia.

MR. CARROLL: Yes, sir.

MR. GARCIA: On this final draft of the permit and Compliance Plan and Renewal, are you going to prepare an executive summary of what is in the report and mail it to us as soon as it's approved?

MR. CARROLL: We sure can.

MR. GARCIA: All right.

MR. CARROLL: We'll do that. And we can report that to the RAB at the next RAB meeting. I think it would be a good time to identify the differences between the old permit and the renewed permit where there are differences. Sometimes it's nuances or minor things, but there are some things that we're going to be obligated to do that we weren't obligated to do under the old permit so that would be a good time.

MR. GARCIA: The reason I asked you that is to see if we can get some information on what you just said and on

the permit so when we review it in the next RAB meeting in July, we can be familiar with the information on the compliance -- on this compliance plan.

MR. SKROBARCEK: Just a follow-up question regarding that document. Since there were no comments, where was it published? What media was it published in?

MR. CARROLL: According to TCEQ requirements, it was published in a newspaper of major circulation in Bexar County and every county surrounding Bexar County and also in the La Prensa and also on several radio stations. So that's according to their requirements. Okay.

MR. MARTINEZ: Next item, again Paul, the updates from Building 360.

MR. CARROLL: I talked about Building 360 and also Building 301 and then we can have questions after that.

As you know, the Building 360 SVE system has been operating, continues to operate. Couple of things that we've been talking about is our -- the adjustments to the noise levels that we've been working on. Those reduction actions have been completed except for one baffle around the pump motor part. That should be completed in May. It's already pretty quiet.

MR. SKROBARCEK: You can barely tell it's running actually.

MR. CARROLL: Yeah. During our training this next

week, we're going to drive by there and let everybody get out and listen to it and look at it and have the folks who do the operations and maintenance on that, kind of go through the system and show y'all -- show the folks how it operates, the principles and how it removes the contaminants from underneath that building.

Another thing we've been doing at Building 360 directly related to that SVE soil vapor extraction system is that we determined in 2008 that we needed to do a little bit more subslab sampling to determine or verify extended contamination being addressed by the soil vapor extraction system. We have initiated that work. HGL, our contractors, began drilling operations early April 2009, this month.

We've done seven of the borings that we've proposed. There were 15 borings proposed. Those have been completed and we anticipate the remaining borings to be completed in the next few weeks. Several things we have to do is work around the people's schedules at that building. They have -- I believe every two or three weeks they have a long weekend, three weeks --

MR. SKROBARCEK: Two.

MR. CARROLL: -- to try to get that next window to get -- to get the remaining part.

Once sampling reports are available, the SVE system radius of influence will be calculated in order to determine

if that system is adequately addressing all of the known sources of contamination. And then, you know, if we determine that it's not, we'll have to make whatever adjustments to that system to be able to do that.

And also, we're determining the pace to closure. We'll be able to get good data from that area where the SVE system wells are. Those are horizontal wells and can understand what the area of influence is and what the cleanup -- what the pace is, how that's going.

Here's a little drawing of where the contamination is underneath the northwest corner of that building. It shows kind of where we've found the soil contamination. The yellow lines going horizontally are those extraction wells and then the additional pink dots that you see are the additional borings that we're putting in to do additional sampling.

Okay. That's Building 360.

Moving over to Building 301. That was also an old metal plating shop and we've installed an electrical resistive heating and soil vapor extraction system there to heat and extract the tetrachlorethylene -- it's the main contaminant there -- volatile organics from the soils and shallow groundwater.

That system's been operating since about July of last year. We do monitoring, regular maintenance, monitoring samplings of that so at start-up the temperatures were about

81 degrees below the ground surface. Once we kicked it off now, as of March 31st, the end of March, they were at 94.8 degrees centigrade, which is about 202 degrees Fahrenheit. One of the -- in a couple of the areas, there's another area that's about 94.6 and then there's another smaller area that's about 46 degrees centigrade, at about 140 -- 115 degrees, I'm sorry, Fahrenheit.

The next map shows these zones. The area A is up -- excuse me. I had a pointer, but the batteries are out. This is Area A right here; Area B is this area here; Area C is here (indicating). All these areas have reached their operating temperature. There's a little bitty area here that's about eight to ten feet that's -- we call Area D that's not at its operating temperature yet. Get this turned over here. Figure out which way I'm going.

An understanding of how this system works, I think most of you have already seen this, but it wouldn't hurt to go over it again. There are electrodes that are placed in the ground. All of this area, an electrical current is applied, this area is heated. Soil grains act as individual resistors. Steam generation is uniform through the heated zone.

It does well in clay as well as sands because clays are heated. They actually heat better and they create cracks which allows the PCE, TCE to volatilize and then the soil vapor extraction system can pull those out and treat those --

treat those vapors. So that's kind of how that works. Next slide.

Recently we've done 60 percent confirmation sampling. That was done in February 2009. Those results indicate that contaminant levels have been significantly reduced -- reduced in many areas to nondetect levels. As a result of the data, 81 of the 200-something electrodes were disconnected in March in order to focus current on other portions that are not working -- are not quite as efficient as those other areas.

Here's a chart. I don't -- I don't mean to point out every number here, but this chart just kind of shows all the -- all the sampling results. The numbers in bold are still numbers that are over Risk Reduction Standard 2, that's our target cleanup. But as you can see, we're a good ways toward achieving the cleanup there, even at 60 percent of the time that we're -- we've allotted for this cleanup to occur.

Okay. This one is easier because this shows the system sampling that we've done, the constituents that we sample for, the number of pounds that's calculated by analytical results that we've received from the laboratory per constituent. So as you can see, PCE is the target constituent that we're removing. We've also had -- have had other volatiles such as vinyl chloride, one TCE, DCE, methylene chloride that were removed quickly and this flat line means

there's no more of that being removed.

So the PCE, vinyl chloride, lot of that got removed about the first week and this is -- no more has been removed after that. But this line here shows we're still showing progress cleaning up tetrachlorethylene. And according to those calculations from laboratory results and the molecular weight of PCE, about 1200 or so pounds has been removed to date.

So this is -- I think this has been an extremely successful cleanup that's -- that's going to happen pretty quick. We're going to show some good results within the year time frame that we had allotted for it to occur.

Any questions from the RAB?

MR. SKROBARCEK: So that equates to about two drums; doesn't it?

MR. CARROLL: Yeah.

MR. SKROBARCEK: Of material if you just had product?

MR. CARROLL: About 14 pounds per gallon.

MR. SKROBARCEK: Something like that.

MR. CARROLL: 700 pounds per drum.

MR. SKROBARCEK: Uh-huh.

MR. CARROLL: That's right.

MR. GARCIA: Yes, sir. I'd like to ask that once you evaluate the system and how they're working that we put

them on our next agenda so you can tell us --

MR. CARROLL: Put on them what?

MR. GARCIA: On our next meeting agenda so you can give us a full report on how they're doing and how they're working and how much work they've done and maybe before you send the facts, send us some preliminary information so we can get familiar with what happened so that we'll be more qualified to ask some questions.

MR. CARROLL: Okay.

MR. MARTINEZ: Any other questions of Paul on these two building status reports from the members of the RAB?

Being none, the next presentation is by Mr. Bill Norton from Tetra Tech, the contractor. Third visit to the RAB reporting on the former metal plate shop.

MR. NORTON: Thank you guys for having us back again. Our purpose here tonight is to kind of give you an update of where we're at with the excavation at the former metal plating shop in the parking lot of Building 171.

I'd like to have some brief introductions, then go over the work that's been completed to date and then discuss just a little bit of the air monitoring that we've done at the site during the activities ongoing and then go over the remaining work to be completed and then talk a little bit about the schedule, where we're at, and then we'll have conclusion for questions and so forth. Next slide, please.

As far as the introduction goes, my name is Bill Norton. I'm the project manager for Tetra Tech. Keith Bradley is our contracts officer. We have Larry Tyner and Brian Howard, our technical lead engineers. Of course you guys have met Mr. Paul Carroll with AFRPA and Mark Davis is absent. Luis Medina is our project manager that we coordinate with daily at Kelly Air Force Base.

Very quickly, just this is the work completed to date. The first ten or so items we reviewed already. This is where we compared the work plans, mobilized to the site, did our setup and so forth and did some preliminary investigation work. What I'd like to focus on are the last five or six items we've actually began excavation. And to date, we have removed approximately 1390 cubic yards of the asphalt and that material has been taken to a recycling facility for reuse.

We have removed and disposed of 1320 cubic yards of concrete rubble. That consisted of the old foundation slab, vats, footers and so forth we took out. And then to date -- and this is as of yesterday afternoon -- we have removed approximately 35,040 cubic yards of what we refer to as Class II nonhazardous soil, but is contaminated. That has been taken off-site and disposed of.

And we have also removed approximately 300 cubic yards of hazardous soils. And in addition to that, we've had some ongoing construction activities as far as installation of

the shoring and so forth. We're down to 25 feet with that as part of our ongoing process.

This is just a footprint of what we looked like on April 1st as far as depth. You can see it's kind of color coded. Zero is the ground surface. It goes to 20 foot in depth. This has now changed obviously since it's about 14 days old. We've now progressed past that point, but just kind of want to give you guys a visual of what it looks like. Yes, sir.

MR. SKROBARCEK: Where is it in orientation to 171?

MR. NORTON: Yes. 171 is to the north, the very top of the site, the railroad track at the lower end of it and that's east and west.

MR. SKROBARCEK: Okay.

MR. NORTON: Next slide. This is just some photographs. I thought you guys might find it interesting more than anything else. This is our shoring installation going in. This is a combination of shotcrete/concrete and soil mills. This is a fast approach we use to allow the excavation to keep going. It does nothing more than protects the safety of the workers while we're in the hole to make sure that the boring doesn't collap -- the hole doesn't collapse because we're down to over 20 feet right now. We're actually coming up on our 30-foot run. We've made some significant progress. Next slide, please.

And then this is just a site photo, and again, just for your curiosity, in case you kind of wonder what we're doing. This is an example of us loading trucks in and out. You can see where we're making our runs, our digs and stuff and our trucks are coming in. This is our daily routine operation where we load out trucks and transport them off site. And this is, again, just to provide you guys kind of an insight of what we're doing out there on a daily basis.

One of the things that we have done throughout the course of the project is we monitor the air around our workers and the surrounding environment. And in doing so, we monitor directly in the worker's breathing zone, which is like right where they're standing and working. We will monitor within the chain link fence area, which is what we call the exclusion zone, and then we also monitor beyond the chain link fence, which we call the perimeter.

We do realtime monitoring for vapors and exposure, like I said. The air sample is conducted during work activity to protect our workers. To date, we've done 128 individual sampling events. From that, we have generated 640 samples. The chemicals have been screened for all contaminants of concern and all chemical screens have been non-detect for everything, the breathing zone to the exclusion zone and at the perimeter.

So in conclusion we don't indicate -- have anything

to indicate that we're emitting any kind of vapors while the excavation is going on.

Just a quick summary of the work that's remaining to be done out there over the next few months. Obviously we want to continue the soil excavation and disposal from 15 to 45 feet below the ground surface. And then once we're through with that, we want to come in and put a carbon source in the pit of this area below the groundwater. And the reason for that, that's going to help clean up the groundwater over time. Even though we've got the soil material out and the source area, the groundwater is still contaminated so we'll put this in there, that will release a carbon source to lower the groundwater concentrations over the next couple of years.

MR. PERSON: When do you expect to hit groundwater?

MR. NORTON: Sir?

MR. PERSON: This is Paul Person. When do you expect to hit groundwater?

MR. NORTON: We'll install the carbon source probably in the next five to six weeks.

MR. PERSON: How deep?

MR. NORTON: It will be between 40 to 45 feet roughly.

MR. PERSON: With the drought situation we're in now, that should be minimal?

MR. NORTON: Yeah. Right now, the low water table

is at 30 feet and that's where the source area -- below that is what they call the Navarro clay. I'm sure you're familiar with that. So there's no water below that, you know, as far as the official aquifer.

So our goal is to clean up this official aquifer so that's why we're concentrating on 40 foot. That's right at the top of the Navarro so that's why we're putting the carbon source there.

Once we're through with that, we're basically going to do a site restoration and that will consist of bringing in backfill, bringing the site back to grade. We'll put in some additional -- replace the monitors wells and monitor the site over the next couple of years and then we'll do some pavement and so forth to bring it back to the original surface and then from there we go into the monitoring event.

We have periodic monitoring for three years and we'll come out and do base -- routine sampling at specific monitoring wells for a three-year period, one-year increments. And with doing that, then we'll go into the reporting phase where each year we'll turn in our report to Mr. Carroll of the results we found to show the concentrations.

This is just a quick summary of our schedule. We anticipate all the excavation being completed by July. We anticipate having the parking lot totally restored by August 2009. We'll have the replacement wells in by August as

well. And then in September of '09 we will initiate the annual groundwater sampling events and those will be three consecutive events. Next slide.

And that's pretty much it in a nutshell. It's a straightforward project. I'm really pleased with our efforts of our subcontractors and so forth. I'd like to ask if you folks have any other questions or anything.

MR. AVILES: First of all, let me compilement you for the work you've done. I'm Rafael with the Port and we took Judge Nelson Wolff on a tour of the Port just I believe it was last Thursday, showed him of course the excavation area where you were working. Usually we don't want to show people the areas where we've got construction going on because, you know, we're trying to show our good face. But this is an area where we were very eager to let them see what was going on.

Armando and I have worked together in the past. I'm not saying that they'll ever ask, but he's very impressed with the work that's going on. If by chance the county commissioners ask for an update, since he did take the tour, any problem with getting y'all out there just to give a quick five, ten minutes like you did with the -- if they do -- I'm not saying they have, but should they.

MR. CARROLL: No problem. I gave them an update about three or four months ago as a matter of fact --

MR. AVILES: Right.

MR. CARROLL: -- and we talked about this project so we'd be glad to go back.

MR. AVILES: Okay.

MR. NORTON: I appreciate the compliment. I'll pass it along to my field crew. We have some top shelf people. We're hiring a lot of local people in San Antonio. We've had nothing but good success out of them so we're very, very fortunate. And in saying that, the folks at the Air Force, Mark Davis and Luis and those guys have been very good to work with. It's been a team effort.

It's not just been Tetra Tech or anybody else. It's been everybody kind of focusing on the issues. We had a lot of upfront coordination with everyone, including the Port Authority, and we want to make sure we kept you guys informed and so forth. We really appreciate that. You guys have made us feel real welcome here so we appreciate that.

MR. MARTINEZ: Any more questions from members of the RAB? Thank you, Mr. Norton.

We have a returning former RAB member, Mr. Gary Miller, next to give the results of the EPA Soil Vapor Intrusion Study.

MR. MILLER: Thank you for letting me come back and kind of give you a summary of what we've done to date. I'm going to start just going back over what we talked about a little bit last time. Basically, the study was originally

conducted -- as you can see from these three questions, we wanted to concentrate of the areas with the highest groundwater concentrations of off-site base -- off-base groundwater contamination.

We were basically focused on number two, to determine if we had a complete pathway. We didn't really believe -- we may not even have a complete pathway. The bottom one, just want to make that clear, that we were never intending to do a full delineation of any contamination we found. We were just trying to basically determine if there was a potential problem in the area. Go ahead. Next slide.

This is, again, just kind of a basic conceptual site model of vapor intrusion issues. There's three different exposure scenarios shown here. Really the one that we would focus on is this third scenario here where basically it shows a residential structure without a basement sitting over a soil and groundwater contamination. In our case, we had no soil contamination. We're really just focusing on the groundwater contamination in the offsite area.

Now this particular structure is showing, you know, just a home. A lot of the homes in the area we sampled had pier and beam type structures and we'll talk about that a little bit more. Go ahead.

I'm having trouble reading the slides. Basically we wanted to -- we asked these three questions any time we

started doing the vapor intrusion study. We -- if we found subslab or subsurface gas, we wanted to make sure it wasn't entering the residence. That basically was going to tell us if we had a complete pathway. And if it was in the residence, were we sure that it was from the subslab -- from the subsurface or was it maybe a lifestyle interference. I think we talked about this once before, but it could be, you know, your dry cleaning has the same type of chemicals that we were looking for. The same compounds that are in your dry cleaning, a lot of them are in your shoe cleaners, your waterproofing and different likes that that you have in your home.

Common everyday products, even though they're sealed, would still show up in our sampling. So at the homes that we did sample, we removed all that stuff if we could find it. In some cases, which we'll talk about a little bit later, we think we may have missed a few, but -- and it also could be from ambient. Now there's actually a lot of TCE -- if you just take an ambient sample outdoors, you'll find TCE in the air at measurable concentrations.

And basically the last -- you know, same thing. We were just wanting to make sure other sources were identified. Go ahead. Next question.

This is basically what we used out here. It's a Trace Atmospheric Gas Analyzer Mobile Laboratory. Basically

it's a big Blue Bird school bus is what it is that's been outfitted with a lot of equipment and it gives us the ability to do on-site analysis that we were able to use for screening of all these homes. Go ahead.

Back -- step back and look at the earlier sampling that we did first real quick. When we did the May 2008, we did 20 homes where our -- that was our target, to try and get 20 houses and sample. Originally we were going to do all 20 in the 34th Street area that Paul talked abouat. And for those of you not familiar, 20 -- 34th Street is north of Kelly.

If you can see the map over here, the groundwater map, basically right here where the plume is still in -- a small portion of the plume still exists. There were some concern in that area because that had the highest groundwater concentrations at the time in one well. There was a well that had a very high concentration of TCE or tetrachlorethylene. And we were concerned that possibly there was, you know, a correlation between that high concentration and indoor air problems in the area.

We ended up doing 17 homes in that neighborhood. Concerns from the community were that maybe we should look at other areas. We also added three homes northeast of East Kelly, which would be back in -- if you can see this, again, the post over here, it's kind of back off of East Kelly in

this general area right here, just right off the boundary across the railroad tracks.

What we did during that time is we ended up collecting 16 subslab soil gas samples and four of the homes were pier and beam homes, again, like I talked about before so crawl -- we under those homes we did crawlspace samples.

What we were able to do in all cases is we did a screening process first using the mobile laboratory you saw earlier and then we came back and we also collected a sample which was sent offsite to a lab so we could compare and make sure we were getting comparable results, which we did.

Basically after we did the study or the --the initial sampling or screening sampling, we made a decision to sample five homes, go indoors and do the full indoor air sampling and then resample the subslab in those five homes. Go ahead to the next slide, please.

Just going to kind of show you real quickly where we're at. On the far left side is -- this is 34th Street. The green pins were just different homes that we sampled in May of 2008. Go to the next one.

This is the area off of East Kelly. I think the base is back -- back in here. This is Kelly. I believe that's Kelly streets. Anyway, there are three homes. This is actually a new residential neighborhood. It doesn't show up on this map. At the time, there were homes through here.

There were homes on these streets. And we picked two homes down right off the neighborhood. Go to the next slide.

And it's a very busy slide. It's hard to see. I apologize, but we tried to get all the results from the -- from the sampling on this one slide. We ended up bringing the results with me. Basically what we had -- have to look at it again myself.

We picked five homes. Basically what you can see, these are the five homes we ended up picking that had the highest subslab values at the time. The values were still not real high, but we decided, you know, those are the five highest we had outside of one. I believe there was one -- this is another one we sampled right here (indicating).

There was one other one that was high that we chose one right next door to it that had a very comparable number that we decided to sample. Out of this sample, only one of the homes had -- all the homes -- basically our screening level for PCE is 0.41 micrograms per cubic meter. And out of these homes, there was actually only one value and it was collected on one of the samples.

The other sample didn't have -- had a very low -- had a value of .78, which was still basically a 10 to -6 range risk. It -- it was a little higher than -- I think it was at 9.3 times 10 to -6. Pardon me, 1.9 times 10 to -6 level for risk level. Again, it's still well above any action level we

would have picked. Go ahead to the next slide, please.

Because of some concerns that were expressed during -- when we were presenting the data before, we agreed to go back and possibly -- and sample the homes again to see if there was a seasonal variation in the homes.

Our original plan was to go back to the 34th Street and resample those five homes again because of some difficulties gaining access agreements and some of the homeowners, you know, because of the results last time they decided that they would rather we not sample their homes again so we were only able to get two of the original five homes to resample. We were able to get one of the homes that had the highest value before so we were happy with that.

What we did add in the 34th Street was we added one additional home. The homeowner had contacted Kelly and asked that her home be included. It was much farther down in the area, but we agreed to sample her home along with -- go to the next slide. We added to -- I guess I left something out there.

Anyway, there was also another area that we added seven additional homes and I'll explain -- I think I got a map. A little bit later I'll show where the rest of them were. But basically what we did was at these homes -- because of the homes we -- we only had two homes that had a subslab so we did subslab samples at two homes and then the other nine

homes were all pier and beam homes that we collected crawlspace samples. And because we had a limited number of homes -- we only ended up with eleven homes this time.

Again, it was access agreement issue. We knocked on a lot of doors and got a lot of blank stares and a lot of nos. But we did try to contact as many people as possible in the neighborhoods. What we decided to do was sample the indoor air in all eleven homes. Again, we screened them all using the TAGA like we did in 2008. Go to the next slide.

This just kind of shows you the general area I believe. This is the 34th Street area again. Again, we sampled -- this is 34th Street. Kelly is down here. This is I believe -- I think it's Groden, Growdon it's called. We were able to sample one home on Bay, one on Carnation and then the last home that we added was -- was an extension of Bay. It's on Weir Avenue. Go to the next slide, please.

This is the area which we call it East Kelly, but it's between the main base and the former East Kelly. It's that little triangle of land which had been impacted at one point by one of the plumes. It's in -- again, it's in the area of this little triangle area -- shaped area between the main base and East Kelly. Most of the homes were on Baker Avenue. There was one home further down on Hollenbrook or -- yeah, Hollenbrook would be this one here. Hollenbeck, excuse me. When we did the seven homes in this area -- I believe

that's what we added. Go to the next slide please.

This is an overview that shows all the samplings we did and where we did it in relation to Kelly. Because you can see, this is the main base. East Kelly is in here. This is the concentration at seven that we did in 2009. This is the other -- the eleventh that we did in 2009. Again, it's pretty far out, but this is actually a plume. It's off of Commercial and Collingsworth I believe is the street. There's actually a PRB, a permeable reactive barrier wall that the Air Force installed right in front of this lady's house.

The green samples are the ones we did also in 2008 so this is just showing the location in relation to everything else we did in May of 2008. Again, these are the ones we sampled in 2008 and 2009. Go to the next slide, please.

Again, these are the results, still a little busy. But again, it's only showing PCE because that was our main concern and it was really all that we were able to detect. We did have two minor detections of TCE in two of the homes at very low concentrations, actually lower than our ambient concentrations that we received. And just to kind of read off a few of these, basically we had two homes that had -- trying to find them. The first -- the top two on this list are subslab samples that we got very comparable results, actually probably a little lower than what we had last time when we did these homes. Actually -- I guess it's actually quite a bit

lower because that home that's at 280 was I believe 600 last time. If I'm not mis -- yeah, I think it was 600.

But in each of these homes, we ran the results multiple times. We did a -- this particular column here is what we did using the mobile lab. We ran through and screened each home. What they would do is they would walk into a room with their hose and take a one-minute sample inside the room and they would move to the next room and take another one minute sample and they would plot all these and the homeowners would get a printout that would show the result in each room. And what I had plotted up here were only the maximum numbers. And in most cases, that's the only value that was detected, if there was anything detected.

And out of that, we only had two -- we had -- I think there's four that actually had any detection above -- our detection, again, only one of those is deemed above our screening level. The others are much lower than our screening level and generally they're not even reported. But I'm showing -- I wanted to show you all the values that we obtained.

And the only home that we had a value above our screening levels was the second home listed here. And the value was somewhat elevated. We went back into the home and we discussed with the homeowner what was going on. The homeowner indicated to us that they had a person that lived

with them who worked in the -- in an auto shop and she said that he does come in with his clothes and she said, you know, even she notices when he comes in that it does put off an odor and we think that may be where that value is coming from because that home did not have a value like that the last time. It was a different homeowner the last time. The home has been sold since it was last sampled.

But again, it's -- the number is well below what we would consider an action level, which would be a number that we thought it could potentially over a lifetime cause an increased risk to somebody's -- to human health. Anything else on here I wanted to talk about real quickly?

Oh, I wanted to point out a few things here. When we did these results, we also did ambient samples, which I was mentioning earlier we could put a Summa canister, one of our sampling devices, which I didn't put a picture in this presentation. We would put it outside behind somebody's house. You know, it would just collect an outdoor air -- a sample of the breathing air that is just floating around outside.

Out of those results -- just want to point that we did get results. Probably -- well, actually some of our ambient numbers were almost as high as these, these few detections we had. That's what leads us to believe that some of these values may actually just be ambient air that is, you

know, in the indoor air environment. And it's almost impossible to go into a house and take everything out of it.

You know, the homeowners looked at us funny when we would bring in these plastic tubs and we'd start going through their cabinets and remove stuff out of the home and ask them to leave it outside overnight until we could finish our sample. Go to the last slide here.

The conclusions that we came up with basically from the study, we do believe there is a potential for complete pathway to indoor air. I mean it's obvious we got indoor air values of some type. They're very low, but we did get a -- show that there was a complete pathway.

The one home that had concentrations above our screening level is well below an action level. That particular home is a slab on grade and it's in an area where the groundwater concentrations have been decreasing and have decreased actually since that particular -- the sampling -- the sampling originally started because of one well.

That particular well has now dropped in concentration again and so we believe that as long as the wells are continuing to drop and the Air Force is going to continue their monitoring plan that there's no reason that the values in the house would be suspected to continue to increase. The other homes that we sampled, which is what we had always -- this is a theory that we had always believed is

that in Texas, the pier and beam homes are generally well ventilated.

People don't seal up their pier and beam homes like you do in the north where if people have a home like that, they seal the vents to keep the cold air out. In Texas we just don't get cold enough, and especially in San Antonio, you don't have the same issues. So generally the homes are vented and so if anything is collected under these homes, it's obviously being vented away because we found only in two cases did we get any detection whatsoever in a crawlspace area.

In both of those homes, the values that we received were less than -- I think they were both less than half of our screening level, which they were barely above a detection level. So they could have just been interference in our sampling. And again, they were also both TCE, which is different than what we had found anywhere else. And we did not find any concentration in either one of those homes indoors. It was only the crawlspace.

And the last one I've already talked about. It's really the -- monitoring to the groundwater plume is going to continue by the Air Force. And we basically feel that the TCE and PCE concentrations in the off-base area, as you can also see from Paul's maps over here that the areas even in this East Kelly area that we talked about, basically they're a non-detect in the wells in that area. So we sampled the areas

at the request of homeowners who thought that the plume could have also -- you know, we could have vapors still present in the area. But now the groundwater plume is continuing to drop.

We did sample a home out here in one of the highest concentrations out in this area that's left off-base and we've also sampled the highest concentration up here. These other areas in this general area is basically a commercial/industrial area. It's very hard to sample an industrial area for indoor air values because they could be using very similar products and we won't get involved in an OSHA issue. That's basically an issue for OSHA.

And that's -- I believe that's it. There's one more slide or -- no. Oh, it's our next steps. I'm sorry.

Basically what I had hoped to do before tonight actually, I was going to try and meet with each of the homeowners. I've had issues with the travel to get down, but I am planning on tomorrow talking to each homeowner individually and explaining all the results to them because I don't want to just give them a packet of paper and walk away. I want to sit down and talk to them about it and make sure that they understand what the results mean.

And as you can see, we presented tonight and then what I will also do at the request of Southwest Workers Union is I'm going to give another presentation tomorrow night at a

meeting that they're hosting at another location. I believe it's Fuerza Unida, if I'm pronouncing it correctly, building on New Laredo Highway. I believe it's 710 New Laredo Highway.

MS. LOPEZ: It's at Fuerza Unida. It's at 710 on New Laredo Highway.

THE COURT REPORTER: Excuse me?

MR. MARTINEZ: Could you please speak up louder?

MS. LOPEZ: It's called Fuerza Unida. It's a sewing co-op and it's on 710 New Laredo Highway.

MR. MILLER: And I believe the meeting starts at 6:30; is that still correct?

MS. LOPEZ: Yes.

MR. MILLER: Okay. That's 6:30 tomorrow night. If you're interested or you know somebody that might want to hear this again, I'm going to give basically the same presentation again to maybe a different group of -- of people. And that's really -- that's all I have. I mean if you have questions, I'll be glad to answer them during the public comment period if you put a comment down or if there's questions from the RAB I guess.

MR. SKROBARCEK: Appreciate the presentation. The question is the two slides before this, you speak to things being well below the action level. Can you define what that action level is and define action level so everybody understands what that is?

MR. MILLER: Okay. Well, Mark and I just talked about this. I meant to change that terminology because it is kind of confusing.

What we did was we originally calculated some values based on current guidance that we have available. Now we actually went above and beyond. I had a risk assessor look at values and she used some numbers for cancer slope values and stuff from California, which we basically had -- you know, her group as a risk assessor has been told to use. They're actually more conservative than what EPA had been using from our old guidance.

So that's how we calculated our screening level, which is. 41. And a screening level is basically a risk where we look at a -- you'd have an increase of one cancer in a million. For an action level, we decided an action level would be a 10 to the -5 risk, which would be one cancer in 100,000 I guess. And then for that to happen, our -- our action level would be 4.1 micrograms per cubic meter or -- yeah, cubic meter. And we were nowhere near that. I mean we were still at point -- or what we were at? 1.838 was our highest value for PCE.

So that -- that's basically what an action level -- an action level would be what we would decide, unless other factors were influencing. But some of the other factors that we believe influenced this is the groundwater concentrations

are continuing to drop. There are source control remedies in place. There's pump and treat systems in place. There are pier and beam -- permeable reactive barrier walls in place that are continuing to -- to lower the groundwater concentrations so we believe that the groundwater concentrations will continue to drop. And there's no reason for us to believe that the indoor air values will increase in any of the homes. So that's another reason why we would, you know, look at maybe even a higher value than that 4.1 value for an action level.

And again, those are calculated based on EPA values, you know, that we have. And like I said, they're more conservative than what we would look at under our 2002 guidance, which is out there as a draft guidance, but that's what we have been instructed to use. We actually went more conservative than that to calculate these values.

MR. SKROBARCEK: Thanks.

MR. MARTINEZ: Yes, sir.

MR. MILLER: Yes, Rodrigo.

MR. GARCIA: Gary, I have lived in that area all my life off 38th Street just north of there and a lot of the people, including some of the workers will agree with me, we have had problems with that junkyard called Alamo Aircraft and the EPA has never done anything about it, how they're -- how they're contributing to the vapor intrusion problems.

We also have when we took the tour down those two jet fuel tanks, is that contributing to the problems, the type of groundwater contamination or vapor problems, has that been certified clean? And when are you going to tackle that Alamo Aircraft? That junk has been there for years and years and years. It's rusting and rotting in there and it has never been dealt with by the EPA, TCEQ or anyone else. When are they going to deal with all that junk there? None of that is salvageable and cannot be resold. It's been sitting there, rotting there -- rotting for the past 30 years.

MR. MILLER: I really can't answer you on that, Rodrigo. I mean the problem is the facility is not a regulated facility. I mean they -- what they are doing is a salvage operation. I'm sure they may have some type of a -- you know, more of a local ordinance almost than there is a -- a hazardous waste type cleanup issue.

I do know that something that the Air Force is working on is looking into offsite sources that may be adding to the groundwater contamination. They may be looking into ground contamination in a lot of areas, you know, around Kelly that they don't feel were caused by actions at Kelly.

Now whether it contributed to the plume, you know, we basically sampled in the neighborhood so whether they have contributed or not, we still didn't find anything. We didn't find a values that would cause us concern in those

neighborhoods so whatever contribution --

MR. GARCIA: I'm talking about outside -- I'm talking about inside the perimeter. Have you gone to see how that junk --

MR. MILLER: No, I have not.

MR. GARCIA: -- is leaking (inaudible) --

MR. MILLER: I do know that --

MR. GARCIA: -- because I've seen --

THE COURT REPORTER: Excuse me. Excuse me. One at a time.

MR. MILLER: I can tell -- tell you that I know that TCEQ's local office has gone to Alamo Aircraft numerous times in the past and looked into complaints that they were storing stuff, they had stuff leaking. And what I recall hearing over the years is that they never found anything that they could actually tell Alamo Aircraft they needed to clean up.

So there's -- you know, as of right now, there is nothing. I mean obviously if they find something in the future, I guess they would go ahead and -- but I can't speak to what TCEQ would do with it.

MR. GARCIA: Who has jurisdiction on that, TCEQ and EPA go over there and do a full investigation?

MR. MILLER: I don't think there's any investigation -- there's no rationale for us to go to in there right now. Mark?

MR. WEEGAR: Mark Weegar, TCEQ. I just -- we've talked about Alamo Aircraft before. I mean the TCEQ does inspections on the facilities like that. We have done inspections on Alamo Aircraft and we have not found any violations of how they're storing.

I mean I understand what you're saying, that the site is kind of an eyesore from the outside looking in. But we go in and do, you know, our evaluation and inspections of how they manage their -- you know, do their housekeeping, how they manage their materials and things like that. To my knowledge, they have not been cited for any kind of violation. So TCEQ does not have the authority based on no indication of any kind of release or anything like that just to go in there and either, one, do our own site investigation or compel them to do it without having any indication that they've had any kind of releases or any kind of violations of state regulations.

You know, you have to have -- you have to have some indication that they are -- that they are mismanaging their -- their products and their waste and things like that before we can do go something like that and we have not identified that. They have not been cited for violations and something like that to my knowledge.

MR. MILLER: Anymore?

MR. MARTINEZ: Anymore questions of Mr. Miller?

MR. CAMDEN: Gary, I got one more question on your table. You've got some limits that are lower than actual -- your actual screening levels that are reported out. I was just wondering is there a reason for reporting like a .36 instead of --

MR. MILLER: The only reason why I did that was to show all the values. Because if somebody looks at the report, they'll see that there is a value in the report. Although if you read the report, it does say that they're below reporting limits. The reporting limit was .41 so they did not report anything in there. We only listed them because that was what I was asked to do by management, to show that, you know, we were showing all the values that we detected.

Again, those values are very -- that's why I'm making it very clear, they're below our screening level even and they're actually between a detection limit and reporting limit so they're kind of in that gray area where they're not at legitimate values even by the lab. The lab even marked them as whether or not they may or may not be a -- a true detection.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: do y'all --

MR. MARTINEZ: Excuse me, sir.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Do y'all have anything to do --

MR. MARTINEZ: Sir. Excuse me. The discussion so

far is still limited to the discussion between the RAB members and the presenter. I'd like to ask if there is another question from any member of the RAB.

MR. AVILES: Not a question, but just a suggestion. That's going to be in Councilman Cortez--

THE COURT REPORTER: Excuse me. Can you speak up?

MR. AVILES: Sorry. That's going to be in Councilman Cortez's district, the Alamo Aircraft. So I mean I know that his staff, Tim Salas and his group, would be very eager to hear from you if you want to go ahead and see what they can do as far as the city. Because that's even off Port property, but that does fall in Councilman Cortez's district.

MR. GARCIA: Yeah. I bet you if this was up next to the Dominion, something would have been done already.

MR. NAZIRITE PEREZ: Yeah, that's true.

MR. MARTINEZ: As we indicated at the beginning, there is now -- we are now at the session of public input. I have five cards. I believe I'm getting a sixth card.

As I stated earlier, we have over the past three years requested that members of the general public, the audience, limit yourself to three minutes. And again, remember that the purpose of the whole program is remediation -- environmental remediation of the former Kelly Air Force Base and the ongoing work.

I'd like to ask -- give Mr. Greg Schwartz the

opportunity to come up and speak before the RAB here at the podium and the microphone. Introduce yourself.

MR. SCHWARTZ: Hi. My name is Greg Schwartz. I am a reporter with the San Antonio Current and I've been doing some research on the matters here and I recently discovered something that I think the community members of the RAB should know about, which I don't think has been very widely publicized.

And a couple of years ago, Metro Health and their contractor Health Care Resolution Services brought in a outside cancer expert, a professor Timothy Aldrich from East Tennessee State University, to do a feasibility study and analyze the statistical data of the cancers in the area and try to do some analysis there. And when they didn't like the results of his report, they put together a blue ribbon panel to critique it and then they did not release it to the public.

And I tried to interview Mr. Aldrich about this and I called him last week and he told me that he could not speak about it because he had been threatened with a breach of contract lawsuit if -- not only if he published the report on his own, but if he ever spoke about it to the media. And I found that a bit troubling.

And so I interviewed Dr. Fernando Guerra from Metro Health yesterday, and him and Assistant Director Charles Pruski both told me they had no knowledge of this contract

lawsuit, that they withheld the report because that was within their contractual right.

But they said they had no knowledge of the threat of the lawsuit. They sort of passed that to their contractor and -- but when I interviewed the president of Health Care Resolution Service today in a very brief phone call, she refused to comment on that and said that she would have to refer me back to the City of San Antonio, which in this case would be back to Metro Health.

So no one seems to want to take responsibility for that legal threat, but I just -- I'm troubled by the fact that Mr. Aldrich, who was brought in for his expertise, is not allowed to defend his own report which indicated that 11.5 percent of the cancers in the Kelly area may be attributable to living above the plume.

MR. MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Schwartz. The next person I would like to call is Mr. Robert Silva. And I'd like to warn Mr. Silva that there is a cord literally right under me. I do not want for you to slip -- trip over it so please be careful.

MR. SILVA: Please blur my face out from the fear of retaliation and safety of my livelihood from the State of Texas and EPA.

I'd like to begin by thanking Mr. Miller for the do-nothing agency approving the Air Force's cleanup that has

resulted in the deaths of untold Americans. Thank you, Mr. Miller, for your rubber stamp.

I'd like to first ask the question about the approval from the community to -- where is he? Yes, sir. I had asked you a question. You stated that the community has been approved the certain specifications for cleanup. What were you referring to?

MR. CARROLL: What are you asking? I don't remember exactly what question it was.

MR. SILVA: Due to the base realignment and closures.

MR. CARROLL: Right. The community -- part of the BRAC law is that the community stands up a local reuse authority and that local reuse authority goes through the process and identifies what their proposed reuse is for the former base. That is a process that goes through and they submit that after they go through the process to the Air Force and the Air Force identifies that in the record of decision for the reuse of the base.

So Kelly -- most of Kelly was chosen for an industrial reuse. There are parts of Kelly that were chosen for a residential use, small portion, and that is what the Air Force has cleaned up to. Those are the levels --

MR. SILVA: And where is this letter? Who signed it from the community?

MR. CARROLL: That's the community reuse plan. The LRA's reuse plan. It should be on record. The -- the record of decision from the Air Force is also on record.

MR. SILVA: Can you provide that this to the RAB members so it can be shown to the record?

MR. CARROLL: I think it's on the administrative record. I can -- I could identify the website the administrative record is on.

MS. COIRA: That record is actually mentioned at the back of everyone's packet, just for your information.

MR. SILVA: Well, I'm asking you to provide it. I'd appreciate it if you would.

I'd like to go back to the -- Mr. Miller's presentation and I'd like -- a question for him to answer was why wasn't North Kelly Gardens tested? It seems that North Kelly Gardens has a high rate of illnesses and it intentionally was ignored for testing and I'd like to know when he gets back.

The other one is the PCE levels will soon change and making these levels much lower than what they are to federal guidelines. How is that going to affect these results that he's getting?

The other one is since the initial testing was done during the warm days, will the next one be done during the colder days since the effects of the doors being closed and

the heat being used indoor affects how vapor intrusions are affecting the households indoors making it more likely for more intrusions to happen?

The next thing is I'm going back to a specific issue that's been going on with EPA and Mr. Weegar with TCEQ. There was a statement put out by TCEQ and it was labeled the interactions with Mr. Silvas with TCEQ. Are you aware of that letter?

MR. WEEGAR: Not sure what you're talking about.

MR. SILVAS: Okay. I'll provide you a copy.

MR. WEEGAR: Is it something that I was involved with?

MR. SILVA: Well, TCEQ, you're an employee.

MR. WEEGAR: There's -- I don't know, there's like five or 6,000 -- no, maybe -- maybe over 6,000 people that work for TCEQ.

MR. SILVA: Let's get real funny about it, why don't you.

My next question is operating under the Texas Workers or the open meeting -- Texas Workers Open Meeting Act, are we?

MR. MARTINEZ: This is a public meeting. This is a public --

MR. SILVA: Open public.

MR. MARTINEZ: Public meeting --

MR. SILVA: Texas Open Meeting. Right. Aren't you supposed to take a roll call and see if you have a quorum? Aren't you operating without a quorum?

MR. MARTINEZ: I do not know what is a quorum at the moment.

MR. SILVA: Oh, boy. Okay.

MR. PERSON: We have a quorum. We have a quorum tonight.

MR. SILVA: Where? Count them.

MR. PERSON: One, two, three, four.

MR. MARTINEZ: Well, let me --

MR. SILVA: Community members.

MR. MARTINEZ: Allow me to say that there is not a single action item. This is simply a reporting process from consultants from the EPA, if necessary from other federal, state agencies, to the RAB. There is not one item that requires an action -- a decision to be made by the RAB. So we are not violating any public law.

MR. SILVA: Still, you should take roll call.

MR. MARTINEZ: Thank you.

MR. SILVA: And have a vote on an open meeting or quorum and you haven't done that.

MS. COIRA: You might want to mention, Mr. Martinez, that we did a round table introduction of the Restoration Advisory Board members of the beginning. While this is a

public forum for -- for any sort of things to be considered, really the quorum that we need to have is from our Restoration Advisory Board, not from a larger community.

MR. MARTINEZ: Mr. Silva, you're approaching your three minutes.

MR. SILVAS: Again, I'm being shut off once again. We have extra time to go and, as usual, we're shut off from voicing our concerns.

I just want -- again, Mr. Miller, Mr. Weegar, you are on notice -- notification that you will be called soon for your testimony for your obstruction of a federal investigation. Y'all know what I'm talking about. Thank you.

MR. MARTINEZ: Ms. Diana Lopez, Southwest Workers Union. Welcome.

MS. LOPEZ: Hello. Good evening. I just want to say it took me about two calls to do different -- to two different agencies and I looked on the website and I had about two different addresses for this meeting, two different times. So that was also very, very hard to find, just when a time and place for this meeting was going to happen.

Two, the RAB is a very flawed process. It's -- it's overseed by the Air Force; therefore, as we see by the graphs around you, and the contamination in the first place, there is no interest of the community here.

MR. PERSON: I beg your pardon?

MS. LOPEZ: There is no interest of the community here as we see by the graphs with the contamination in the first place. So therefore, you know, you have the Air Force overseeing a lot of the -- a lot of the projects, which do not include any community insight on it.

MR. PERSON: I have to disagree. I've been sitting here for 15 years and I'm a community member so I don't --

MS. LOPEZ: Yes, but you don't --

MR. PERSON: How long have you been coming to these meetings?

MS. LOPEZ: I was a resident. I just -- I just started. I'm very young, as you see.

MR. PERSON: How old are you?

MS. LOPEZ: I'm 20.

MR. PERSON: When you were five --

MS. LOPEZ: I'm 20 and I've only been affected --

MR. PERSON: When you were five, I was here. Okay? So there is some involvement by the community.

MS. LOPEZ: But not -- not at the community level.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Don't argue --

MS. LOPEZ: You have the Air Force overseeing --

THE COURT REPORTER: Excuse me.

MR. MARTINEZ: Excuse me. One at a time.

(Inaudible.)

MR. MARTINEZ: Excuse me. There is a discussion

between two people here.

MS. LOPEZ: You have the Air Force overseeing all of the projects; so therefore, if something -- and most of these agencies are -- are involved in some way or another with the City of San Antonio or with the Department of Defense. But that's three --

MR. PERSON: Not me.

MS. LOPEZ: -- three people, three community members, four community members here as opposed to all these agencies. So you have a lot of oversight. Since there's -- there's no -- there's no choice, as he was saying earlier --

MR. PERSON: I'm free to say whatever I like whenever I want.

MS. LOPEZ: -- that the RAB does not have any choices in the projects. As he said, it was only a way to find out. A forum as he said.

MR. PERSON: I have to disagree. We used to have another subcommittee of this whole group where we had people come in and give us presentations on what our consultants have been doing for us. It was paid for by Kelly Air Force Base. It was TAPP money that we had, TAPP grants where we had analysis of SAIC reports delivered to us from a third party. This is way back when you were like ten years old.

MS. LOPEZ: Yeah, but there's still community --

MR. PERSON: So I wouldn't --

MS. LOPEZ: -- involvement in this. If you go to the meeting tomorrow, you'll find people who have been struggling for 20, 40 years on this who have had no community insight of this.

MR. PERSON: They're welcome here.

MS. LOPEZ: Yes, but it's -- this -- this base isn't set up for them.

MR. SILVAS: Just go on with your point. He's -- he's dragging you on.

MR. MARTINEZ: Excuse me. Again, the discussion is between these two people and any other member of the RAB that would like to participate in this discussion.

MS. LOPEZ: If you please, let me go on with my two or actually three.

As Mr. Miller was saying that -- that that TCE was -- was -- there was air -- he had air monitor testing outside and I was -- it was at a conductive level, but if you look at different studies at a lot of the nation and around the world, TCE is present in all communities around Air Force bases, around-s military base.

San Antonio has seven military bases, formerly eight, so we're in the higher risk of having TCEQ (sic) around Air Force bases and military bases.

And two -- and three, four, actually, my -- my thing just keeps going on. Port San Antonio does the same kind of

maintenance work that the military did before. So how do you know that -- that the contamination is -- doesn't keep going on?

This just -- just shows a few of the -- of the contamination process, but -- but with the work that -- that Boeing and -- and Lockheed Martin is doing, that contamination is just going to keep -- keep going on. But all you hear is about the -- the past contamination and how that affects people. But you see, the -- the plume is getting smaller.

But in 50 or few so years, just what happened 50 years ago, the same plume is -- is going to go in the groundwater and in the shallow groundwater because groundwater doesn't just stay in one place, as we've heard from many agencies that they tried to tell us that groundwater doesn't really -- that groundwater doesn't flow down -- downstream, that fish don't swim and other nonsense that they've just told us over and over again.

So that's -- that's my conclusion. You know, the process doesn't end here. And -- and the contamination is still going as long as that -- as that maintenance is still going in Port San Antonio. So that's -- that's something that needs to get into account.

And lastly, I don't know how long y'all have been into to see the monitor -- the monitoring wells by the S1 pit, but those -- those well caps are in very poor condition. It's

easy for them to just pop off. They're rusted. They're not -- they don't really have identification. You know, it's really easy to move them and that's something of a concern to not only me, but also the people who live around there. You know, I'm a very small person and I was able to just move it with my foot. You know, that's something that y'all say y'all have been monitoring them and looking at them over the years, but it seems like nobody has been to those sites in years and years. Thank you.

MR. MARTINEZ: Thank you. Ms. Helen Hunter. Mr. Garcia.

MR. PERSON: Rodrigo has a question.

MR. GARCIA: I would like to address a concern. I have also been involved in this, like Mr. Person, since the early 1990.

MR. PERSON: And this gentleman here, too.

MR. GARCIA: As has Mr. Nazirite. And as Mr. Carroll can attest, I have been very actively involved. When we first started, I was doing 70 to 200-page reports asking him questions. Even now, we set the agenda. We tell him we want reports on this; we want reports on that; we want reports on this. And they -- he caters to every question that we ask, every report that we ask. Because I've spent hours reading through this material; I've spent hours reading through the reports.

And I advise you, if you have a problem like you just mentioned, feel free to put it in writing, like I've been doing for the past 17 years, and submit it to Mr. Carroll. A lot of my issues have been addressed because I submit everything in writing. And sometimes he spends hours reading 30, 40-page reports that I give him asking him questions about this and that and everything else.

So I advise you to get involved, write all your concerns down, submit them to Mr. Carroll and we will make sure that they get addressed. That's what we're here for.

And a lot of us have been doing this for 15 years, 17 years, 18 years and five years I suppose. And we take very -- we take this very seriously and they do cater to us very extensively on every issue that we ask them to face.

MR. MARTINEZ: Mr. Carroll.

MR. CARROLL: I'd like to set the record straight on just one instance.

MR. MARTINEZ: I'm sorry. Speak louder.

MR. CARROLL: Sorry. I'd like to set the record straight on just one instance.

Current regulations don't allow carte blanche contamination to be entering the ground, the groundwater, the soils on this base from current activities. There are regulations that these people have to comply with and Brian over here will be glad to identify a lot of those regulations.

Now that -- that kind of stuff is getting reported here and, you know, that -- that stuff you kind of let it go sometimes. But these kind of things, there's old contamination that we're taking care of. While the base was active, we had to comply with current regulations and now we're complying with the -- with the regulations overall.

The tenants are complying with their regulations. They're being watched much more closely than anybody has ever been watched in the past and I think they're very proactive to cut down actually their use of chemicals and other things that can harm the environment. So, you know, those -- those are the requirements of these companies.

I just want to set that record straight.

MR. MARTINEZ: The next person, Helen Hunter. Is not here. The next person, Mr. Rodriguez.

MR. EIGINIO RODRIGUEZ: Good evening. My name is Eiginio Rodriguez. Before I came to this meeting, I felt I was safe. Actually today, this morning, they had called me from the doctor's office. They said I had missed an appointment. The appointment I have is because of elevated liver enzymes. I had no idea about this vapor situation. I honestly felt I was safe because I thought, Well, if it's the drinking water, someone looks at the quality of the water.

Thus far, I've been lucky. The liver is working fine, hopefully I'm going to be okay. But still, when I heard

this, you can imagine what I was dreaming back there or daydreaming.

When I was a kid, we lived in General McMullen and Patton and we used to have a clothes line hang and wire. And my brother and I would build a tent and we'd play in that tent and the better of the enclosure, the greater the tent was. And now I see these things about vapors going through the soil.

I was also privileged to have served in the water quality task force regarding aquifers so I know that aquifers are caves so things can go anywhere. The dry spell, like some mentioned, it does create cracks in the soil. In those days, which was was the late '60s, I still remember playing outside. Sometimes it was hot as hell. We were -- I mean people would say, You live in Texas? But it makes me wonder about these vapors now.

In the meantime, regarding what has occurred here, there was a land use request when it was Kelly U.S.A., which was to -- for part of it, I don't know if it still exists, was to be a TOD, which is a Transportation Oriented District. I'm not sure if that's still there. Now it says that the community requested for industrial. So whomever did addition back then -- I'm going to be honest, I'm not sure if it was related to this group or not. It used to be called Kelly U.S.A.

It concerns me that since 1998 till today, regarding TCE and PCEs, the vapors have only been reduced by fifty percent. Why am I concerned? Because in the old days, remember the old days when you wouldn't have to get off your car to get gasoline, you'd have somebody pump it for you. Well, that was stopped. Now of course gasoline at the time had lead, but it was stopped for a reason. It was stopped because people -- the highest rate of brain cancer came from those that served the gasoline to all of us. So that was stopped.

So when I hear that the vapor amounts and the limits are below par and all this kind of business, that there's enough ventilation, it makes me wonder. Does this stuff accumulate in your body? Is it an aggregate amount even though it's just a little bit? Does it begin to accumulate in your body? What happens? I'm not sure. There's no health people so it's not fair to ask you but just to consider in the future. When you talked about the monitoring of the homes and stuff, when you did find the high elevations, was the fixed monitoring system put in place or is it just on a case by case basis or let's try that, let's try this?

Another thing that I'm curious about is did anybody do a study regarding the elevations of these properties? I'm not sure if it has anything to do with it, because there's different -- you know, how it has those regions of different

elevations, has anyone looked to that?

The asphalt that was removed, is it evaluated before being recycle? Because it showed that the vapors go up. Now this asphalt may be new, who knows.

Another one is -- well, like I said before, the accumulations of stuff -- and I really wish I hadn't come to this meeting because I honestly thought I was safe because the water I drank, I did not think it -- I mean it would be clean water of course. But now that I learned about vapors, it's a totally different situation. And I'm glad y'all are here looking into it and I hope y'all ask the tough questions so (inaudible.)

MR. PERSON: I've got a question for you.

MR. EIGINIO RODRIGUEZ: Yes, sir.

MR. PERSON: You have SAWS water?

MR. EIGINIO RODRIGUEZ: Excuse me?

MR. PERSON: You get water bills from SAWS?

MR. EIGINIO RODRIGUEZ: Yes, sir.

MR. PERSON: Then you're on San Antonio water?

MR. EIGINIO RODRIGUEZ: Yes, sir.

MR. PERSON: I wouldn't worry about it.

MR. EIGINIO RODRIGUEZ: No. No. I'm not on San Antonio water.

MR. NAZIRITE PEREZ: I do worry about it.

MR. PERSON: You drink San Antonio water out of the

tap?

MR. EIGINIO RODRIGUEZ: Yes, sir.

MR. PERSON: And you get a SAWS bill?

MR. EIGINIO RODRIGUEZ: Yes.

MR. PERSON: Doesn't come off of Kelly wells.

MR. EIGINIO RODRIGUEZ: Well, actually Kelly has a close system because there was an Air Force base; therefore, it's not attached to the actual SAWS system. So that's one of the safety precautions when you have a military base you do not want someone from the outside to tamper with your water system. That's why I felt safe that my water was okay. I mean now as a kid, I lived right there on the General McMullen and Patton, but then I moved to the 78228 area. Both zip codes are in line with this. But still, you would think before SAWS pumps water, they test it.

MR. PERSON: They do.

MR. EIGINIO RODRIGUEZ: Now, there's something called trimethylenes that when you mix with chlorine, which is used in the water system, it creates a carcinogen. So all these accumulations of different chemicals -- because now chlorine and fluorine and nobody has really said how it affects the body. So then you mix a vapor, a gas, that like go into our bodies so how does, you know, that react with us? So these are a lot of little things. We'll find out in the future and somebody is going to do an autopsy, and say, You

know, this is wrong. So any other questions, sir? Thank you.

MR. MARTINEZ: The last card I have here is from Mr. Jesse de los Santos.

MR. DE LOS SANTOS: Good evening, everybody. I'm just a visitor here. I'm a resident of 2208 Monterrey Street, but I do have a property on 39th Street, 700 block. And I just read in the paper about three or four weeks ago where they found lead in some children on 36th and Eldridge, which is only three blocks from my property.

I have a big lot that I have to maintain maybe twice a month and I walk it and I'm not there only for 30 minutes and go home because I don't live there. It's just a plain lot. But I'm there for maybe three, four hours, six hours, seven hours, and I don't know whether I'm standing on contaminated land or not. And I was wondering, when they found this lead, were y'all involved with the city or was it the city involved you guys? That's all I have to say. Thank you very much.

MR. MARTINEZ: Mr. Weegar.

MR. WEEGAR: The lead contamination you're talking about on Eldridge, that apparently was -- TCEQ and EPA have both -- EPA's -- their contractors, emergency response contractors have been out there and are out there removing the lead-contaminated soil from that particular property. TCEQ has been involved along with Bexar Metro Health on that.

But that was actually -- it appeared to be soil that was brought in by a previous landowner and placed in the yard. It's not -- it's not something that is widespread. It's limited to that yard. It was -- as far as I know, we have no indication of where that soil came from. A previous landowner actually brought that in as fill material and put it down in the yard. It had -- it apparently has shell casings and actual bullets and things like that so obviously somebody had removed it from some type of a range or something like that, a gun range or skeet range or something and had brought that soil in and put it down specifically just in that yard. So it was limited to that property on Eldridge.

MR. DE LOS SANTOS: Well, incidentally I worked at Kelly Air Force Base for 40 -- 1952, retired in 1992, and there were buildings that there that we could not drink water. Do not drink the water, not from the faucet. Bring your own water. You would open a faucet and brown, green all kinds of color water was there. Thank you very much.

MR. SILVA: Can Mr. Miller answer my question that I had presented when he was absent?

MR. MARTINEZ: Could you repeat the question?

MR. SILVAS: Mr. Miller, on the ongoing levels of TCE, the levels that are going to be brought down, exposure levels are greater, how is that going to affect the testing?

MR. MILLER: Like I was saying earlier, Robert, when

we did our study, we calculated values based on the very conservative -- the ultra conservative values that were being used in California and other states, which are much lower than what is in our current guidance. So we were already using the lowest values that -- that we knew of that are out there, that have been scientifically studied anyway, or actual values that risk assessors can use.

MR. SILVA: What are those levels?

MR. MILLER: I don't know the exact cancer slope base because my risk assessor actually did the study and she came up with the values, but that's how we calculated the screening levels that we did.

MR. SILVA: The other thing is was there any testing done in North Kelly Gardens?

MR. MILLER: That's -- that's the area of off 34th Street, that's what we were calling North Kelly Gardens.

MR. SILVA: So there was actually testing done?

MR. MILLER: Yes.

MR. SILVA: A lot of the testing was done during the warmer days of the year.

MR. MILLER: And that's why we came back in February of this year and resampled, to do a seasonal study. And again, the Air Force had also done a seasonal study back in 2000, 2002 I believe. They had done a couple of studies on base and kind of off-base they did a seasonal study. In

neither case did we ever really find any real difference.

You know, you do the seasonal study in colder climates because, generally, in cold climates they keep their house closed up more. When we did the study in the summer, we asked the homeowners to leave their homes closed, although some did leave windows open, maybe they didn't have central air or something, they used windows to ventilate.

So that's when we came back in February thinking that we'd get a better time to do it. And we asked the homeowners again to leave their homes closed and leave interior doors closed so we got isolated values inside certain rooms. That's what we were looking for.

MR. SILVAS: You had mentioned that testing wasn't being done on base, but all the facilities aren't maintenance. I mean there's facilities such as the older housing units and etcetera.

MR. MILLER: Well, what we did was on base we did a survey of areas that were potentially over concent -- highly concentrated, contaminated groundwater and basically we decided that most of the facilities were industrial-type operations that were over those higher-up concentrations. We didn't really find any office space or residential structures that are over the groundwater plume on Kelly.

And then on top of that, we decided where the interest really seemed to be was the off-base area and that's

where we concentrated on. We allowed the Air Force to continue their studies, as Paul talked about, in Building 360 and so on and those have been looked at by the Air Force.

MR. MARTINEZ: Thank you. Thank you very much. I'd like to -- Elizabeth, is the RAB community member nomination process still open?

MS. COIRA: It is still open in fact, and I think we've been able to distribute to you the majority of the Kelly RAB recruitment fliers, which are also very helpful by the way. On the back, they have the upcoming dates for the Kelly RAB marked in red. And if you know a few folks that might be interested in becoming members on the Kelly RAB and live, work or own property in the affected area, please come by, pick up a flier, pick up a poster, pick up a nomination form. We've been distributing these out to the community as well and we hope to see y'all back here in July.

MR. MARTINEZ: We heard the passion that several of you expressed when you made your presentations and it is heard and appreciated. And as Elizabeth has just indicated, the staff has been looking for additional community representatives to take part in these RAB events. So please, talk to Elizabeth and find out a little bit more about what is the nomination process and be part of the Restoration Advisory Board. Thank you.

The next item on the agenda is, according to

tradition, customary, the RAB has a discussion among itself as to what items you would like to hear discussed, presented at the subsequent meeting. The next meeting is July. Any suggestions? Mr. Weegar.

MR. WEEGAR: I think the RAB would like to hear an update from Tetra Tech on the Site MP excavation, just kind of tell us where you guys are moving on that. Again, progress update of how the big dig is going.

MR. NORTON: Absolutely.

MR. WEEGAR: I think any of the RAB folks that are going to be on the -- there was mention of a tour and whatnot. I think you'll be very impressed with the size of the excavation over at MP. I know I was out there today and I was -- it's been about maybe a month since I was there the last time and they have made tremendous progress in that excavation. It's pretty impressive.

MR. MARTINEZ: Any other suggestions, any member of the RAB, for items to be presented at the next RAB meeting in July?

MR. SKROBARCEK: Are there any reports, technical reports coming out between now and then that we may want to do an update on? If there is, we would like to be briefed on that.

MR. CARROLL: Okay. The Semiannual Compliance Plan Report that went in in January should be concurred -- TCEQ

should have concurred by then and we can report on that. If the permit gets approved, we will also report on that.

MR. MARTINEZ: This is going to be a short meeting. Any other suggestions, requests?

MR. CARROLL: They usually grow on us.

MR. CAMDEN: This gives the opportunity for any -- I know the primary focus is on remediation efforts, but if there are any other reports out there that may have a health component to it that may be available or corollary reports that might be available, I'd like to see the opportunity to see any of those presented if they're available.

MR. MARTINEZ: Duly noted by these two gentlemen at the middle of the table. Any other suggestions?

Hearing none, we have adequately gone through the entire agenda. We appreciate the participation by members of the public. You are welcome to return to each and every RAB meeting every quarter.

Meeting is adjourned. Thank you very much.

STATE OF TEXAS)

COUNTY OF BEXAR)

I, Gina K. May, Certified Shorthand Reporter in and for the State of Texas, hereby certify that this transcript is a true and correct a record as possible, transcribed by me through computer-aided transcription.

I further certify that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties in the action in which this proceeding was taken, and further that I am not financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of the action.

WITNESS MY OFFICIAL HAND, this the _____ day of _____, _____.

_____

Gina K. May, CSR
Texas CSR 5273
Expiration: 12/31/10
FEDERAL COURT REPORTERS
Firm Registration No. 97
10100 Reunion Place , Ste. 660
San Antonio, Texas 78216
(210) 340-6464 (210) 341-5533