KELLY RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD

July 13th, 2010 6:30 p.m.
AFRPA Headquarters
485 Quentin Roosevelt
San Antonio, Texas 78226

RAB Community Members:
Beverly Abbott
Jose Arzola
Eloy Garcia
Brian Skrobarcek

RAB Government Members:
Tommy Camden, San Antonio Metropolitan Health Department (SAMHD)
Paul Carroll, Air Force Real Property Agency (AFRPA), Government Co-Chair
Kyle Cunningham, SAMHD, Alternate
Paco Felici, Port Authority
Jorge Salazar, Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ), Alternate
Kathryn Thomas, United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)
Mark Weegar, TCEQ

AFRPA Staff:
Melissa Baird, Contractor
Richard Black, Contractor
Val de la Fuente, BRAC Program Management
Daniel Dunning, Contractor
Laura Guerrero-Redman, Contractor
Art Hoecker, Contractor
Jose Martinez, Contractor/Facilitator
Luis Medina, BRAC Program Management

Public Attendees:

Leslie Brown
Bill DiGuisseppi
Bob Goodson
Lacy Guaderrama, TCEQ San Antonio
Yikram Iyengar
Kenneth McDill, HydroGeoLogic, Inc.
Nanda Nanjurdappa
Rick Rogus
Sowmya S.
Juan Sandoval
Jennifer Schneider, AFCEE
Robert Silvas
Stephanie Smith, Representative Charlie Gonzalez's Office
Dave Wacker
Kathryn White

RAB Members Not Present:

Rodrigo Garcia
Lidia Martinez
Nazirite Perez
Paul Person

MR. MARTINEZ: Ladies and Gentlemen, welcome to the July 2010 meeting of the former Kelly Restoration -- former Kelly Air Force Base Restoration Advisory Board. My name is Jose Martinez. I will be your facilitator for the evening.

I'd like to point out a few things before I pass on the -- the meeting to the members of the -- of the board. As I always do, I'd like to remind everyone that the purpose of the meeting of the RAB, the Restoration Advisory Board, is to discuss the ongoing environmental remediation at the former Air Force base. Any topic that does not pertain to that issue, the staff will be more than willing to discuss the issue with you and refer you to the appropriate agency within the community where you can get the issue addressed, resolved. So very important, I'd like to make that point every time.

Very quickly, I'd like go over the agenda. Following me will be a brief presentation by the cochair community cochair, Ms. Beverly Abbott, on some membership issues pertaining to the community membership. I will then point out a few things, administrative issues. I will then be followed by Mr. Paul Carroll, the cochair of the Restoration Advisory Board, who will address two issues.

There are actually three issues listed in the environmental update, but the OPS demonstration topic will be part of the discussion that he, also Paul, will be discussing on the issue of property transfer.

We will then go into a public comment period. It says 8 o'clock there, but if you will allow us a little flexibility, it is not necessarily time-certain. We will then have a period of approximately 20 minutes for any member of the general public to address, again, an issue pertaining to the environmental restoration at the former Air Force base. And with respect to that, there are some cards that when you signed in, you were advised that if you'd like to make a comment, please take one of these cards and provide us your contact information. In case staff needs to get back in touch with you, we would like to be able to have your phone number, your contact information, e-mail, etcetera. And I will then be able to call upon the -- the persons that have requested to address the restoration -- the board.

One last thing I'd like to make a point that it is -- at about 8 o'clock is the period for the public to ask questions of the board, of the staff, and to make comments. The rest of the time period is for the members of the board to aptly discuss issues with the staff and ask -- and make comments among themselves.

So with that in mind, I'd like to ask Ms. Abbott to address the membership issues.

MS. ABBOTT: Good evening. My name is Beverly Abbott. I'm the principal of St. John Berchmans Catholic School just down the street here from Kelly and I live and

work in the affected area. And I'd like to ask each member to introduce themselves.

MR. SKROBARCEK: Brian Skrobarcek, community member.

MR. WEEGAR: Mark Weegar, TCEQ, Austin.

MR. ELOY GARCIA: Eloy Garcia, community member.

MS. THOMAS: Kathy Thomas, EPA, Dallas.

MR. FELICI: Paco Felici, Port San Antonio.

MR. CAMDEN: Tommy Camden, San Antonio Metro Health District.

MR. ARZOLA: Jose Arzola. I'm a community member.

MR. CARROLL: Paul Carroll. I'm the environmental coordinator for Kelly for the Air Force.

MR. MARTINEZ: There's a topic of a vacated RAB member.

MS. ABBOTT: I understand there was an individual who had asked for membership and that individual's name is Lidia Martinez. She went through training and the orientation in December but has been unable to attend the meetings. They have contacted her and she just is not able to attend. So they're giving her the opportunity to again reapply to become a member and to see if it's going to fit in with her schedule a little bit better, maybe later on for the next few meetings.

As per the rules, she has missed enough meetings that her membership is no longer valid and so now we have a vacated RAB seat, which is available for anybody that would

like to apply.

MR. MARTINEZ: Thank you, Ms. Abbott.

The next item on the agenda is my listing the administrative items which are frankly the -- the information that was made available to the public via the local media. If you turn to page six in your packet, there's a listing. And of course within the packet itself are the individual items that are listed on this sheet.

I'd like to point out that there was one extra item that was included in the packet. It's a three-page document titled Frequently Asked Questions Associated with the Leon Creek Fish Consumption Advisory. That item is not listed on page eight, but I'd like to make sure that all of you are aware that this is included in the packet.

I would like to now ask Mr. Paul Carroll, the cochair, to address the issues on the environmental update.

MR. CARROLL: Thank you, Jose.

First we'll be talking about Building 171 parking lot. As most you who have come to the meeting tonight have probably seen out in the -- out in the parking area, there's some fenced off area. That's the same area where we worked on this Site MP where we've done the excavation down to about 45 feet and done the environmental work there.

Well, what's -- what's happened since then is after we got done with the environmental work, we have environmental

concurrence from TCEQ that the environmental situation is addressed in the soils; however, we had some settlement issues around right at the very edge of where the excavation was. I'll go ahead and click to that. If I can get it to work. Where's our -- there we go. Boy, I'm behind; aren't I? Sorry about that. Trying to get it to catch up.

Okay. We had some sink holes in the parking lot where the parking lot has sunk and what we did is the Port San Antonio did some investigation. There's a storm drain that was actually breached by some of the anchors that they put in the -- TetraTech, our contractor, put in the wall to hold the wall up. That caused the storm drain to be pouring water into the edge of this excavation and causing the sink hole. At least that's part of the problem.

And what we're doing to -- what our contractor is doing to remedy that situation, they're out there right now installing these soil -- these columns, concrete columns, basically to shore up the parking lot to be sure we don't have anymore settlement in the parking lot causing the sink holes. And that's what they're doing out there.

It's not strictly an environmental issue, but it is part of their contract of doing that part of the repairs under warranty. So here's a picture of the rig you probably saw as you're on your way in. They're drilling about a 3-foot diameter column down to about 35 feet and filling it with the

concrete. So that's going to be done before the end of this month and we'll have that all shored up and ready to allow for the construction of the new complete parking lot that goes along with our building here. The parking lot of course will be -- will have guard houses, entries and it will be fenced all the way around for -- for security and access per Air Force policy.

MR. CAMDEN: Are the additional costs being picked up by the engineering firm or are y'all having to pay more money to --

MR. CARROLL: Yeah. Yeah, they're covering that portion. There is a portion that's outside of their excavation that we're looking at, too, that's got a -- one or two sink holes also. That may be because of the old slurry wall that we put in in 1990 and '91. We're going to investigate all the way around that to be sure that we don't have anymore sink holes outside. That will -- the Air Force will end up -- probably end up paying for that part. But the majority of what they're doing though is -- is under their warranty.

MR. SKROBARCEK: So is that inside the walls or outside the walls where you're getting subsidence?

MR. CARROLL: They're getting subsidence -- the main part of the subsidence is inside the shotcrete wall that they installed when they did their excavation.

MR. SKROBARCEK: Okay.

MR. CARROLL: There was an area about 15 feet long by five or six feet deep that was just outside of this that we've -- we've located and we're looking into. That's something that's going to be our -- our issue. It's right on top of the old slurry wall though so we suspect it's because of that for whatever reason.

MR. SKROBARCEK: Okay.

MR. CARROLL: All right? Next topic I'm going to be talking about is to finish the Semiannual Compliance Plan Report discussion. From last time, if you remember, it's been several months but we talked about -- kind of went through item by items the Semiannual Compliance Plan Report and we've already talked about Zones 4 and 5, what we'll be doing -- no, it wasn't. It was Zone 2 and 4. Where's my help?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: 1 through 3.

MS. ABBOTT: 1 through 3.

MR. WEEGAR: 1 through 3? Okay. I'll get to the right slide. Maybe it -- okay. Here we go. Okay. We've already talked about Zones 1 through 3 and this time we'll be talking about Zones 4 and 5.

Also, we'll be talking about Leon Creek sampling. That's done -- sampling that's done as part of that Semiannual Compliance Plan Report. Things that we cover on that are stream flow and elevation measurements, surface water,

outfall, seep and sediment sampling and bioassessment fish tissue sampling that we do. Sampling reporting activities were in accordance with the requirements from the Hazardous Waste Permit issued by TCEQ and renewed in April of 2009. And we received approval of that report in June 2010.

Okay. The first site is Zone 4, which is better known as East Kelly is OT-51. And that was an old engine cleaning facility I believe. And the second is the East and South Bank sites. These are sites that were placed in -- on the border of Zone 4 on the south part and on the east part where we have groundwater extraction and treatment prior to prevent plumes from moving off-base.

What we call the UPRR PRB, which is a series of two passive reactive iron filing walls, that are placed on property that's near the Union Pacific Railroad yard. That's why it's called that. Those are to intercept a couple of plumes there. And then the Commercial Street PRB on the other side of the map over here, two more sections of that same type of wall.

The plumes that we see coming off the base, there's some pretty good maps of these if you want to take a look at them. There's some in your packet that identify where the PCE, tetrachloroethene, and TCE, trichloroethene, plumes are. And these plumes, as you see, originated near and on Zone 4 and have migrated over the years off-base a couple of miles.

In Site OT-51 that we showed a moment ago, current remedy is vegetable oil treatment. We've injected vegetable oil into the aquifer. That breaks down the TCE into its breakdown products ending up with non harmful byproducts. The COCs that exceeded the Groundwater Protection Standard in 2009 included TCE and vinyl chloride.

Here's the site of that -- picture of that showing the TCE and cis 1,2-DCE concentrations that are remaining there. As you can see, they're fairly low. The Groundwater Protection Standard for TCE is five micrograms per liter and it's below that at that site and on cis 1,2-DCE which is I believe 70. All of the concentrations are below that standard there.

The East and South Bank sites on the border of Zone 4, the current remedy includes groundwater recovery from horizontal wells that were drilled to intercept the plumes there along the eastern and southern border boundaries of East Kelly. And the contaminants of concern that exceed the standard there in 2009 include PCE and TCE.

And here's the concentrations of PCE and TCE that exceed the groundwater standards there. As you can see, most of the PCE is off the base to the -- to the east and a lot of this -- a lot of the plume that was on base has already been captured by this system. There's still TCE in the area that the system is still capturing.

The UPRR PRB was installed in 2005 as an action to address migration of chlorinated VOCs from an upgradient off-base source located north of East Kelly. And the COCs from -- at that location include PCE, TCE, cis 1,2-DCE and vinyl chloride. And here's a closeup of the concentrations of those contaminants. There's the PCE is listed -- is shown here. In that northern section, it's up, you know, around a hundred ppb there and then in the southern section, you know, it's a little bit over a hundred going into the wall and it's at -- somewhere between ten and 40 or 50 on the other side of it.

MR. SKROBARCEK: What was the off-base source?

MR. CARROLL: We have not found a specific source of that contamination off-base. We just kind of know the general vicinity it's coming from and we've installed remedies to take care of it and that's about as -- about as much as we know. It does look like it comes from between -- between there and back over here in the road because I think we have a well over in here that shows it's not -- it didn't originate from any further than this area somewhere (indicating).

And here are the TCE concentrations at the same transects. We have up to about a hundred or so micrograms per liter there at the northern segment and just over ten in the southern segment of TCE. Commercial Street one, as y'all know, is over here toward -- toward the east from that. It

was installed in two phases in April of 2004, June 2005 for the same reason and the COCs that exceeded the Groundwater Protection Standard in 2009 included PCE, TCE and vinyl chloride.

And here are the concentration figures that show that. As if -- if I can point this out, this is -- this is basically a concentration that's less than the concentrations that we see going through these walls. So this is down below five in between these. That's why the wall doesn't extend all the way.

Findings and conclusions for the Zone 4 sites. OT-51 almost complete with the natural degradation of that site and the amendments that we've been putting in have been working. On the East and South Bank, the groundwater recovery system appears to be effective in remediating that site. And the UPRR PRB, it overall continues to be operating properly and successfully and then Commercial Street PRB, it also appears to be operating properly and successfully.

At Site S-1, which is on the northern part of the base, y'all -- if you were here for the last RAB, you heard Mike Spradling from CAPE described what's going on there. We've -- we're installing an electric -- electrical resistive heating system at that site so that's where that site is.

The 34th Street PRB is a passive reactive barrier iron filings that was installed right down the middle of 34th

Street north of the base. Intercepted a plume there.

There's the Building 1533 PRB, which is just east of this building right here, to intercept a plume before it goes off the base, and the Building 1414 vegetable oil injection site, which is right up here.

The Site S-1 was a former waste oil storage facility, former Defense Property Disposal Office. And what happened there was the soil vapor extraction was installed in '99 which includes 11 extraction wells. A groundwater recovery system, consisting of six recovery wells, is in place there. That's where our Zone 5 groundwater treatment plant is.

And also we have COCs. Contaminants that exceed the Groundwater Protection Standard in July 2009 included benzene, chlorobenzene and arsenic at that site. Here's the concentrations of benzene and chlorobenzene. We have up to a thousand micrograms per liter in the -- in the groundwater at that site of benzene on 10,000 of chlorobenzene.

34th Street reactive wall was installed in 2004, 2005. It treats an off-base PCE and TCE plume. And COCs that exceeded the Groundwater Protection Standards included PCE, TCE and cis 1,2-DCE. And again, a figure showing the concentrations at these wells, there is -- most of the concentrations are in between zero and a hundred. There's one well that's at 715 right here. So there's kind of a hot spot

of PCE in one of the wells at this location. And then TCE are pretty low levels at 10 micrograms per liter which is twice the Groundwater Protection Standard so it's still over so we're still working it.

And then the building 1533 PRB, that was constructed in 2002 to treat a PCE and TCE plume that originated at that same Site S-1 and prevent it from migrating off-base. Vegetable oil injection was performed in late 2008 upgradient of the PRB to help attenuate the contaminants before they go through the PRB therefore extending the life of that. TCE exceeded the Groundwater Protection Standard in 2009.

Now here's the shape of the plume there. It's TCE concentrations. And as you can see, there are some low concentrations that -- that do go through that wall. The wall is intended to treat the TCE to as low a levels as we can and then natural attenuation will take over from there and treat it down to the Groundwater Protection Standard. You'll see that in a lot of these PRB walls we have installed here.

Building 1414 is where we've injected vegetable oil or HRC. It's a compound that has lactate which is a -- it adds the carbon source for the bacteria that naturally degrade the TCE and PCE there. That was injected in 2002 and the most recent injection we've done is in 2006 and that was emulsified vegetable oil to help the process along. These things when you inject them, they only have a certain life span and you

have to kind of monitor to be sure they're still working and you reinject if you still have issues.

Contaminants that exceeded the Groundwater Protection Standard in 2009 included TCE and cis 1,2-DCE. And here are the concentrations of that location, Building 1414. As you can see, the TCE is over about 400 at one location, 647 at another so that's a pretty hot spot right here that we're still working to try to get down to the Groundwater Protection Standard.

Cis 1,2-DCE, those are pretty high levels also. Those levels are also indicative that the vegetable oil is doing its job because that cis 1,2-DCE is a breakdown product of the TCE and that's one of the things we look for to ensure that this is working as intended.

I also have the plume D waste management area. That's another injection site where this HRC was injected in 2002 and again in 2008. Just one of the areas. There were two areas that we looked at at that site, one we call east and one we call west. COCs that we still have in 2009 includes TCE, cis 1,2-DCE, trans 1,2-DCE and vinyl chloride.

So here's the plumes here. As you can see, we have some very high concentrations of TCE at this location up to about 48,000 micrograms per liter. So we're watching that pretty closely. The good thing is it's localized but we're -- we did that reinjection. We're watching the results of that

reinjection pretty closely and as I explained the last slide, this cis 1,2-DCE is one of the things we watch and it's up to about 6500 parts per billion, micrograms per liter there.

Findings and conclusions of the Zone 5 sites that we reported in our Compliance Plan Report are that the current groundwater recovery network is effective in providing boundary control for Site S-1. The electric resistive heating system is being installed at this site and I wanted to put that in there and I'm not sure that that was reported in the Semiannual Compliance Plan Report, but I wanted to make sure that y'all knew that was going in that, that's the site that that system is going into.

At the 34th Street PRB, that monitor well that I pointed out a while ago that has elevated concentrations, we -- we are watching that. We are monitoring that and we have a plan that we outlined in the operating properly and successfully documents that if it does continue to increase or doesn't show decreases, we'll have to go in and do some other amendment there, some other kind of treatment to be sure that's being treated because that's downgradient from that wall that's supposed to treat it and we're watching that.

Building 1533, reactive wall. The TCE plume since 2008 has shown an increase in size in the north and south. We see fluctuations common and those are common due to varying rainfall amounts. We're continuing to monitor the

effectiveness of that PRB and will make adjustments as necessary to that.

The plume D, we do know, as we just showed, that the reductive dechlorination is occurring there. We see decrease in TCE concentrations and increase in the daughter products of the TCE. And the dechlorination of VOCs is almost complete in the 1600 east area that should say I believe. And some residual vinyl chloride is present in the vicinity of one of those wells.

Now we're to the Leon Creek monitoring. Leon Creek, we sample 59 locations. We call them stations. 56 of those stations are within the boundaries of the former Kelly Air Force Base. There are three reference stations which we normally call background, but they're for reference to try to get a background level, an aerial background level from this area from Salado Creek, Medina River and Medio Creek.

Anyway, Leon Creek is divided into four segments, sections one, two, three and four. One is from Highway 90 to the northern boundary of the former Kelly Air Force Base. Section two extends from the section one boundary southeast about 1.7 miles to Southwest Military Drive down here.

Section three extends from the section two boundary southeast to the City of San Antonio stormwater discharge pipe on Leon Creek. And then section four extends from the section three boundary southward about 0.8 miles downstream.

I'll be showing a picture of where our monitoring locations are here in a moment. One thing we sampled is surface water elevations and at 22 stations including two seeps and three outfalls. The hydrologic budget is one of the things we kind of look at. Is it gaining water from the groundwater or is it losing water into -- into the ground.

Segment one showed neither loss nor gain so it's equal. Segment two showed a water loss that's most likely to infiltration. Of course this was last summer that we're looking at these sampling events so -- so it was pretty dry then. Segments three and four show water gains presumed to be groundwater inflow from the creek.

Another thing we do is surface water and sediment sampling. We collect surface water samples from 39 stations, 29 instream locations, four seeps, three outfalls, which are basically storm drains, and three reference stations. We're required by our TCEQ permit to compare sample results against the Texas Water Quality Standards acute and chronic aquatic life criteria and human health criteria and then other sediment samples we collect from 27 stations including 23 instream locations, one outfall and three reference stations. Those results were compared to the Texas Water Quality Standard human health criteria.

It's kind of hard to see probably back from back further, but the locations where we do monitor Leon Creek

start up here. You can see the red dots here, here, here and then the red and green dots here all the way down at all these locations down here and then proceeding -- this is our Zone 2 area, south of Military Drive, going all the way through that, still down Leon Creek. And then these are our reference stations that I mentioned a while ago that are in different locations and different creeks and then upstream.

I think y'all have a -- I don't know how good -- that's not a very big copy in your packet, but --

MR. ARZOLA: Where is section two again? Section two?

MR. CARROLL: Section two is -- let's see. What did I say?

MS. ABBOTT: Should be north of Military Drive.

MR. CARROLL: North of Military.

MR. ARZOLA: Southeast to San Antonio stormwater discharge pipe on Leon Creek. Section three.

MR. CARROLL: That's pretty much all of the former Kelly and the Lackland area.

MR. ARZOLA: I'm sorry. Section three, can you point that out to me?

MR. CARROLL: Section three?

MR. ARZOLA: Uh-huh.

MR. CARROLL: That's down here to the south of Military Drive, down -- how far does it go. 0.9 miles, I'm

not sure if I can find it on the map. 0.9 miles, but it goes from --

MR. ARZOLA: On the southeast corner.

MR. CARROLL: -- Military Drive -- Southwest Military Drive down 0.9 miles.

MR. ARZOLA: Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: How old is the aerial shot?

MR. CARROLL: How old is it? A lot of times it will say when it's from. I'm not sure. I'm assuming it's within probably five or -- five or six years old. We may -- it may identify it there, but I can't read it.

MS. ABBOTT: I think it's right under that seal.

MR. CARROLL: I see. Is it?

MS. ABBOTT: Just needs a bigger font but...

MR. CARROLL: I can't read it.

Okay. I'll go through the surface water findings first. What we've seen that exceeded the Texas Water Quality Standards criteria are semi volatile organic compounds, benzo(a)anthracene, that's misspelled, at one reference station. Benzo(a)pyrene is exceeded at one reference station. Metals, dissolved silver was exceeded at five locations, including both upstream and downstream locations. Pesticides p.p-DDE was exceeded in one downstream location.

The seeps that we sample, we've seen the findings there are the PCE exceeded human health criteria of five

micrograms per liter at two seep locations at SP003 and SP0011. And then TCE exceeded the human health criteria at two seep locations, one location the southern part of Zone 1 and one location near the groundwater treatment plant.

And then the sediment sampling findings, sediment sample results from in-stream locations resulted in volatile organic compounds, semi volatiles, pesticides, metals and PCBs that exceeded the TWQS human health criteria. The one VOC is toluene. SVOCs include benzo(a)pyrene, benzo(b)fluoranthene, benzoperylene, chrysene, di=n-octylphthalate, fluoranthene, and then another one I can't pronounce, phenanthrene and pyrene. So several VOCs exceeded the criteria.

Pesticides -- several pesticides and PCBs including Aroclor-1260. Also several metals, arsenic, cadmium, chromium, copper, lead, mercury, nickel, silver and zinc.

And the last bullet says that the reported exceedances in surface water and/or sediment samples are believed to be coming from an alternate source other than groundwater. We've got several stormwater outfalls present in the stream reach bounded by the former Kelly Air Force Base.

So what our -- and I'll get into what our Compliance Plan tells us to do when we see these things in a couple of slides.

The bioassessment is actual fish tissue sampling. Our contractor collects samples of about nine fish I believe,

each station that they sample, and they send them off and get them analyzed for these contaminants. And there are 11 bioassessment monitoring stations that we sample at.

The minor bullet there says that Leon Creek sample stations were not meeting the assigned aquatic life use except station KY30LC001, which is partially supported, and KY30LC052, which is fully supported. What that means is that there was not adequate stream flow to support the aquatic life in those locations. And that was during the drought last summer so that makes sense. Of course it's back to a pretty good flow now. Toxicity testing of surface water samples from 11 chronic toxicity monitoring stations including water flea and flathead minnow, test results indicated no impact to Leon Creek there.

And then we did fish tissue sampling to monitor the eco system at 11 fish tissue monitoring stations. A total of 12 fish species were collected for testing. There was a sample from a station KY30CL026 that exceeds the TCEQ screening level for Aroclor-1260, which is the PCBs we've been hearing about, but did not exceed the whole body tissue residue effects level for freshwater fish species indicating the fish samples were minimally impacted by contaminants. Of course, this was 2009 sampling again.

Finding and conclusions. What we are required to do is to monitor the creek of course and we see these sample

results and compare them to past concentrations. And if we do see an increase in contaminant concentrations in the surface water samples, stream sediment samples or bioassessment samples, we're obligated to investigate the source and impact of the increase and if necessary to propose additional corrective action measures. So therefore the statement we are investigating the potential source of these increases including the stormwater outfalls.

MR. MARTINEZ: Any questions from member of the RABs for Paul?

MS. ABBOTT: I had a question about plume D. That's really interesting you have that one hot spot. That's like a tremendous amount and then right around it, it decreases significantly.

MR. CARROLL: Yeah. It's highly localized. It's over in the area of the Kelly Club and we -- I don't think we found a source, a specific source for that, but we do know it's there and we're trying to address the contamination.

MS. ABBOTT: And it wasn't identified in the previous Compliance Plan?

MR. CARROLL: Yeah, it's been known for a long time.

MS. ABBOTT: But has it increased; has it decreased?

MR. CARROLL: It has decreased slightly. We did the round of injections in 2002 I believe. It knocked them down some, but we found that the injections -- we probably didn't

inject enough substrate into that formation to do a really good job there so we went back for a second round of injections. Yes, sir.

MR. ARZOLA: Just paint the picture for me. Who collects these fish samples and where are they sent for testing?

MR. CARROLL: Okay. HGL is our contractor for the compliance plan sampling.

MR. ARZOLA: Uh-huh.

MR. CARROLL: Right now they are. They have I believe under subcontract CH2M HILL that actually does this fish tissue sampling. The samples are collected. They're preserved on ice, sent to an accredited laboratory that is designated to do that kind of sampling.

MR. ARZOLA: Is it done locally?

MR. CARROLL: I'm not sure where the lab is. I may have heard but forgot.

MR. WEEGAR: I would -- I would doubt that it's local. There's not a whole lot of labs that are set up to do that type of sampling.

MR. ARZOLA: So HGL is a contractor who collects the tissue.

MR. CARROLL: That's correct.

MR. ARZOLA: And they box it up in ice.

MR. CARROLL: Yes.

MR. ARZOLA: And they send it where? Where again? What's the name of the lab again?

MR. CARROLL: It's -- I don't know. It's an accredited laboratory. It's an approved laboratory that does that kind of thing.

MR. ARZOLA: Could we find out for the next meeting?

MR. CARROLL: Sure. Yeah.

MR. MARTINEZ: Any other questions for members of the RAB?

MR. WEEGAR: The lab information will be in the Compliance Plan and it has to be a NELAC approved laboratory for the TCEQ to accept the data, which is the anacronym for National Environmental Laboratory Accreditation Program or something like that. But it has to be a laboratory that meets specific criteria in order for the agency to accept that data.

MR. FELICI: And the Department of State Health Services is conducting its own sampling completely independent.

MR. CARROLL: Yeah. The Department of State Health Services did their sampling in 2007.

MR. FELICI: Right.

MR. CARROLL: And yeah, that was completely independent of any sampling that we do. As a matter of fact, it was a little bit different type -- quite a bit different type of sampling. They did -- they collected the fish and

then they fileted the fish and they sampled only the filets instead of the entire fish like we're required to do. They also did a little bit different kind of analytical procedure to I guess look at the PCBs in a little bit more specific way I guess than what we do in our sampling.

MR. ARZOLA: Who's the other department that does the sampling?

MR. FELICI: State Health Services.

MR. CARROLL: There are a couple of different -- different methods that they used in this -- this sampling that they reported just the other day on TV. It's impossible to compare what they did to what we do. If you looked at the concentrations of what we see versus what they saw, you wouldn't -- you wouldn't be able to compare and say, you know, we were right and they were wrong or they were right and we were wrong. It's just a different type of sampling. But they did -- you know, their sampling did indicate that there were issues with PCBs in the fish tissue; therefore, they extended the fishing advisory for a longer period of time and also they extended the area that was under the original fishing advisory.

MR. ARZOLA: But it would appear to me if you are doing an analysis or if you are doing -- you're analyzing fish tissue, there is a defined methodology as to the process to test those tissues looking for the same thing. Now when you

talk about sampling, are you talking about a larger sample that they take versus a smaller sample or where the probability of an error might increase or decrease or --

MR. WEEGAR: The samples that Kelly is required to collect, those fish -- the fish tissue, that's -- that's the whole fish. They're not -- they're not fileted. It is bass-o-matic (phonetic) type of thing, you know. They're completely -- it's got skin, fat, everything in there.

MR. ARZOLA: Everything.

MR. WEEGAR: And what TDH did -- what health services -- State Health Services used to be called, Texas Department of Health, they did that first sampling 2002 or something like that. As a result of what we were seeing in Leon Creek, we actually asked them to go out there and do a further evaluation and what they did then was just the filet and they analyzed it for the different PCBs.

I think what Paul is saying now is what they've done this time is, again, it's filets but it is a different type of chemical analysis of -- they're not doing the different congeners of PCBs. They're doing something I'm not really familiar with. It's a whole different chemical analysis and it's not a apples to apples comparison. So you can't take what they just have done and said, Okay, this is lower concentrations or the same concentrations as to what they saw in 2002. It's not even comparable to their own data. And it

can't be compared to the Kelly data either.

MR. ARZOLA: That's where I was going with this question. You know? Is there some kind of way to compare, you know, Hey, you know, I have a sample, now you test it. I'll test it. And we both test it and we can compare. Plus or minus. You know what I'm saying?

MR. CARROLL: Yeah. We can't do that. The -- I guess it all boils down to the purpose of our sampling versus the purpose of their sampling. Their sampling is a little bit different focus on protection of human health from fish that are caught in the stream. We're -- we have the purpose of sampling to ensure that we meet the requirements of the TCEQ regulations for aquatic life in the streams.

So there's a little bit different purpose. It's kind of -- it's not a whole lot different purpose. It's all for protection of human health, but we do have the couple of different methods. We are seeing -- you know, we've historically seen PCBs in that -- in that sediment. So that's what we're going to look at from -- from now is we're going to -- we're seeing the highest concentrations of PCBs and sediment near some very large stormwater outfalls that flow into the creek that drain a significant portion not only Kelly but the neighborhoods and this entire area.

MR. ARZOLA: Uh-huh.

MR. CARROLL: There's some culverts that are ten by

11 feet in size and two or three are over six feet in diameter. So what we're going to do is work with -- work with TCEQ and with the city to go up -- up and look into those and see if there are any PCBs traveling down those and see if we can try to pinpoint a source, you know.

At Kelly, you know, in 2003, we removed the PCBs containing transformers from Kelly. They're -- to become PCB free in all of our sampling that we've done at Kelly, we haven't seen PCBs as a problem that's been released at Kelly. There have been a couple of releases that I saw in our records that have been cleaned up; however, you know, we don't see a widespread problem. But if there is a problem that we see from the stormwater sampling that traces back to Kelly, we will -- we will be taking care of that.

MR. ARZOLA: Okay.

MR. FELICI: When is the next round of sampling that you would do?

MR. CARROLL: The -- actually the next round of sampling that is being done this month and this -- this sampling that I'm reporting here is from a year ago this month. So we do them in July and then again in November I believe. Or June and July and then November. So we do the fish twice a year.

MR. SKROBARCEK: So Paul, I recall this issue as this has been covered a couple of times in other RAB meetings.

MR. CARROLL: In the past.

MR. SKROBARCEK: In the past. If it's -- if we're identifying potential impacts from alternative sources offsite, or upstream, what have the agencies done in the interim to look any further to find what those source mechanisms are?

MR. WEEGAR: Well, whenever -- whenever -- when the Department of Health put the initial fish consumption advisory on Leon Creek, whenever that happens, it's considered to be an impaired water body and it's not compliant with the Clean Water Act. And in TCEQ we implement a plan -- a program called the total maximum daily load. TMDL is the acronym. It's run by our chief engineer's office and we've got a number of these programs that are going around in different impaired water bodies around the state and we're -- basically what those folks do is work with the cities, municipalities, what have you, potential sources of these different contaminations.

It's not just PCBs. It can be -- you know, you got fecal coliform coming into your surface water. It could be some kind of oxygen demand issues, things like that. They try to work and set up a plan for getting those streams cleaned up through limiting the discharges to the streams.

I mean a lot of times this is from, you know, urban runoff, you know, non point source type stuff. It could be from wastewater treatment plant discharges, who knows. But

there's a number of different sources that together put the load on these water bodies that impair them.

So our chief engineer's office folks in the TMDL program work to try to eliminate these discharges over a period of time so that these streams get cleaned up and get back to their normal described usages.

It's my understanding that they're working with San Antonio River Authority, I think the Methodist Health folks, USGS.

MR. SKROBARCEK: I just didn't know if there was anything in the last couple of years that we've been talking about that that's been identified upstream or whatever.

MR. CARROLL: One of the things that's been ongoing, we got a briefing on this last year, was the USGS is doing the sediment sampling, the study of a lot of the watersheds that go through San Antonio including Leon Creek. Pretty soon they're going to have a report out on that. I think they're going to have a couple of briefings, one with the --

MS. CUNNINGHAM: We're planning on having a meeting on August the 3rd and just a community meeting and USGS is going to brief to the community on that report. The scientific investigation report is going through peer review now and it should be finished up or will be finished up by the end of September and released. And then they're going to do a report for the public that will be based on that report and it

will be coming out a little bit later in the fall. But those all go through peer-review.

MR. CARROLL: That will be pretty helpful information that we can use to help us trace down the source of those PCBs. The fish sampling is one thing but fish, you know, tend to move back and forth so you can't really pinpoint where they're getting that just by sampling the fish so that will be a good piece of great information and we'll be looking for it.

MS. ABBOTT: The samplings that you're going to be taking at the end of July, how long does it take to get those results?

MR. CARROLL: It takes three to four weeks to do all our sampling that we end up doing and a lot of those laboratory samples are on a 30-day turnaround time so we'll start getting information within 30 days. It has to be validated and it has to go through a process to get validated which will take another 30, 45 days and then the reporting starts. They start writing the report, compiling the information into some understandable tables for us to review. We start getting that for our review in November and it's due to TCEQ on January 25th I believe.

MR. WEEGAR: It will be -- it will be interesting, too, because it's kind of a base point study it looks like because right now you don't -- you've got the stretches of

Leon Creek where there's been sampling done. Well, the rest of the San Antonio River shed hasn't been sampled really.

So is this something unique to this area of Leon Creek or is something that's more systematic with, you know, San Antonio River shed? We won't know until that data comes back in.

MR. FELICI: Any idea why the report that was just issued by State Health Services is citing 2007 sampling?

MR. CARROLL: I think it took them a long time. Kyle, do you know the answer?

MS. CUNNINGHAM: Well, basically I think it was a funding issue but they said in 2003 that they would come back in approximately five years and do that again. So that's what they did. Now they sent -- they collected the samples and then sent them to the lab they use, it's the ^Gerling lab at Texas A&M and they're the only lab that the -- the seafood division of the Texas -- the Division of State Health Services will use. That's the only one. And then it took the Gerling lab, oh, about a year and four months I think to actually get results back to the State Health Department and then it took them about that long to come out with their analysis.

So it's just a long process. But they did -- I think the reason they extended it, you can look at the results and that's part of it, but then I think they wanted to have some buffer especially on the southern end, just to make sure

that they covered the area. And they also extended a little bit to the north, not a whole lot.

MR. CARROLL: Okay. Any other questions?

MR. MARTINEZ: Any other questions from members of the RAB? If not, Paul, stay standing because the next topic is property transfer.

MR. CARROLL: Okay. A brief update on property transfer progress. We are still moving to complete the Draft Operating Properly and Successfully determination for Zone 3, which is where we're sitting right now, about 368 acres for a planned transfer by 30 September of this year. We submitted that to U.S. EPA and also followed up with that with the Draft Finding of Suitability to Transfer and Supplemental Environmental Baseline Survey.

Those are the environmental baseline documents and transfer-related documents that we submit to U.S. EPA for their review, along with the OPS, for their review and comments. Like I said, Zone 3 is about 368 acres. It's the most industrialized portion of the former base and, if successful, if U.S. EPA agrees with our operating properly and successfully determination for this Zone 3, that will clear the way for what we call a whole base transfer and that's a -- that's a big milestone for Kelly and for the agencies to achieve.

Now this Zone 3 is outlined in the blue. A

former -- I don't know if you can read it. I think you can read them. All of the former transfers are in the little callout box on the top of your little map there. And then the projected conveyances 368.40 acres is what it says, but it's got to have a survey to determine the exact size. That's going to be pretty close to that.

And the remediation systems that are associated with this operating properly and successfully document that we have to get approved by the EPA are these that are outlined in Zone 3. Most of y'all have seen these maps again and again, but it includes this Site MP out here. There's a recovery system here and the injection of the veg oil that we've got for treatment. We've got several recovery systems, two soil vapor extraction units, several passive reactive barrier walls that consist of iron filing walls and, you know, groundwater treatment from these sites. So this is the most complicated one we've done to date, the most difficult one to achieve. That's why it's the last one.

But we hope in -- by the end of September that all of this property is going to be transferred into the hands of the Port Authority and this Port San Antonio will be completely under their control. Of course that doesn't mean that they're taking over the cleanup. The Air Force is still responsible for that. So we have this PCE plumes and TCE plumes that we have. This is also -- we had to demonstrate

operating properly and successfully on these, too.

There's the PCE plume based on 2009 sample data and y'all saw this last time. You've seen the green outlines for the original delineation of those plumes in 1998 and then these blues are the current status of the plumes. And that's really it in a nutshell of what we plan to do before September of this year.

MR. MARTINEZ: Any questions from members of the RAB for Paul?

MR. SKROBARCEK: So we're 12 years into this process -- or more actually -- and you see some reduction in the -- in the size of the plumes. For how long do you expect it to be ongoing until the plumes are completely dissipated?

MR. CARROLL: Our OPS documents indicate that these plumes are varying treatment times. Some of them will take two to three years, some of them five to six. I think that the most common -- the larger plumes will take probably about ten to 15 more years to address at their -- at their current rate.

MR. CAMDEN: Is there any other promising technology out there that might speed that process up?

MR. CARROLL: Yeah, there is. It's getting -- the technology is getting better every day. Kind of leading back to one of the things we've discussed in the last couple of RABs, we're planning on trying to issue a performance-based

contract where we allow a contractor to come in and take over the entire cleanup project and to look at those very things. What can you do to speed this cleanup up? You know, do you want to concentrate these injections of this veg oil or this HRC into more locations? Do you want to extend these walls? Do you want to build more walls? Do you want to do some innovative technologies that we're looking to try to speed this up?

And -- and we've done those across the nation and from our experience, that's proven to be the case in most of these performance-based contracts is that they -- they do know how -- you know, contractors do know how to do that when you give them the ability to make those kind of decisions and do whatever kind of actions that they need to do to get that done. They're more than willing and able to -- to address those kind of things.

So, you know, at the current state, the systems that we have in place right now looks like ten to 15 years on the groundwater treatment. I wouldn't be surprised a year from now if we get the performance-based contract issue that we might see some -- a little bit more aggressive cleanups on those.

MR. MARTINEZ: Any other questions?

We are now at the time of our agenda that we allow for members of the general public to ask questions, make

comments. As usual we respectfully ask each individual that would like to make a comment, ask a question, to limit his or her time to three minutes, allowing for participation by other members of the general public.

And I have only one comment sheet. If there are any others, could I please have them? While we're waiting for the other sheets, Mr. Silvas, you have the floor.

MR. SILVAS: For the record, my name is Robert Silvas, former RAB member, community activist. I'm bringing some more information on behalf of the community to the board in regards to a Board of Environmental Health Toxicology Research Program. Metro Health was well aware of this yet hasn't brought it to the attention of the board. I'll provide you these documents and I'd like to know what the Air Force is doing about outreach and providing this information to the community.

Secondly, I had left some information with you, sir, in regards to the 2006 study and tactical storage of herbicides.

MR. CARROLL: Uh-huh.

MR. SILVAS: Did you have a chance to look at that?

MR. CARROLL: I have looked at some of that. Yes, I have.

MR. SILVAS: Why haven't I heard from you?

MR. CARROLL: I don't really have any other feedback

other than what we've -- what we've released already. I don't have any additional information.

MR. SILVAS: So can I state for the record that those records that show that Kelly Air Force Base was not a site listed on the contract for the undersecretary of the Air Force as a place for storage for herbicides, Agent Orange?

MR. CARROLL: We were listed as storage of herbicides. The two components of Agent Orange were stored here, that's correct.

MR. SILVAS: No, sir. You need to read your records a little more clearer, sir. You had a mixture of a combination. You had Agent Orange. You had the two --

MR. CARROLL: Not that I was able to find --

MR. SILVAS: Well, sir, you need --

MR. CARROLL: -- information on.

MR. SILVAS: -- to review your records.

Secondly, the East Kelly sites that you've discussed earlier, all the plumes and everything, what sources have you found that are the result of these plumes?

MR. CARROLL: The East Kelly?

MR. SILVAS: Yes.

MR. CARROLL: Which ones are you talking --

MR. SILVAS: Zone 5.

MR. CARROLL: Zone 5?

MR. SILVAS: Yes, sir.

MR. CARROLL: They're -- I think I reported what those sources were, where we knew where the sources were.

MR. SILVAS: The buildings.

MR. CARROLL: Yeah.

MR. SILVAS: Okay. The --

MR. CARROLL: Didn't I?

MR. SILVAS: You went over some buildings. I just didn't hear you discuss the storage sites of the Agent Orange that was kept at East Kelly.

MR. CARROLL: I don't think that was in our reporting tonight, no.

MR. SILVAS: It's in Zone 5.

MR. CARROLL: There was an herbicide storage yard that was cleaned up in Zone 4, SS7, something like that.

MR. SILVAS: You're correct, Zone 4.

MR. CARROLL: I don't remember the site designator.

MR. SILVAS: Okay.

MR. CARROLL: But yeah, we -- we did previously clean up a site that had some herbicides, pesticides in the soils, closed those to TCEQ regulatory standards.

MR. SILVAS: The breakdown that the PCBs -- the chemicals that break down the PCBs, aren't those also a result of Agent Orange breaking down the PCBs?

MR. CARROLL: Not that I'm aware of.

MR. SILVAS: Okay.

MR. CARROLL: PCBs are a chemical that was used in mainly transformers and like equipment to -- to help those operate at high temperatures without breaking down and the PCBs were later found to be harmful and, you know, that's why the Air Force cleaned those up.

MR. SILVAS: Provide you that. I'd like to see what you can do to provide for the community outreach and the protected areas.

MR. CARROLL: Okay. Urban studies --

MR. MARTINEZ: We are at the three-minute mark. Are you through with your remarks?

MR. SILVAS: Come on, you've got no one behind me. Come on. Jesus.

MR. MARTINEZ: It's a policy as a board. If the board would like to --

MR. SILVAS: You know what, give me a few more minutes. Okay? No one behind me. Stop rushing me. You always do this. I'm tired of it.

MR. MARTINEZ: I'm sorry, sir, but the policy of the board --

MR. SILVAS: So let me finish. Will you take some lead --

MR. MARTINEZ: -- is to allow three minutes.

MR. SILVAS: -- initiative in this?

POLICE OFFICER: Three minutes. That's it.

MR. CARROLL: We'll review it.

MR. SILVAS: All right.

MR. MARTINEZ: Thank you, sir. Yes, Ms. Cunningham?

MS. CUNNINGHAM: I just wanted to mention, just to let the board know, I wasn't trying to keep anything from y'all. There was a community meeting, the Quintana Road Neighborhood Association, Dr. Leslie Heitman and Dr. Thomas McDonald from A&M attended that meeting and they are going to do some testing in that neighborhood of residential areas, if people volunteer, and to try and answer questions for the community.

They also are going to do some health education in the Kelly community so it will be several neighborhoods. We attended that meeting also.

MR. MARTINEZ: Were there any other members of the general public that would like to make a comment or ask a question of the RAB?

If not, we have covered the items on the agenda and the next -- last item is for members of the RAB to suggest items that they would like to have brought up for discussion at the next meeting, which is scheduled for October. Yes, ma'am.

MS. THOMAS: One of the things you talked about before was whether you wanted to continue doing the RAB meetings every quarter. So you're kind of getting to the

point where if you do the whole base transfer, you need to make that decision.

MR. MARTINEZ: Okay. One item. Thank you. Other items?

MR. WEEGAR: The -- will the S-1 ERH system -- will you have some preliminary data do you think by the next RAB you can kind of share with us on how that's working as far as the soil contamination?

MR. CARROLL: Yes. We should have the startup data and we may even have one round of sampling by the next RAB. So we'll report that.

MR. SKROBARCEK: How about a Building 360 update?

MR. CARROLL: Okay.

MR. SKROBARCEK: Performance of the SVE system?

MR. CARROLL: Okay.

MR. SKROBARCEK: Anything you have that's available.

MR. MARTINEZ: We have one other suggestion.

MR. ARZOLA: We could have, if possible, the results of the USGS meeting that they're going to have August 3rd, the sediment results that they're testing, and also the -- hopefully the fish sampling that's going to be done this month. Should have it for October; right, Mr. Carroll?

MR. CARROLL: We won't have the results published by then. We should be able to at the following RAB.

MR. ARZOLA: Okay.

MR. CARROLL: But not -- not this one.

MR. SKROBARCEK: One more suggestion. You talked about performance-based contracts and you cited some other examples where you had some good outcomes with that. If you have any case studies or anything that you can share with us maybe at the next RAB, that will be helpful. Just to see what kind of benefits you could get from doing such a thing.

MR. ARZOLA: Yeah.

MR. SKROBARCEK: That will be helpful.

MR. ARZOLA: That would be good.

MS. ABBOTT: That August 3rd meeting, Kyle, where is it going to be located?

MS. CUNNINGHAM: Looks like it's going to be at the Cuellar Center.

MS. ABBOTT: So anybody is invited?

MS. CUNNINGHAM: Everybody is invited.

MS. ABBOTT: And that's at what time?

MS. CUNNINGHAM: I think the meeting will probably start at 6:30.

MS. ABBOTT: Evening?

MS. CUNNINGHAM: Yes.

MS. ABBOTT: Cuellar Center.

MS. CUNNINGHAM: 6:30 to 8:00.

MS. ABBOTT: Where is the Cuellar Center?

MS. CUNNINGHAM: You know, I'm going to have to get

back to you on that.

MS. ABBOTT: Google it. Right. No, I was just thinking maybe if we were interested we could go to the meeting and might get some answers ourself.

MS. CUNNINGHAM: Okay.

MR. ARZOLA: Yeah.

MS. ABBOTT: Do you know whether they'll have information on paper or will it all be all verbal or ...

MS. CUNNINGHAM: Good question. I would love to have a little handout --

MS. ABBOTT: Right.

MS. CUNNINGHAM: -- that we're trying to, you know, pull together. I doubt that that will be ready by that point in time, but if there's something to hand out or at least where the information will be available.

MS. ABBOTT: Maybe that would be good to have for the October RAB meeting if we had it.

MS. CUNNINGHAM: By October we should -- hopefully we'll have that. I know that the scientific investigation report will be finished and they'll -- definitely all that will be on the Web and there will be hard copies.

Now, the whole investigation report you probably need a red wagon to carry it out with or a dolly, but, you know, hopefully -- they're pretty thick -- the shorter reports will be ready this fall. That will be, you know, something

that I understand.

MS. ABBOTT: Thank you.

MR. SKROBARCEK: So one other thing. Maybe in the future RAB, it may take a little bit of time to gather the information that you need, but the issue of herbicide storage has been brought up a couple of times in the past. And I don't know if it's been addressed in the past or not.

But to me it takes sense to gather -- I would ask if we gather the information that's available, if it hasn't already been presented, and provide that information as far as where it was stored, you know, what cleanups were done, is there any residual actions that are required or anything like that, so we can go ahead and address that issue.

MR. CARROLL: Okay.

MR. MARTINEZ: Yes, sir.

MR. ARZOLA: This is more of a question. We were getting -- we were getting transcripts of the RAB meetings. Is there a reason why we stopped receiving those transcripts?

MS. ABBOTT: We got one.

MS. BAIRD: They were in the pre meeting packets. They were mailed to each of the RAB members in the mail packet. Did you get your packet?

MR. ARZOLA: No, I didn't get one.

MS. BAIRD: We'll check your address.

MR. ARZOLA: Yeah, I -- it's correct.

MS. GUERRERO-REDMAN: We can actually probably provide you a copy before you leave.

MR. ARZOLA: Excellent.

MR. CARROLL: Sorry about that. I don't know how that didn't get there. Everybody else got theirs?

MR. SKROBARCEK: I got mine.

MS. ABBOTT: I got mine.

MR. ARZOLA: I didn't get mine.

MR. MARTINEZ: Yes, sir.

MR. FELICI: Just wanted to also throw out a suggestion on a possible presentation, if not for the next one then for the subsequent meeting. But could we get a rundown on -- outside of these meetings, just any -- any outreach that might have been done to the community just to apprize them of the work policy? I know the trades has the -- the news release that was recently sent down in response to that State Health Services, but maybe if we can get a summary of the last year or two worth of any community meetings and any other fliers or -- or other information that's been -- that's been shared with the public.

MR. WEEGAR: I mean I think trying to figure out what -- just about the fish consumption or in general?

MR. FELICI: No, in general. Just the -- like I said, with regards to -- to Paul's work and what's essentially covered at these meetings.

MR. CARROLL: Okay. We do that every time with the RAB packets; however, we'd be able to get to put a list together of the things we've done over the past year from -- from that.

MR. FELICI: Yeah.

MR. CARROLL: Okay. That's easy enough.

MR. MARTINEZ: Any other suggestion or agenda items for the next one or two RAB meetings?

MR. CARROLL: May end up spreading on or two of these items over a couple of meetings.

MR. MARTINEZ: Right. Any other last comments, questions by members of the RAB of Paul or among yourselves? We are literally over. We're through with the agenda items. We're actually early.

Hearing none, do I hear a motion to adjourn?

MS. ABBOTT: Motion to adjourn.

MR. MARTINEZ: I hear a motion. I see a motion. We are adjourned. Thank you.

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 4th day of September, 2010.

/s/ Gina K. May

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