



KELLY AFB
TEXAS

ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD
COVER SHEET

AR File Number 3241.1

KELLY RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD

July 11th, 2006, 6:30 p.m.
Dwight High School
2454 W. Southcross
San Antonio, Texas 78211

APPEARANCES**COPY****RAB Community Member Attendees:**

Robert Silvas, Community Cochair
Esmerelda Galvan
Rodrigo Garcia
Nazirite Perez
Armando Quintanilla
Michael Sheneman

RAB Government Member Attendees:

Adam Antwine, Installation Cochair
Kyle Cunningham, San Antonio Metropolitan Health District
(SAMHD) (Alternate for Melanie Ritsema)
Gary Lyssy, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA),
(Alternate for Gary Miller)
Mark Weegar, Texas Commission on Environmental Quality
(TCEQ)

Other Attendees:

Don Buelter, Air Force Real Property Agency (AFRPA)
Sonja Coderre, AFRPA
Todd Colburn, AFRPA Contractor
Mara Contreras, TCEQ
Alan Ferrell, SAMHD
Norma Landez, AFRPA
Eduardo Martinez, AFRPA Contractor
Jose Martinez, AFRPA Contractor
David Plylar, Office of City Councilwoman Radle
Abigail Power, TCEQ (Alternate for Mark Weegar)
Heather Ramon-Ayala, AFRPA Contractor
David Rodriguez, Community Member
Ed Salinas, AFRPA Contractor
David Yanez, Office of Senator Van De Putte
Joe Zupan, Zephyr

1 (Proceedings began at 6:35 p.m.)

2 MR. MARTINEZ: All right. Let's get started
3 now that we have everyone here. Before we begin, let's go
4 over some ground rules. Cell phones, please turn them
5 down. Rest rooms are right outside the door to your
6 left. The men's is the first door on your right. If you
7 keep going, the lady's is on your right past the men's.

8 I've got a lot of valuable information for you
9 tonight so let's try to stay focused, let's stay on
10 target. If you want to speak during the public comment
11 time, if there's anyone in the community -- I don't see
12 any additional community members. We have public comment
13 cards in the back. Fill one out and just give it to me or
14 one of the staff members.

15 If you want anymore information on any of the
16 items that are covered this evening or any other items
17 that are of interest to you, please fill out a request for
18 information sheet and those requests for information
19 sheets are also located at the sign-in table. Other than
20 that, let's go ahead and get started.

21 As soon as we have these folks that are coming
22 in, we'll start with the Pledge of Allegiance. Okay. If
23 everyone would please stand for the Pledge of Allegiance
24 please.

25 (Pledge of Allegiance was said.)

1 (Moment of silence observed.)

2 MR. MARTINEZ: Okay. At this time, I'd like
3 to welcome everybody here to the Restoration Advisory
4 Board. And I want to talk about some important issuing
5 here, good information being given out.

6 Let's start with the roll call first of all just
7 to account for all the RAB members, and insure that any
8 alternates that may be sitting out in the audience will
9 join us at the table if they are here representing one of
10 our RAB members. So let's go ahead and start.

11 Mr. Silvas.

12 MR. SILVAS: Present.

13 MR. MARTINEZ: And then Ms. Kyle Cunningham.

14 MS. CUNNINGHAM: Here.

15 MR. MARTINEZ: Mr. Garcia.

16 MR. GARCIA: Here.

17 MR. MARTINEZ: Ms. Galvan.

18 MS. GALVAN: Here.

19 MR. MARTINEZ: Mr. Perez.

20 MR. PEREZ: Here.

21 MR. MARTINEZ: Sir, I'm sorry --

22 MR. LYSSY: Mr. Lyssy. Here.

23 MR. MARTINEZ: Mr. Quintanilla.

24 MR. QUINTANILLA: Here.

25 MR. MARTINEZ: Mr. Sheneman.

1 MR. SHENEMAN: Here.

2 MR. MARTINEZ: Mr. Antwine.

3 MR. ANTWINE: Here.

4 MS. POWER: Mr. Weegar is in the rest room.
5 He'll be joining us.

6 MR. MARTINEZ: Mr. Weegar is in the rest
7 room. Is there anybody else that is an alternate that is
8 here representing a RAB member? Please join us at the
9 table.

10 All right. Then we shall begin. What I want do
11 first is go over the agenda -- sir?

12 MR. SILVAS: Yes. Before we continue, I had a
13 phone call from Coriene Hannapel and due to a medical
14 nature, she will no longer be a part of the Restoration
15 Advisory Board as a member, but she will try to attend
16 so -- and until she can provide me with a written
17 document --

18 MR. MARTINEZ: Thank you for that
19 information. I hope she is okay.

20 Okay. Let's go ahead and do a brief agenda
21 review. First what we're going to do is address some
22 administrative issues. We're going to talk about TAPP
23 reports that are up for review -- that potential review.
24 Excuse me. For reports that are up for potential TAPP
25 review and then talk a little bit about the meeting

1 minutes.

2 After that, we're going to be given an update
3 from the Air Force Real Property Agency. Mr. Antwine and
4 a couple of his folks are going to give us an update
5 followed by a presentation of the results of the air
6 monitoring of PRBs that was constructed off base.

7 And then we'll go ahead and get a briefing on the
8 regulatory processes that are used to conduct
9 environmental cleanups. And then we'll do a -- sort of an
10 update on the environmental cleanup progress for zones 2
11 through 5 of the former Kelly Air Force Base.

12 Now you'll notice that you have some fairly large
13 packets in front of you. Let's go ahead and do a packet
14 review for those board members that have packets.

15 Obviously at the front is the agenda. Then we
16 have the action items reports. These are action items
17 that were brought up at the last meeting, the April --

18 What was the date, Todd, of the TRS?

19 MR. COLBURN: I'm sorry?

20 MR. MARTINEZ: What was the last date of the
21 last TRS?

22 MR. COLBURN: June 13th.

23 MS. CODERRE: June 13th.

24 MR. MARTINEZ: June 13th. Thank you. And so
25 you'll read some good questions, good actions that came

1 out of that. And after that, you'll see a list, looks
2 like there are some potential reports or reports that
3 could potentially be reviewed under TAPP and Mr. Silvas is
4 going to guide us through that. Get some votes.

5 Behind that, you'll see the agenda briefing. And
6 this is intended so we can follow along and keep track of
7 where we're at.

8 Environmental cleanup process -- oh, I'm sorry.
9 I'm missing one. The air monitoring at the PRB
10 construction was the first presentation. And then we go
11 into the Environmental Cleanup Regulatory Process Overview
12 and then a fairly thick presentation after that. Lots of
13 good data on it, the environmental cleanup progress update
14 for zones 2 through 5.

15 You'll find some handouts that sort of correlate
16 with that briefing and it's basically those posters that
17 you see in the back of the room in a handout size so it
18 makes it easier for you-all to review. And then also a
19 little handout of some maps depicting the four zones that
20 are the responsibility of the Air Force Real Property
21 Agency. And that's sort of to help like also with that
22 briefing, follow along.

23 Then we'll see a series of newspaper articles
24 that have come out. One is the San Antonio Current;
25 another one is from the Express News; another one is from

1 mysanantonio.com. And then there's a -- some information
2 on the travel scholarships available to attend the Boston
3 Brownfields Convention, November 13th through the 15th.
4 That's if you're interested.

5 Yes, Mr. Silvas.

6 MR. SILVAS: Once you wrap it up, I'd like to
7 submit an agenda change.

8 MR. MARTINEZ: Okay. One second. We're
9 almost done.

10 After that, some newspaper articles that were
11 placed announcing this meeting, Express News, La Prensa
12 and Southside Reporter, and then finally a public notice
13 that ran regarding the Kelly test cells, FOST and so that
14 is pretty much it for the packet.

15 Now Mr. Silvas, you said you had some --

16 MR. SILVAS: Yes. These were an agenda
17 change. First would be the cadmium/breast cancer study
18 from the article dated July 9th, 2006. I'd like to
19 include this as an item and to further request a follow-up
20 on this study.

21 MR. MARTINEZ: So what would you like, sir?
22 I'm sorry.

23 MR. SILVAS: The cadmium/breast cancer study
24 that was in today's paper.

25 MR. MARTINEZ: You want somebody to provide

1 information?

2 MR. SILVAS: Well, no. I want to put that on
3 the agenda that way we can put in a request to further --
4 to study it.

5 MR. MARTINEZ: Okay. Do you want to talk
6 about it at this meeting tonight --

7 MR. SILVAS: Yes.

8 MR. MARTINEZ: -- because we have a lot of
9 stuff to cover.

10 MR. SILVAS: Won't take long.

11 MR. MARTINEZ: Okay. I believe there's a
12 vote.

13 MS. CODERRE: Just put it on the end. We can
14 discuss it.

15 MR. MARTINEZ: Okay. We'll add it to the
16 end.

17 MR. SILVAS: And last but not least is the
18 article on Tuesday, July 11th. This is regarding the
19 former Kelly Golf Course.

20 MR. MARTINEZ: What is that, sir? What is the
21 intent of that?

22 MR. SILVAS: To go and have the Air Force
23 answer some questions on the initial study that was done
24 by the Kelly personnel.

25 MR. MARTINEZ: Sir, you're referring to an

1 article there. Can I see that, please?

2 MR. SILVAS: Yes, sir. These are your
3 copies.

4 MR. MARTINEZ: Thank you. Okay. So what Mr.
5 Silvas is referring to is an article that was written by
6 Roddy Stinson in the San Antonio Express News and ran
7 today and it talks about the golf course that now is the
8 responsibility of Lackland Air Force Base.

9 All right. Is there anything else we need to go
10 over? If I can find my -- all right. What we'll do at
11 this time is we'll open the floor to any community
12 comments. Is there anybody out in the audience that wants
13 to submit a comment? Do we have any comment cards filled
14 out? No? Okay. Then we'll go ahead.

15 MR. SILVAS: Is this a good time for members
16 to make any comments they'd like?

17 MR. MARTINEZ: Sure.

18 MS. CODERRE: Well, the administrative piece
19 and minutes, can we --

20 MR. MARTINEZ: Yeah. Let's do that piece.
21 Let's go over the administrative and maybe that will
22 tie-in over there.

23 MR. SILVAS: Okay.

24 MR. MARTINEZ: All right. So what we're going
25 to start off with is the meeting minutes. And what you'll

1 notice is you have a stack of meeting minutes sitting
2 there behind your meeting packets.

3 Now Mr. Silvas, did you want to sort of talk
4 about those?

5 MR. SILVAS: Okay. These are the minutes that
6 were refigured I think.

7 MR. MARTINEZ: Correct.

8 MR. SILVAS: Correct. Okay. And --

9 MR. MARTINEZ: Those had not been signed since
10 I believe October 2005. And we went through and sort of
11 expanded them a little bit. Made sure that they were
12 inclusive of all the -- all the materials that were handed
13 out at each of those meetings.

14 MR. SILVAS: Okay.

15 MR. MARTINEZ: So what we want to do is sort
16 of offer those up to the board members for review and
17 comments. And if you would, please submit those comments
18 to Mr. Silvas as we will be meeting in two weeks. The
19 date of that meeting?

20 MS. CODERRE: I don't believe we've
21 established a date, but we're looking at roughly two weeks
22 from today as the executive committee agreed. So comments
23 will need to go to Mr. Silvas if you have any objections
24 or comment that you'd like to make and at that time you
25 would -- the cochair would certify the minutes.

1 MR. SILVAS: Okay. My concern is I know we
2 came to an agreement that I would be the one to put the
3 final approval on these -- on these meeting minutes and
4 I'd like to bring this before the whole RAB and make sure
5 that -- for the record that we all agree on that.

6 MS. CODERRE: So are you asking to poll the
7 community members of the RAB that they are in agreement
8 with what you agreed to at the -- the board meeting?

9 MR. SILVAS: That's correct.

10 MS. CODERRE: Okay. So shall we do that by a
11 show of hands for the community members only? Are you in
12 agreement that if you review those minutes, provide any
13 comments that you would have to Mr. Silvas so that
14 approximately two weeks from today he will meet with the
15 installation cochair Mr. Antwine and will approve those
16 minutes? Do you give him permission to do that? All in
17 favor? I would ask you to raise your hands.

18 MR. MARTINEZ: Thank you.

19 MS. CODERRE: I see --

20 MR. MARTINEZ: Mrs. Galvan.

21 MS. CODERRE: -- Ms. Galvan, Mr. Perez's hand.

22 MR. GARCIA: I want to add a stipulation to
23 that.

24 MR. QUINTANILLA: I need to ask questions on
25 that.

1 MS. CODERRE: Okay. Mr. Garcia.

2 MR. GARCIA: Add a stipulation to that. Mr.
3 Chairman, we and the RAB, in the -- in the reporter's
4 notes that they send us, a lot of them have to do with
5 from the TRS that they want us to approve now.

6 These minutes that they sent us, we asked for a
7 lot of things from staff and we need to have not only
8 comments on the -- from the RAB members on all of this,
9 but you need to ask staff to review all of these -- all of
10 these bylaws or these report notes, --

11 MR. MARTINEZ: Transcripts?

12 MR. GARCIA: The dialogue. We need an
13 extensive report because when all those dialogues, we
14 asked for a lot of information. We asked for a lot of
15 direction and we've asked for a lot of work for staff to
16 do.

17 So if we're going to be doing this, we need to
18 get staff to get all of these meetings, appearances,
19 affidavits, read through them and tell us how they're
20 going to respond to everything that we asked during these
21 TRS meetings because if we're going ask them for some more
22 questions and ask them to take more action after we review
23 all of this, then they have to do their share of the job,
24 go back through all of these legal reporter notes that
25 were taken and they need to go through all of that and

1 respond to us and tell us, look, these are the comments
2 and requests that were made.

3 Every one has been reevaluated and this is how
4 it's going to respond to you and you are going to respond
5 to our TRS, the meeting notes, but we are going to respond
6 to the reports and the comments taken by the court
7 reporter.

8 Because too many times we have a court reporter
9 document all this and it just disappears and melts like
10 ice and we never see any action from staff. Everything
11 that we've asked them, we scream and we scream and we
12 scream to death and all that's documented in the court
13 reporter's minutes and we keep bringing up the same thing
14 every TRS meeting on what we are wanting and no action is
15 taken. And enough is enough. They have to do their share
16 of the work.

17 If they want us to go through this and -- I'll
18 give him a comment. I can write a whole book of comments
19 of their failures, but they also have to do their work, go
20 back through all of these court reporter minutes and
21 report to us.

22 MS. CODERRE: And I believe that if you review
23 the minutes that we have in the packets in front of you,
24 they are expanded minutes. We did exactly what you have
25 just requested, gone back through those transcripts and

1 tried to provide more information from those to -- to
2 expand those minutes to be more representative.

3 As far as responding to your request for
4 information and other topics, the action items report that
5 we produce after these minutes -- after these meetings,
6 excuse me.

7 MR. MARTINEZ: Which is this.

8 MS. CODERRE: And there's one in your packet
9 tonight from last month that the response to those
10 requests for information that we don't -- we're not able
11 to address during this meeting. So we -- we're trying to
12 find that balance between the minutes and the action items
13 reports that will satisfy the kind of information that
14 you're looking for.

15 And if you'll give us the opportunity, read
16 through what we've provided you there, which is an
17 expanded version of those minutes, and -- and provide your
18 comments to Mr. Silvas.

19 MR. GARCIA: These bureaucratic comments
20 are -- are Air Force bureaucratic comments, they still are
21 not sufficient just like the quick way we scan BCT
22 minutes. They're just forced down our throat and these
23 action items where you cite this little stuff where you're
24 going to do this, this, that's all we see. We never see a
25 lot of our concerns addressed properly. And if they are

1 addressed, they'll usually refer to somebody else or it's
2 not -- it's not our job or it's dumped on somebody else.
3 And I'm getting sick and tired of that.

4 If I have to start in on you again, I'll do it,
5 but I've been nice for the past two months, but if I start
6 in again, I'll start doing it because we're not getting
7 satisfied. You're not publishing these meetings enough
8 because if you did, we'll see -- we would see an audience
9 full of people just like these ladies did a good job of
10 publishing the Roundtable, they had a huge turnout and
11 apparently just putting three or four articles in the
12 newspaper is not good enough. Well, if -- go ahead.

13 MR. SILVAS: Yes. To further talk about the
14 summary minutes, I think I brought this up, too, and the
15 fact that there are certain points that are left out and
16 things aren't pointed out in the -- in the summary
17 minutes. So with that in mind, I think there's some
18 middle ground that we're going to have to find here.

19 And so with that in mind, the other problem being
20 is we still have to worry about the approval of the other
21 minutes from January '05 to October '05.

22 MR. GARCIA: Yes.

23 MR. SILVAS: With that in mind I think we
24 should concentrate on these here in front of us, get these
25 out of the way and then move on those other ones that have

1 yet to be refigured and represent to us.

2 MS. CODERRE: Okay. So the vote stood at two
3 people that were in agreement.

4 MR. QUINTANILLA: I haven't spoken, ma'am.

5 MS. CODERRE: Oh, I'm sorry.

6 MR. QUINTANILLA: I have to agree with what
7 Mr. Silvas said. And for the record, you know, we need to
8 review the minutes from January 2005 to September 2005.
9 That needs to be done. And this is not in the record.

10 And also, I did want to bring this up, Mr.
11 Silvas, perhaps for your edification here. The RAB
12 meeting -- RAB meeting minutes shall contain a record of
13 the persons present, a complete and accurate description
14 of the matters discussed and comments received and copies
15 of all reports received, issued or approved by the RAB.

16 The accuracy of all minutes shall be certified by
17 the RAB cochairs. RAB meeting minutes should be kept at
18 the information repository; however, if the RAB meetings
19 reflect decision-making copies, they should also be --
20 should also be documented in the administrative record.

21 And that's sort of your checklist for -- for
22 this. And this is all that I'm saying. And I will -- I
23 agree with the -- with you and Mr. Antwine going ahead and
24 approving of these minutes with the exception of the
25 January 2005 to September 2005 because we haven't seen

1 them. We don't know if they're supposed to be in the
2 administrative record or not and that has to be
3 accomplished. And I'm saying this for the record. We
4 need to do it right. If we're going do it at all.

5 We shouldn't come back six months or a year later
6 and try to do this. And I do approve of you and Mr.
7 Antwine -- approve -- approving them and bringing to us
8 for a final review any corrections that we may make, but
9 not when we bring out a stack four or five inches thick.
10 I can't -- I can't review those in one minute.

11 MR. SILVAS: In two weeks.

12 MR. MARTINEZ: Understood. And that's --
13 that's why we're giving you those two weeks so you can
14 take them back home, on your spare time read those over
15 and make sure they do comply with what Mr. Quintanilla is
16 saying, you know, that they are inclusive, that they --
17 all the copies of the materials are there.

18 MR. QUINTANILLA: I also need a commitment I
19 guess from you, Mr. Silvas, and also from Mr. Antwine that
20 you-all aren't going to review and approve the minutes
21 from January 2005 to September 2005 because they're not in
22 here.

23 MR. MARTINEZ: I think the January -- correct
24 me if I'm wrong, Todd, but the January through September,
25 those were already signed; correct?

1 MR. COLBURN: Correct.

2 MR. MARTINEZ: That's why they're not in here.

3 MR. QUINTANILLA: Were they ever brought
4 before the -- are they complete in every respect or are
5 they just --

6 MS. CODERRE: If you-all want this to be a
7 meeting that's just about administrative --

8 MR. QUINTANILLA: No, no, no. Let me finish,
9 ma'am. I didn't interrupt you when you were speaking.
10 Please give me the same courtesy.

11 MS. CODERRE: You're absolutely right, Mr.
12 Quintanilla. I apologize.

13 MR. QUINTANILLA: Thank you. Anyway, we need
14 for this to be done. And I haven't seen it. I don't know
15 if the -- the other packages have the same data that this
16 has or -- are they equal, all the records are in there,
17 all the comments and all the -- all the documents that
18 were given on -- on there. And that was one of the
19 reasons that I did not approve of them at that time.

20 MR. ANTWINE: That's what she's here for.

21 MR. QUINTANILLA: Who is she?

22 MR. ANTWINE: Everything you say, everything
23 we talk about is documented right here. Now, you know, we
24 can sit here and debate minutes for the next --

25 MR. QUINTANILLA: You're saying that --

1 MR. ANTWINE: -- three years.

2 MR. QUINTANILLA: -- you're not gonna do it.

3 MR. ANTWINE: I'm saying that we will never

4 agree on the --

5 MR. QUINTANILLA: We already --

6 MR. ANTWINE: -- adequacy of the minutes.

7 MR. QUINTANILLA: We already agreed. We

8 already --

9 MR. ANTWINE: No, you haven't. He hasn't

10 signed them. Okay. If you agreed --

11 MR. QUINTANILLA: Neither have you.

12 MR. ANTWINE: I'd be glad to --

13 MR. QUINTANILLA: I just looked at them.

14 MR. ANTWINE: -- sign every one of them.

15 MR. QUINTANILLA: Yeah.

16 MR. ANTWINE: Okay? Because my staff put them

17 together and as far as I'm concerned, they're adequate.

18 But the adequacy in your eyes, it seems like we can never

19 meet it. And so we're going to sit here and debate --

20 MR. QUINTANILLA: I haven't --

21 MR. ANTWINE: -- this or we're going to give

22 you some facts on all the progress we're making and move

23 forward. But if you want to --

24 MR. QUINTANILLA: If you would --

25 MR. ANTWINE: -- debate minutes for the next

1 three years, you know, I've got ten years till I retire.
2 So we're either going to make some progress or we're going
3 to sit here and talk about minutes and how -- how you're
4 not satisfied with them.

5 And here's the minutes right here (indicating).
6 This is court recorded. That's what it's for. Anything
7 this doesn't cover, I guarantee you this young lady right
8 here doesn't miss a beat.

9 MR. QUINTANILLA: Well, but it's got to be in
10 here.

11 MR. ANTWINE: Well, no, it doesn't have to be
12 in there. That's based --

13 MR. QUINTANILLA: Well, where does it say --

14 MR. ANTWINE: -- on your opinion.

15 MR. QUINTANILLA: Where does it say that it
16 doesn't have to be in here?

17 MR. ANTWINE: And it does haven't to be in
18 there, Armando.

19 MR. QUINTANILLA: Certain things do have to be
20 done.

21 MR. ANTWINE: Well, but -- but we can -- we're
22 going to debate that. Are we going to debate that --

23 MR. QUINTANILLA: No, no. All I'm --

24 MR. ANTWINE: -- because that's all we seem to
25 do.

1 MR. QUINTANILLA: All I'm asking is for you
2 and Mr. Silvas to --

3 MR. ANTWINE: Okay.

4 MR. QUINTANILLA: -- make sure that what is in
5 here, on the -- on the RAB rule, that the RAB meetings
6 shall contain a record of the persons present, a complete
7 and accurate description of matters discussed and comments
8 received and copies of all reports received, issued or
9 approved by the RAB.

10 MR. ANTWINE: We'll make -- we'll make --

11 MR. QUINTANILLA: Issued or approved by the
12 RAB. That's.

13 MR. ANTWINE: We'll make the court
14 recording --

15 MR. QUINTANILLA: -- the key. That is --

16 MR. ANTWINE: Can I propose something?

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

19 MR. ANTWINE: Can I propose that we make the
20 court reporter's transcripts an attachment to the minute,
21 complete and accurate description? I don't know where you
22 can find a better one. What -- can you tell me what would
23 be better than a court reporter's transcript?

24 MR. QUINTANILLA: I will agree --

25 MR. ANTWINE: It's complete and accurate

1 minutes of what was done.

2 MR. QUINTANILLA: I will agree to that part,
3 but I'll --

4 MR. ANTWINE: Okay. Well, that's what
5 we'll --

6 MR. QUINTANILLA: I will not agree to the
7 accuracy of the --

8 MR. ANTWINE: You don't have to. You're not
9 the cochair.

10 MR. QUINTANILLA: Are the minutes --

11 MR. ANTWINE: Okay?

12 MR. QUINTANILLA: Yes. But I --

13 MR. ANTWINE: You don't have to. He does.

14 MR. QUINTANILLA: Let me read to you the last
15 sentence, Mr. -- Mr. Antwine. Please.

16 MR. ANTWINE: Okay.

17 MR. QUINTANILLA: Again, or approved by the
18 RAB.

19 MR. ANTWINE: Okay. Well, we're asking you to
20 take two weeks to either approve or disapprove.

21 MR. QUINTANILLA: That's these.

22 MR. ANTWINE: If you don't -- if you don't
23 approve of them, say you don't and put it on there and say
24 you don't approve.

25 MR. QUINTANILLA: I've already said that.

1 MR. ANTWINE: Okay. Well, then let's --

2 MR. QUINTANILLA: I've already said that
3 that --

4 MR. ANTWINE: -- move on. Let's move on then.

5 MR. MARTINEZ: Why don't we just focus on the
6 packet of minutes that's on your table for now.

7 MR. ANTWINE: You're never going to approve
8 them. I think we know that.

9 MR. QUINTANILLA: But --

10 MR. ANTWINE: You're never going to approve
11 anything we do, sir. With all due respect, --

12 MR. QUINTANILLA: What do you mean I never
13 will?

14 MR. ANTWINE: -- you will never approve
15 anything we do.

16 MR. QUINTANILLA: You're -- you're not --

17 MR. ANTWINE: You're going to finding
18 something.

19 MR. QUINTANILLA: You are not telling the
20 truth here.

21 MR. ANTWINE: Yes, I am.

22 MR. QUINTANILLA: I do -- I do approve. I
23 have --

24 MR. SILVAS: Okay. Let's get on track.

25 MR. QUINTANILLA: -- approved of these. I

1 have not approved January 2005 to the September 2005.
2 That I have not approved.

3 MR. ANTWINE: Can we close this item
4 because --

5 MR. MARTINEZ: Mr. Weegar, you've had --
6 you've had your hand up for a while.

7 MR. WEEGAR: Can I just offer this concept
8 here?

9 MR. QUINTANILLA: I agree -- I agree to that.

10 MR. WEEGAR: Minutes are a -- they are a
11 summary of what took place in the meeting. They are not a
12 verbatim transcript. They are a summary. And I think
13 what the RAB rule is trying to ask or lay out there is
14 that you provide -- that everybody agrees it was a true
15 and accurate summary of what took place at the meeting.
16 And by giving your -- the cochair the authority to sign
17 off on them, you are -- it is the community's obligation
18 to provide to the cochair comments you have. He will work
19 with his counterpart to get those changes made.

20 But these minutes don't need to then come back to
21 each individual RAB member and get their -- their vote of
22 approval because you are by voting on giving your -- the
23 citizen -- the community cochair that authority, you are
24 granting him to vote in your stead.

25 MR. QUINTANILLA: The -- the book -- the law

1 says the RAB rule --

2 MR. ANTWINE: It's not the law.

3 MR. QUINTANILLA: -- says that they will be
4 certified.

5 MR. ANTWINE: It's not the law, sir.

6 MR. QUINTANILLA: The RAB rule then.

7 MR. ANTWINE: Okay.

8 MR. QUINTANILLA: And the RAB rule comes from
9 the law. The law says that there must be a RAB rule.
10 Okay?

11 MR. ANTWINE: Okay. Just like policies do
12 and -- yeah, you're right.

13 MR. QUINTANILLA: I'm right. It says --

14 MR. ANTWINE: That's somebody's interpretation
15 of the law.

16 MR. QUINTANILLA: It says: The accuracy of
17 all meetings shall be certified by the RAB cochairs.

18 MR. ANTWINE: That's him and me.

19 MR. QUINTANILLA: That is correct. And it
20 also states that the -- the -- that the RAB shall approve
21 the minutes.

22 MR. ANTWINE: Okay. Well, you figure out how
23 to get it approved and we'll -- we'll sign it.

24 MR. QUINTANILLA: Well, we already -- we
25 already approved this.

1 MR. ANTWINE: You did?

2 MR. QUINTANILLA: Yes. So all I --

3 MR. ANTWINE: Well, let's sign them and get on
4 with it.

5 MR. QUINTANILLA: After the two weeks review,
6 we can --

7 MR. ANTWINE: Okay. Well, I thought you just
8 were objecting to that.

9 MR. QUINTANILLA: No. I'm objecting to the
10 January through September 2005.

11 MR. ANTWINE: Okay. Let's take that as an
12 action item. We can't address that right now.

13 MR. QUINTANILLA: Thank you very much.

14 MR. ANTWINE: Will you take that?

15 MS. CODERRE: We'll be glad to take that.

16 MR. QUINTANILLA: Thank you.

17 MS. CODERRE: Even though those minutes have
18 already been signed by your cochair.

19 MR. ANTWINE: Okay. We'll show him --

20 MR. QUINTANILLA: They don't have the --

21 MR. ANTWINE: We'll show you the approved,
22 signed copies --

23 MS. CODERRE: No, they don't.

24 MR. ANTWINE: -- of those minutes and
25 hopefully we can get on with it.

1 MR. QUINTANILLA: She's already agreed to it.
2 She's already agreed to it, that they don't have --

3 MS. CODERRE: What did I just agree to in your
4 mind, Mr. Quintanilla?

5 MR. QUINTANILLA: Beg your pardon?

6 MS. CODERRE: What did I just agree to?

7 MR. QUINTANILLA: I just said that you were
8 the one that agreed to it. She has already agreed I said,
9 not disagreed.

10 MS. CODERRE: Are we going to be able to talk
11 about the environmental restoration program at some point
12 this evening?

13 MR. QUINTANILLA: Who is the facilitator? Is
14 it -- right here.

15 MR. SHENEMAN: Where is David?

16 MR. SILVAS: All right. In closing on this,
17 and then we'll move on, I just want to state that the
18 minutes that were from '05 of January to September '05
19 were in my view approved. Wrongly. They were inaccurate
20 and we know that. I had come back and said that on the
21 record. And again I will. And if it helps, I will submit
22 something in writing, but those need to be again
23 represented and since it's an action item that's all I've
24 got to say. Thank you.

25 MR. MARTINEZ: Thank you, sir. All right. At

1 this point we will move on to reviewing this list of
2 reports that are optional, potential reports for review
3 under the TAPP program. So I think, Mr. Silvas, if you
4 want to lead us through or if you'd like me to, it's up to
5 you.

6 MR. SILVAS: Okay. For the projects upcoming
7 for '06 and '07, we got a list of six of them up on top
8 would be the Semiannual Compliance Plan Report for '06,
9 January '06. Next would be July 2006 Semiannual
10 Compliance Plan Report. Zone 2 and 3 Corrective Measures
11 Implementations, CMI Workplan, the CERCLA five year review
12 report, the Environmental Process Control Facility, RCRA,
13 RCRA Facility Investigation Report and the site D-10
14 closure report.

15 Now I guess we're going to bring this up and go
16 ahead and take a vote to get these approved because we
17 have to submit these either in a one-on-one submittal
18 request or as in a group. But the first step is to get
19 them approved by you-all, by this RAB and we'll go ahead
20 and --

21 MR. MARTINEZ: Let's take a vote on each one
22 then. And this is for the community members only.
23 Again. So if we can see a show of hands, please, and
24 don't put them down until I count you. Or should we just
25 do the ballot sheet?

1 MR. SILVAS: The ballot.

2 MS. GALVAN: Ballot.

3 MR. MARTINEZ: Ballot it? Okay. So if you
4 can take about maybe about two or three minutes to select
5 the ones that you would like to see reviewed under the
6 TAPP program please and then I will collect the ballot
7 sheets.

8 MR. ANTWINE: Just for clarification on these
9 dates, these are the reports that are going to be issued
10 during the calendar year 2006 and 7 that we're aware of
11 or --

12 MS. CODERRE: They are the ones -- these are
13 the reports that we anticipate will be out within the next
14 12 months or so except for the first one --

15 MR. MARTINEZ: Which has already been out.

16 MS. CODERRE: -- which has already been
17 published and the January 2006 Semiannual Compliance Plan
18 Report.

19 MS. LANDEZ: The first one, the third one, the
20 fourth one and the fifth one have already been published
21 and submitted to the regulators.

22 MS. CODERRE: Thank you, Norma. First, third
23 fourth and fifth of those reports have already published
24 and submitted to the regulators.

25 MS. GALVAN: Do we sign this?

1 MS. CODERRE: You do not need to sign that.

2 MR. WEEGAR: Wait a minute. The zone 2 and 3
3 Corrective Measures Implementation Workplan hasn't been
4 submitted.

5 MS. LANDEZ: Oh, I'm sorry. Then it's one,
6 four and five.

7 MR. WEEGAR: Corrective Measures Study has --
8 the CMI Workplan has not been submitted.

9 MR. MARTINEZ: So the first, the fourth and
10 the fifth have already been submitted?

11 MS. LANDEZ: Correct.

12 MS. CODERRE: Correct. Are we ready? Should
13 I come by and collect them? Eddie?

14 Eddie, you can keep going.

15 Okay. That's one, two, that's three. Six
16 community members here. Thank you, Mr. Quintanilla. Mr.
17 Sheneman, do you have one for me?

18 MR. MARTINEZ: Sir?

19 MR. WEEGAR: Just a point of clarification.
20 The third item, the zone 2, 3 implementation workplan,
21 that is basically the kind of -- the hundred percent
22 design of the remedy that was selected through the zone 2
23 and 3 Corrective Measures Study which has al -- that was
24 already reviewed by a TAPP contractor and I can't think of
25 whether it was --

1 MR. MARTINEZ: The CMS for zones 2 and 3 was
2 reviewed by a TAPP contractor.

3 MR. WEEGAR: That was either --

4 MS. LANDEZ: Netherly.

5 MR. WEEGAR: -- Netherly or --

6 MS. LANDEZ: Clearwater.

7 MR. WEEGAR: -- Clearwater. So that's
8 basically -- the CMS would have gone through a whole bunch
9 of potential options to doing the cleanup and then
10 selected one and you'd already had your TAPP contractor
11 review and comment on that. So the CMI Workplan is
12 really -- that's just the final -- that's the design of
13 something that was already selected previously and
14 reviewed by the TAPP contractor.

15 So just -- again, just keep that in mind and
16 whether -- since it's al -- for the most part, that has
17 already been reviewed once by the TAPP contractor. You
18 might want to consider that on how you want to try to
19 spend or request funds just as an idea.

20 MR. MARTINEZ: Excellent. Thank you.

21 MR. GARCIA: Is that part of a design review?
22 What you're telling us is that it's been funded for -- for
23 preliminary, but it can't be funded for design review. Is
24 that what you're trying to say?

25 MR. SHENEMAN: Rodrigo, we can't hear you down

1 here.

2 MR. WEEGAR: What I'm saying is that the
3 cleanup plan that is in that particular document, the
4 third document here, the zone 2, 3 CMI Workplan, was
5 selected after evaluating a number of potential cleanup
6 plans and that document that evaluated all the number of
7 potential cleanup plans and came up with this one was
8 already -- was previously reviewed by either Netherly or
9 Clearwater, I don't remember which TAPP contractor, and
10 provided and commented on upon what the remedy was.

11 So what you're seeing here in the -- in the CMI
12 Workplan is really just the full scale. This is what
13 it -- nuts and bolts and all that looks like. But it's
14 previously been reviewed by a TAPP contractor.

15 MR. GARCIA: Okay. What you're saying it's
16 been reviewed by as a cleanup plan, but what we should get
17 now is get a review as an implementation plan to see if
18 it's going to work.

19 MR. WEEGAR: Well, this -- this will not --
20 the CMS that -- that evaluated different options. You
21 know, it kicked a bunch of them out and said this is the
22 one that looks best. All right? And that's what --
23 that's what is in here.

24 As far as how it will ultimately be documented as
25 to how it's working will be, you know, the collection of

1 data, you know, year after year and reported in the -- in
2 the Semiannual Compliance Plan Report. The data in the
3 CMI -- CMI Workplan doesn't -- it's not going to contain
4 groundwater monitoring data and stuff like that that says
5 okay, see, this plan is working. It's just more like
6 the -- the pipelines go here, the electrical connections
7 go here.

8 MR. GARCIA: I understand the way the plan
9 works.

10 MR. MARTINEZ: Mr. Silvas.

11 MR. SILVAS: Again, I'm going over this. I
12 got this in front of me, the CMI Workplan. It looks like
13 this was issued in '98.

14 MR. MARTINEZ: The workplan was issued in
15 '98?

16 MR. SILVAS: That's what it's stating there;
17 is that correct?

18 MR. WEEGAR: No, no. The -- the permit and
19 Groundwater Compliance Plan which is basically Kelly's
20 contract with the TCEQ that lays out the specifics of all
21 the sites that they have to investigate and clean up in
22 the process by which they have to collect -- investigate
23 the sites, select a remedy, propose a remedy to the agency
24 was issued in 1998. The CMI Workplan has not -- has not
25 even been submitted yet.

1 MR. MARTINEZ: That's what's going to be
2 submitted.

3 MR. WEEGAR: Right. The CMS was submitted
4 probably last year.

5 MR. MARTINEZ: Corrective Measures Study.

6 MR. WEEGAR: And was reviewed by the
7 contractor last year.

8 MR. SILVAS: So we're not talking about what
9 you're trying to get us to believe was reviewed by the
10 TAPP contractor. This is totally different.

11 MR. WEEGAR: What I'm saying is the process is
12 you -- you conduct an investigation of a site. If the
13 investigation indicates that there is contamination that
14 needs to be -- have a cleanup plan developed, what they do
15 in the Corrective Measures Study is evaluate numerous
16 different strategies for doing the cleanup. Out of that
17 review process, they then propose a final --

18 MR. MARTINEZ: Remedy.

19 MR. WEEGAR: -- remedy.

20 All right? What I'm -- all I'm saying is that
21 what the TAPP contractor had previously reviewed is that
22 process where all -- whereby all remedial options were
23 evaluated and actually commented on the one that was
24 proposed, as well as all the other ones. This is just --
25 this is just the full -- full scale design of that. So

1 there's -- has a TAPP contractor reviewed the CMI and all
2 that? No. But I'm just saying keep that in mind --

3 MR. SILVAS: Thank you.

4 MR. WEEGAR: -- that, you know, the contractor
5 has reviewed this remedy in a different form.

6 MR. MARTINEZ: We're falling a little bit
7 behind in the agenda so I'd like to move on here.

8 Mr. Antwine will give us an update from the Air
9 Force Real Property Agency on the some recurring issues
10 and then Ms. Norma Landez will talk about the BCT and any
11 documents that might go to the library. Mr. Antwine.

12 MR. ANTWINE: Okay. We're trying to gear this
13 section of the meeting towards what -- what are sort of
14 the recurring issues that the RAB members have asked us to
15 provide updates, issues that either we have some progress
16 made on or that are pending some action.

17 So what we've tried to do this time is cover --
18 cleanup progress is the first item. And you'll look
19 around the room, you'll see that what we've also done to
20 try to give you some better insight as to where we are in
21 terms of progress is -- is lay out all the sites by zone,
22 tell you which ones have been closed and concurred upon by
23 the state as far as closed, those are that are pending
24 closure and those that are still in progress.

25 So there's various categories you'll see and if

1 we get a chance at break, take a look at that and that's a
2 site by site analysis of where we are overall.

3 The total is -- as of now we've got about 687
4 sites. And if you'll look at that chart, I'm not sure if
5 you have it up there, but 419 of those sites were closed.

6 MR. MARTINEZ: Don is actually going to go
7 over those.

8 MR. ANTWINE: And we actually have I think
9 concurrence on an additional 50 sites that we just
10 received on yesterday; is that correct? From the state?
11 It's a -- it's a pretty large number of sites and I
12 believe it's in zones 2 and 3 that we got concurrence on.

13 MR. WEEGAR: I don't think it was 50, but --

14 MR. ANTWINE: Some -- somewhere close to
15 that. 52?

16 MR. GARCIA: Can we ask questions during that
17 time or will you --

18 MR. ANTWINE: Yeah, I would -- let me -- let
19 me just give you kind of the big picture stuff and then
20 Don's going to give you some more detail on the sites if
21 you have particular sites you'd like to ask questions
22 about.

23 The other issue that I wanted to bring up was the
24 class two -- class 3 mod on zones 4 and 5. I think Norma
25 is going to talk a little bit about that in her update.

1 We've received a -- we submitted it actually to
2 the TCEQ as of 17 May. Zones 4 and 5 or East Kelly and
3 the warehouse area and we have some pictures to kind of
4 give you a -- give you a flavor for where those zones are
5 as well.

6 The radium program or what you might hear called
7 red sites, we've got only one site, building 1530, which
8 is currently occupied by Lackland, that is still pending
9 some closure. And that's where they stored some kind of
10 radioactive source, you know, as part of the operations
11 in -- in that mobility warehouse. That's the only site
12 that we have that's still -- still requires some action or
13 closeout.

14 The other action item you guys have been asking
15 us to keep you informed on is the guar spill in Leon
16 Creek. We've yet to resolve that with the TCEQ. That's
17 pending their legal counsel's feedback to us as to whether
18 or not there's going to be some kind of a fine associated
19 with the fish kill that resulted from that or whether
20 there's going to be some other kind of -- of
21 administrative fine or notice of violation issued as a
22 result of that. So that one is still open. And we'll
23 keep you up to speed as that progresses.

24 The other thing I think Armando mentioned or that
25 Rodrigo mentioned was the 24 June Roundtable as part of

1 the Kelly Area Collaboration project. That first
2 Roundtable was an environmental health Roundtable in which
3 we did have a very good turnout. It was a good dialogue
4 and some issues were brought. New members of the
5 community were brought or actually came to the meeting.

6 There's another one that is scheduled in August.
7 That's going to be a health related Roundtable which
8 primarily the San Antonio Metropolitan Health District
9 will be giving, you know, various updates on health
10 studies and you'll have an opportunity to participate and
11 I hope you will take the opportunity to come to that as
12 well.

13 I think that's all I've got as far as items that
14 we've identified that you've asked for a little bit of an
15 update on each time we get together so --

16 MR. MARTINEZ: Ms. Landez.

17 MR. ANTWINE: I take --

18 MR. QUINTANILLA: I have a question here on
19 item number three, the one he just finished discussing.

20 MR. ANTWINE: Uh-huh.

21 MR. QUINTANILLA: I requested to receive
22 executive summaries of all the documents that are placed
23 in the cochair library. The answer does not provide
24 the -- the answer that I sought, summaries.

25 It says that you will provide us with a document

1 with descriptions on the slides and handouts to facilitate
2 RAB member understanding of the documents. We want a
3 summary.

4 MR. MARTINEZ: We're getting to that, sir.
5 Actually Ms. Landez is going to go over that.

6 MR. QUINTANILLA: Okay. Then -- then I have
7 another item in here on this same paper. It's the last
8 item.

9 MR. MARTINEZ: Are you referring to the action
10 items report?

11 MR. QUINTANILLA: Yes.

12 MR. MARTINEZ: Okay.

13 MR. QUINTANILLA: That's what he was reading
14 from.

15 MR. ANTWINE: No, no, no.

16 MR. MARTINEZ: No, sir. He was reading from
17 the briefing that was up here.

18 MR. QUINTANILLA: Well, these are action
19 items. But he was talking about the Kelly Collaboration.
20 I'm talking about these action items that are here that we
21 haven't discussed, but I'm discussing item number five.

22 I requested Mr. Antwine to make clear the
23 comments that he made in the April 2006 transcript and the
24 transcript states that I was choking him when I wasn't.
25 And his answer is page 113, lines two through four of 11

1 April 2006 Kelly Restoration Advisory Board meeting
2 document. An exchange between Mr. Quintanilla and me, I
3 was coughing during this exchange. I was not accusing Mr.
4 Quintanilla of physically choking me.

5 I don't recall Mr. Antwine coughing at that
6 time. And I don't think any of the members that were here
7 present remember him coughing either. And that I just
8 wanted to bring that for the record.

9 MR. MARTINEZ: Thank you. Ms. Landez.

10 MS. LANDEZ: Thank you.

11 MS. GALVAN: Can I ask questions before we go
12 on with this area? He said that when he finished he
13 would --

14 MR. MARTINEZ: Is it pertaining to what he was
15 talking about, ma'am?

16 MS. GALVAN: Yes, yes.

17 MR. MARTINEZ: All right. I apologize. I
18 didn't see your hand.

19 MS. GALVAN: Class 3 modification on zones 4
20 and 5. Going over those notes, it says that there was a
21 response to TCEQ's technical deficiency on zone 4 and 5.
22 What technical deficiency was that?

23 MS. LANDEZ: That's what Adam wanted me to
24 talk about. There were several technical deficiencies
25 that Mr. Weegar noted and a couple of them were some wells

1 that we left off our monitoring network and --

2 MS. GALVAN: You left off monitoring?

3 MS. LANDEZ: Some monitoring wells that we
4 left off on our network, just inadvertently left off so --

5 MS. GALVAN: In other words, were not covered
6 to clean up that --

7 MS. LANDEZ: No. Mark -- I'm sorry.

8 MR. WEEGAR: Let me -- let me try since I'm
9 the one that wrote the letter. Basically what the -- what
10 the deficiency identified was -- that's just a term we
11 use. But I suggested leaving some language as it already
12 was in the compliance plan versus what had been proposed
13 because it was actually clearer as it already was written
14 in the Permit and Compliance Plan.

15 The Air Force had proposed monitoring networks of
16 a number of wells for different units and I suggested that
17 they add a couple of additional wells to that monitoring
18 network because I thought that monitoring -- that would
19 make the monitoring network that more efficient, more
20 complete and they agreed to do that. Those kind of things
21 is what the deficiencies would --

22 MS. GALVAN: So the additional wells is
23 considered a deficiency on the plan?

24 MR. WEEGAR: The -- the --

25 MS. GALVAN: Is that what you're trying to

1 tell me?

2 MR. WEEGAR: What I'm trying to say is that we
3 ask -- any time we ask them to make a change, it's called
4 a deficiency.

5 MS. GALVAN: That's what I'm talking about.

6 MR. WEEGAR: That letter -- I would --

7 MS. GALVAN: That's exactly what I was asking.

8 MR. WEEGAR: I would note that that letter and
9 all, and everything, the deficiencies were all copied to
10 Robert Silvas, your cochair. Every letter I send out to
11 the Air Force is copied to Robert. He has a copy of it.

12 MS. GALVAN: And then another question, Mr.
13 Antwine. Looking at all those zones, it looks like it
14 still has not been cleaned up in the community. So my
15 question is this. Why was it never put on Superfund? Why
16 were we not under Superfund?

17 MR. ANTWINE: Well, I mean whether we cleaned
18 it up or not really has no bearing on whether or not it
19 became a Superfund site. That's an assessment that the
20 EPA does and that they did back in 1989. And, you know,
21 if we don't reach the threshold for Kelly becoming a
22 Superfund site, then --

23 MS. GALVAN: Then I think --

24 MR. ANTWINE: -- we don't become a Superfund
25 site.

1 MS. GALVAN: I think the EPA then should
2 answer the question. There is the --

3 MR. ANTWINE: Well, I'd be glad to defer --

4 MS. GALVAN: -- appropriate place. I would be
5 very curious to know why if we still don't have the
6 cleanup done and the community could be in danger by any
7 leaks or spills, whether by air or water or by dirt or any
8 other ways, then why has not EPA considered us as being
9 part of -- under the Superfund.

10 MR. LYSSY: Well, EPA did consider Kelly for
11 being added to the NPL list as part of Superfund. But
12 under EPA, sites are cleaned up either under the CERCLA
13 process or under the RCRA process. And the decision was
14 made that Kelly would be cleaned up under the RCRA
15 process.

16 MS. GALVAN: Who made that decision?

17 MR. LYSSY: Decision was made by EPA.

18 MR. SILVAS: Region?

19 MR. LYSSY: Region VI.

20 MR. QUINTANILLA: And what was the basis for
21 it?

22 MR. LYSSY: Based on the information they had
23 when they were putting together the HRS scores. Not all
24 sites go on the NPL. Just because a site's contaminated
25 doesn't mean that it goes on NPL. So both processes,

1 whether it's CERCLA or RCRA, follow the same type of
2 procedure. There are different names for the report, but
3 they all go through the same type of investigative phase,
4 coming up with the different remedies, selecting the
5 remedies and implementing that remedy.

6 MR. WEEGAR: I would note that R&H Oil, which
7 is right across from East Kelly, an abandoned refinery,
8 used oil recycler has been abandoned since 1992. It has
9 been proposed for listing on the NPL.

10 MS. GALVAN: Uh-huh. I saw that.

11 MR. WEEGAR: An investigation has not even
12 been conducted there. That's 14 years that that site has
13 set out there with no action whatsoever so Superfund is
14 not the -- the end all.

15 MR. QUINTANILLA: I beg to differ with you.
16 It has been cleaned up.

17 MR. WEEGAR: It has not.

18 MR. QUINTANILLA: Well, probably not deep in
19 there, but it is a Superfund site.

20 MR. WEEGAR: It has -- it has been proposed
21 for listing on the NPL. It has not been listed yet and
22 EPA has done a removal. I'm the project manager --

23 MR. QUINTANILLA: Yes, it is.

24 MR. WEEGAR: -- for that site, Armando.

25 MR. QUINTANILLA: They have done the removal

1 and they have worked on it and then have just left it.
2 Now it's overgrown with weeds again. But that was the --
3 a Superfund site and yet Kelly was never a Superfund site.

4 MR. WEEGAR: But the reason that R&H has been
5 proposed for listing on the NPL and Kelly was not is
6 primarily the federal government is here and they are a
7 solvent entity that is -- is able to do the cleanup.

8 The owners and operators of R&H Oil filed for
9 bankruptcy in 1982 and they were all discharged of any
10 liability by a federal bankruptcy judge. So there was
11 nobody there that had the wherewithal financially to do
12 the cleanup and that's why R&H has been proposed for the
13 cleanup because the funding needs to come from somewhere
14 other than the owners and operators; whereas Kelly, the
15 federal government was the owner and operator and they're
16 there available to pay for the cleanup and are doing the
17 cleanup.

18 MR. MARTINEZ: Mr. Silvas, you had --

19 MR. SILVAS: Just in closing, I want to state
20 that Mr. Weegar seems to make points about keeping Kelly
21 off Superfund, but let's state again we have over five
22 other AMC that -- AMC bases that were put on Superfund
23 because of water contamination and yet Kelly was the only
24 one kept off.

25 MR. WEEGAR: That's -- that's probably not in

1 reality --

2 MR. SILVAS: Excuse me. I'm not finished,
3 sir.

4 MR. WEEGAR: Okay.

5 MR. SILVAS: Secondly, Kelly made the
6 hazardous ranking score to qualify for Superfund, yet it
7 was kept off. Thank you.

8 MR. WEEGAR: Probably the reason those
9 other -- there are a number of federal facilities that are
10 on the NPL, but what you have to understand is the -- for
11 a long time, federal facilities were not scored to even be
12 listed on the NPL because of the fact that they were --
13 the NPL was ideally designed for either orphan sites where
14 there's nobody there that can afford to pay for the
15 cleanup or nobody is willing to do the cleanup. All
16 right? The national defense --

17 MR. ANTWINE: Authorization Act.

18 MR. WEEGAR: -- fund -- no, there's -- there's
19 an environmental activist group in Washington. The
20 Environmental Defense Fund or something like that, they
21 filed suit against the federal government saying that just
22 because federal facilities were not going to go bankrupt,
23 you know, federal government will be in place, that didn't
24 mean that they shouldn't be scored and placed on the NPL.
25 So EPA began doing that and placing federal facilities on

1 the NPL.

2 The Congress of the United States decided that
3 really didn't make a whole lot of sense putting these
4 sites on the NPL when that process was really designed for
5 sites that were -- were -- where there was nobody there
6 available to do the cleanup. So Congress amended CERCLA
7 and put in a provision that allowed sites to be deferred
8 from listing on the NPL if the cleanup is being done under
9 some other federal or state environmental cleanup program.

10 So Kelly was at that point where they came along
11 in the process where they were at -- that deferral process
12 was already in place whereas a lot of those other
13 facilities were scored and ranked on the NPL before the
14 Congress amended the federal law. That's basically what
15 happened.

16 MR. MARTINEZ: Okay. Thank you, sir.

17 MR. GARCIA: One last comment.

18 MR. MARTINEZ: We've got to move on. We're
19 getting --

20 MR. GARCIA: One more comment. They talk
21 about the EPA and the Air Force and federal government and
22 all that. Why doesn't the EPA have a professional
23 obligation to look that we're getting enough funding for
24 all of this? People are dying. Former Kelly workers are
25 dying. People that live in the neighborhoods are dying.

1 We're not doing enough health studies. We're not taking
2 care of all the people that got sick.

3 Where is the moral obligation of the EPA to get
4 involved not only judging the chemicals and getting the
5 Air Force to clean it up? How about the damage that --
6 how many people (inaudible) the Guadacanal before they
7 Superfunded that? Why aren't you involved like Guadacanal
8 there and all the people you're killing here? Who is
9 accepting the responsibility? Because I'm very concerned
10 about that. My father died from colon cancer because of
11 all the chemicals he ingested at building 375 when he was
12 there (inaudible).

13 Where is the EPA to look at all these people that
14 died from working there for all those years? The EPA is
15 washing their hands of it saying that well, the federal
16 government is funding it. We don't have to do anything
17 and that's wrong. But you're saying it's -- you know,
18 it's all bureaucratic. You don't look at the moral side
19 of things. It's all bureaucratic.

20 And then you, Mr. Antwine, you talk about Zone 1
21 through 5, 2, 3, 4, 5 and all this stuff, I've told you
22 countless times every meeting, these people are new.
23 They're supposed to get copies of zone 1 through 5 so they
24 can see the basic plan that went with it so when we start
25 talking about all this cleanup going on, they can go back

1 and look at the basic plan and know how this plan got
2 started and have some background information on it.

3 MR. MARTINEZ: We're going to get to that here
4 in a second, sir, in the briefing.

5 MR. GARCIA: Briefing my foot. It's
6 supposed --

7 MR. MARTINEZ: We're getting --

8 MR. GARCIA: -- to be in writing.

9 MR. MARTINEZ: It will be in writing. It's
10 in -- it's in the packet.

11 MR. QUINTANILLA: Just one question, Mr.
12 Weegar, real fast and dirty. Is RCRA cleanup the same as
13 CERCLA cleanup? Identical?

14 MR. WEEGAR: They are -- yes. They are --
15 they're analogous in the cleanup that they result in,
16 which is protection of human health and the environment.
17 Are the terminology different in one program than the
18 other, absolutely. But they are designed to achieve the
19 same level of protectiveness of human health and the
20 environment.

21 MR. QUINTANILLA: Okay. Now I --

22 MR. MARTINEZ: Mr. Weegar --

23 MR. WEEGAR: And I will make -- I will make --
24 since this is something that the Restoration Advisory
25 Board should also be very interested in, there is much

1 more opportunity for public comment under the RCRA process
2 than there is the Superfund process.

3 Under RCRA, through these compliance plan
4 modifications that go to the state, you can request a
5 contested case hearing and if that contested case hearing
6 is granted and it goes to the State Office of
7 Administrative Hearing, you can contest the remedy that is
8 being implemented by the Air Force and being proposed for
9 approval by the TCEQ. You do not have that same option
10 under the Superfund process.

11 MR. QUINTANILLA: Okay. And this is the final
12 part on this thing. One time we asked the Congress of the
13 United States, and that time it was Congressman Tejeda, to
14 find out why we were -- why Kelly was being cleaned up
15 under RCRA and not under CERCLA.

16 And what his staff advised me on was that RCRA
17 was only for the site itself, not beyond the fence lines.

18 MR. WEEGAR: That is incorrect.

19 MR. LYSSY: That is not true. RCRA
20 encompasses the entire site plus where any contamination
21 has gone from that site.

22 MR. QUINTANILLA: All right.

23 MR. MARTINEZ: Mrs. Landez is I think going to
24 give a presentation on that process --

25 MR. QUINTANILLA: Which brings up this

1 question.

2 MR. MARTINEZ: -- so let's wait for that
3 briefing.

4 MR. QUINTANILLA: Why is it -- if it's
5 supposed to be all cleaned up, why was the highest
6 priority given to Kelly to clean up the inside or to
7 contain the contamination before cleaning up the
8 neighborhoods?

9 MR. WEEGAR: That is -- that is not an
10 accurate statement.

11 MR. QUINTANILLA: What is an accurate
12 statement? What did actually happen?

13 MR. WEEGAR: And accurate statement is Kelly
14 is required to remediate all soil and groundwater
15 contamination both on site and off site of the facility to
16 levels that are protective of human health and the
17 environment. What the Air Force did by implementing
18 interim remedial actions on site first was to control the
19 sources of the release, thereby preventing the
20 contamination that had already gotten of site from
21 continuing to spread.

22 MR. QUINTANILLA: When you --

23 MR. WEEGAR: I've used this analogy before,
24 Armando. I know you've heard it, but I'll use it again.
25 It's like when you knock over a cup of coffee, what's the

1 first thing you do? You pick up the cup of coffee and
2 then you decide do I need a paper towel, do I need a mop
3 or a shop vac.

4 What they did in implementing the interim action
5 for source areas like site MP and building 360 and things
6 like that were to try to contain the contamination that
7 had been in the environment for many years and then was
8 sourcing the groundwater that was moving off site, thereby
9 stopping the continual -- it doesn't do a you a whole lot
10 of good to try to clean up the off site groundwater if
11 you've still got an active source there discharging to the
12 groundwater.

13 So that's what they did. They were never given
14 any priority by the TCEQ or anybody else to only address
15 on site contamination first.

16 MR. QUINTANILLA: Why weren't they? Why was
17 the golf course cleaned up? Why was 300 million dollars
18 spent on containment including 19 -- 12-and-a-half million
19 for putting that culvert on Quintana and Malone and -- not
20 Quintana, Bynum and -- and McLaughlin.

21 MR. WEEGAR: As I indicate --

22 MR. QUINTANILLA: 12-and-a-half for containing
23 the containment -- for containing the contamination under
24 people's homes, schools and churches. This is what gripes
25 the people. And only 18 million dollars has been expended

1 in the cleanup of the neighborhoods with three permeable
2 barriers and that is the gripe.

3 MR. WEEGAR: Armando, I will --

4 MR. QUINTANILLA: And it doesn't seem just to
5 the people.

6 MR. WEEGAR: I will go back to my answer that
7 I've already given you before. There was no priority
8 placed on cleaning up Kelly first while the neighborhoods
9 languished.

10 MR. QUINTANILLA: They did though.

11 MR. WEEGAR: The -- the cleanup --

12 MR. QUINTANILLA: They're still languishing.

13 MR. WEEGAR: The cleanup that was done, the
14 approach that was taken at Kelly is the same approach that
15 is done at almost every site. You address the source
16 areas first while you're defining how big the problem is
17 in the ground water and developing a remedial strategy and
18 that's the process that has been followed here just like
19 it has at thousands of sites across the United States.

20 MR. QUINTANILLA: Out of 320 million dollars
21 expended, only 18 million dollars has been on cleanup of
22 the neighborhoods.

23 MR. WEEGAR: How many millions of dollars have
24 been expended on the investigation determining the extent
25 of the contamination?

1 MR. QUINTANILLA: That's part of the 320
2 million.

3 MR. WEEGAR: That is what you have to have,
4 that type of money. You can -- you can spin the
5 accounting any way you want, but the bottom line is you
6 have to have all that investigative data both on site and
7 off site before you can even begin to develop a remedial
8 action.

9 MR. QUINTANILLA: We haven't received that
10 information so we can't speak.

11 MR. MARTINEZ: Gentlemen, we -- we have to
12 move on. We're already ten minutes --

13 MR. QUINTANILLA: Mr. Antwine has not provided
14 that information.

15 MR. MARTINEZ: -- behind schedule. Ms. Landez
16 has to give her BCT update. Thank you. Ms. Landez.

17 MS. LANDEZ: The class 3 mod for the zones 4
18 and 5, Adam wanted me to talk about it. It was already
19 discussed so I'm hoping that everyone understood where we
20 are on that.

21 The next step will be to receive initial draft
22 permit or compliance plan from the state. And once that
23 is received, we're required to submit comments within 30
24 days. And then after that, a final draft permit will be
25 sent to us and we will be required to do a public notice

1 so that we can review the permit and so -- and then -- it
2 will -- the notice will have an end date for your public
3 comments to be submitted to the state.

4 On the BCT, we haven't had a BCT since the
5 last -- I guess since Apr -- February, and as reported at
6 the TRS, our next meeting is tomorrow. We're meeting from
7 10:00 to 3:00. So we'll be there and these minute will be
8 available in your packets from that -- from tomorrow's
9 meeting at the September TRS meeting.

10 And until today, we had not received any
11 documents from the state. We did receive a letter;
12 unfortunately, we didn't have an opportunity to get it up
13 on the screen because it was received just at the -- you
14 know, today, as a matter of fact late yesterday. And it
15 will be available at the next TRS meeting. We'll put it
16 in the cochair's -- provide it for the cochair's library.

17 It's two letters closing quite a few of the zone
18 2 sites. Don will be talking about those in his review in
19 a little while.

20 MR. MARTINEZ: Thank you.

21 MS. LANDEZ: Yes.

22 MR. MARTINEZ: You first, Robert.

23 MR. SILVAS: The BCT meeting that's upcoming,
24 can the community show up as just observers? Is that
25 possible?

1 MS. LANDEZ: As we've talked to you guys
2 before and when you've requested, we said that the BCT has
3 made the decision not to allow any additional folks from
4 off site unless it's a contractor that comes in to discuss
5 what's going on at the site that they're working on. Oh,
6 I'm sorry. Mr. Garcia.

7 MR. GARCIA: You said that this meeting -- BCT
8 meetings last from 10:00 to 3:00; don't they?

9 MS. LANDEZ: Yes.

10 MR. GARCIA: And out of all the things that
11 happens in those five hours, you come up here and in a
12 minute-and-a-half you tell us what happens in five hours
13 worth of decisions? I don't think that's right.

14 MS. LANDEZ: Just let me explain to you what
15 we do at a BCT meeting. Usually a contractor will come in
16 and tell us what they've been doing. One of the things
17 that you -- Mr. Silvas brought up was the article that Mr.
18 Stinson did in the paper today where a contractor is doing
19 some work on zone 1.

20 They're doing -- have done some soil removal so
21 they can -- not really removal. They're just basically
22 excavating around the drum to determine how many drums and
23 how far down so they can figure out the best way to remedy
24 the situation, whether they want to stabilize it or remove
25 the drums so these are the kinds of things that they come

1 in and talk to us about, what is the current status.

2 We tell the state where we are on certain closure
3 activities that we're working on. I mean it's more of a
4 technical information exchange. Basically when we submit
5 a report, that is our proposal to the state, to EPA, how
6 we decide to either close the site or do remedial action
7 on the site. And then they tell us yes, we agree or no,
8 we don't. And this is what you need to do to change.

9 So it's really the letter that we received from
10 the state are the decisions that are made for those -- for
11 each of those documents that we submit. The documents are
12 our decisions that we do for this -- for the sites and
13 their response back to us are the decisions they make
14 whether the site should be closed or not.

15 MR. GARCIA: So it's your opinion that we
16 don't deserve to know what's going on in these
17 construction updates and cleanup updates and everything
18 that is discussed in a BCT meeting?

19 MS. LANDEZ: The BCT meetings --

20 MR. WEEGAR: That's not -- that's not the
21 issue. The Department of Defense -- and if you'll read
22 through the RAB rule, they have identified that the
23 Restoration Advisory Board is the avenue for the community
24 to get input and to have an exchange back and forth with
25 the decision-makers, not the BCT.

1 Ms. Landez, Adam and these folks don't -- they
2 don't have -- they don't have the authority to change what
3 DOD policy was before and now has been -- has been
4 formalized via the RAB rule. They don't have the
5 authority to change what DOD has decided as to what the
6 process is.

7 MR. SILVAS: Well, excuse me. To point out a
8 fact that other bases do allow members to sit on their BCT
9 so --

10 MR. WEEGAR: I'm not aware of any.

11 MR. SILVAS: You just stated earlier that this
12 is an avenue where under Superfund we wouldn't have a
13 voice as we do here under RCRA to speak out, petition and
14 whatever and now you're stating that, you know, we can't
15 go in and join these because we're not allowed. It's
16 because we're not an institution or an agency that we're
17 not allowed. The contractors can go in, TCEQ can go in,
18 yet because we're community members, there's
19 discrimination.

20 MR. WEEGAR: No. What I -- what I said was
21 under RCRA as opposed to CERCLA is you do have an
22 opportunity to protest cleanup decisions that have been
23 made and in fact fight against those cleanup decisions and
24 in court through a contested case hearing. You do not
25 have that avenue through a Superfund process.

1 You cannot challenge an EPA or an Air Force
2 cleanup decision under CERCLA in court. You're not -- the
3 community or individuals are not allowed to do that. You
4 are allowed to do that under -- under RCRA. That's what
5 the whole contested case hearing, the permit modification,
6 going before our commissioners in an agenda, that's what
7 that is all about. That gives not only the Rest -- forget
8 the Restoration Advisory Board. It gives individual
9 citizens who are an effected person an opportunity to
10 challenge a division that is before our commissioners.

11 Under RCRA you have that authority. You have
12 that ability. You do not have that under CERCLA. That's
13 what I said.

14 MR. SILVAS: Right. Well, BCT is just out of
15 the question.

16 MR. WEEGAR: BCT is the -- that is an
17 opportunity for a technical exchange between the cleanup
18 decision-makers, TCEQ, EPA, the Air Force and the
19 contractors.

20 MR. QUINTANILLA: Before you go, I just want
21 to support what Mr. Silvas said. If you read the
22 NEJAC report, the last one that came out, it states that
23 certain bases do allow observers to the -- to their BCT
24 meeting. And that's for the record.

25 MS. LANDEZ: One other thing I did forget --

1 we didn't include in the information, but it is in your
2 information package. You'll notice an ad that was placed
3 in the paper --

4 MR. MARTINEZ: Looks like this.

5 MS. LANDEZ: On June 20th. Your very last
6 page in your packet. June 20th, 2006 Express News.
7 Basically it's a notice that a Finding Of Suitability of
8 Transfer, the test cell area on the base, which is this
9 portion of this area down here, has been submitted to EPA
10 for review. And they -- you have the ability to provide
11 comments to that Finding of Suitability of Transfer to me
12 before the July 20th of this -- of this month. 20th of
13 this month.

14 So it's available at the library for you to
15 review it. It's not a very big document, but you are
16 welcome to review it and let me know if you have any
17 comments.

18 MR. QUINTANILLA: I do have a comment. This
19 is a copy that's being conveyed as a result of the closure
20 for the former Kelly Air Force Base in accordance with
21 CERCLA. We're not under CERCLA.

22 MS. LANDEZ: The transfer.

23 MR. QUINTANILLA: I'm confused.

24 MS. LANDEZ: The transfer of property requires
25 CERCLA covenant that other -- all contaminant have been

1 removed or that there is contaminants left in place. And
2 so that's done under CERCLA 128.

3 MR. QUINTANILLA: So we're under two things,
4 CERCLA and RCRA.

5 MR. WEEGAR: The -- the environment --

6 MR. LYSSY: For transfer of property, yes.

7 MR. WEEGAR: The environmental cleanup at
8 Kelly is being done under the RCRA -- Resource
9 Conservation and Recovery Act implemented -- the sites
10 federal cleanup statute implemented by the State of Texas
11 in lieu of EPA. The federal -- the federal rules
12 governing the transfer of federal property from the
13 federal government to a non federal entity is contained in
14 CERCLA. That is the only provision of CERCLA that applies
15 to this -- to this facility, the property transfer.

16 MR. QUINTANILLA: Thanks a lot.

17 MR. LYSSY: That's specifically CERCLA 128.

18 MR. SILVAS: I have one question. Regarding
19 the document that was sent for review, .

20 MS. LANDEZ: Yes.

21 MR. SILVAS: Was that something that needed
22 potential reviewing under a TAPP contract?

23 MS. LANDEZ: That's something that you are
24 welcome to look at, but property will probably be
25 transferred before your request for funding would -- and

1 even the TAPP review, but that's your -- your prerogative
2 as a RAB to do that.

3 MR. SILVAS: Again, what document was this?

4 MS. LANDEZ: It's the Finding of Suitability
5 of Transfer for the test cell parcel.

6 MR. MARTINEZ: Okay. Let's go ahead and move
7 on. We're already behind schedule here.

8 Next up we have Mr. Joe Zupan from Zephyr
9 Environmental. He's going to give us a presentation on
10 the air monitoring results of -- during the construction
11 of -- is it one of these off base PRBs?

12 MR. ZUPAN: Three.

13 MR. MARTINEZ: Three off base PRBs. Go ahead,
14 sir.

15 MR. ZUPAN: Thank you. My name is Joe Zupan
16 with Zephyr Environmental Corporation. I feel compelled
17 to remind you-all that we are not an Air Force
18 contractor. We've been working with the City of San
19 Antonio and with Kyle and the Metro Health Department to
20 address various community concerns and kind of be another
21 look-see. Just also for the record, Zephyr doesn't do any
22 work for the United States Air Force in San Antonio or
23 anywhere else.

24 This -- this little effort was an effort on
25 behalf of the community to kind of take a look at the

1 installation of the PRBs, the permeable reactive barriers,
2 at three sites that the Air Force was doing and the Air
3 Force contractors were doing as part of their remedial
4 action plan.

5 You know, just to rehash the background even
6 though you're already familiar with it, there's -- there's
7 been historical releases of degreasers and petroleum
8 products and other substances that resulted in chemicals
9 in the groundwater on the base and off site.

10 The three PRB installations that we took a look
11 at were -- the first one was the 34th Street PRB
12 monitoring which was conducted from March 24th through
13 April 28th, 2005. The Malone Street PRB monitoring effort
14 was conducted from March 30th to October 10th, 2005 and
15 the Commercial Street monitoring was conducted from June
16 23 through September 22, 2005, mostly by the personnel
17 from San Antonio Metro Health Department.

18 I'll give you a few more details about that.
19 This is a variation on the maps that you've seen plenty of
20 times that show kind of how the plumes are extending to
21 the south and east of Kelly and East Kelly and off site.

22 You've probably also heard in past RAB meetings
23 and in some of your technical meetings how a PRB works but
24 it might be worth restating it briefly for tonight.

25 Basically what a permeable reactive barrier does

1 is it takes the contaminant plume that's in the
2 groundwater and as the groundwater naturally flows through
3 it, it provides a reactive site for the contaminant to
4 react and be catalyzed into hopefully some less harmless
5 contaminants.

6 It's gotten some pretty successful results across
7 the country, particularly with chlorinated solvent plumes
8 and certainly the Air Force is hoping, and I'm sure the
9 community hopes, that they work here in San Antonio as
10 well.

11 The 34th Street PRB, that's kind of a location
12 map. That's sort of to the north and west of East Kelly.
13 This is kind of a detailed drawing.

14 This PRB was installed using a trenching
15 technique whereby -- it basically just dug a trench along
16 the city street down to about 36 feet I believe and then
17 they introduced a mixture of sand and iron filing to sort
18 of fill the trench back up with a guar gum matrix. And
19 again, the idea is once that's in place, then the
20 groundwater is going to naturally be moving through that
21 because of the natural direction of the groundwater flow.
22 And it will treat the contaminants and the chlorinated
23 solvent and render them harmless.

24 I've got a couple of pictures to share. The one
25 on the left there is the construction of the sand and iron

1 mix conveyer. That's where they're mixing up the sand and
2 the iron filing and introduce it into the trench.

3 You can see they're starting to trench along the
4 city street there on the picture on the right-hand side.
5 On the left you can see they're excavating through the
6 guar mixture and trying to keep that whole process going
7 as they're going in the matrix.

8 The picture on the right is a picture of some of
9 the monitoring equipment that we used. We're monitoring
10 the volatile organic compound and particulate matter. The
11 idea was because these are close to people's homes, we
12 wanted to make sure during the process of construction the
13 Air Force's contractors weren't causing yet another
14 problem for the folks that live nearby. So we were paying
15 very careful attention to that.

16 Yes, sir.

17 MR. GARCIA: How does the mon -- how does the
18 monitor -- does it have a pipe going in the ground to
19 collect it or how is it monitoring?

20 MR. ZUPAN: No. It's actually like kind of
21 breathing the air. It's taking in the air and breathing
22 it just like you or I would if we were standing there
23 measuring it, okay, how much particulate is in that air.

24 MR. GARCIA: Okay.

25 MR. ZUPAN: Okay. That thing was logging the

1 data continuously and we provided that in a report to
2 Metro Health.

3 Our conclusions for that particular area were we
4 didn't see any volatile organic chemicals related to
5 contaminated soil or groundwater detected at all. And
6 there were only two occasions where particulate matter was
7 measured above the action level of 189 ug/m3. That's,
8 again, a concentration in air that you might be breathing.

9 During both of those instances, the wind
10 direction was away from the houses in the nearby
11 neighborhood and more toward the base and so the Zephyr
12 team felt comfortable saying that we didn't see any issue
13 effecting public health or the environment with respect to
14 the construction activity for installing this PRB on 24th
15 Street. Any questions on that one?

16 MR. SILVAS: How many air monitors were
17 installed.

18 MR. ZUPAN: How many?

19 MR. SILVAS: Yeah.

20 MR. ZUPAN: We had one volatile organic -- VOC
21 meter that we kind of walked back and forth with. And
22 then the particulate matter, one -- one instrument -- we
23 always try to locate it sort of downwind from the
24 construction. So in other words, the dust was kind of
25 blowing from that way.

1 We wanted to be sure we were downwind so we were
2 measuring the highest possible particulate matter that you
3 would see or that anyone would see nearby. So we're kind
4 of trying to move around to make sure we're getting sort
5 of a worst case picture of what might be going on.

6 MR. SILVAS: And the monitoring and sampling
7 was done as it was initiated and finalized?

8 MR. ZUPAN: The whole time.

9 MR. GARCIA: Besides that machine, did you do
10 any other type of air monitoring or air grabbing or air
11 sampling besides the machine you were using?

12 MR. ZUPAN: Besides the two machines?

13 MR. GARCIA: Right.

14 MR. ZUPAN: No.

15 MR. GARCIA: You didn't think it was
16 necessary?

17 MR. ZUPAN: The contaminants that we would
18 expect or that would be concerned about would be a release
19 of -- you know, as they're excavating the soil, letting
20 loose some of those organic vapors so we want to monitor
21 for that and also just dust. You know, dust can be a
22 contaminant. That's why we were monitoring particulate
23 matter.

24 I feel like we kind of covered the map with
25 respect to the contaminants we would largely expect to see

1 on that site.

2 MR. GARCIA: Did you put any dust control
3 curtain or any kind of dust control mechanisms?

4 MR. ZUPAN: Yeah. The Air Force contractor
5 did try to do some dust control and that's probably why we
6 didn't get any, you know, high readings for the most part.

7 Next slide. The next installation was actually
8 installed with a completely different technique. It was
9 really quite interesting and that's the Malone Street PRB
10 and that's kind of more to the north and east of East
11 Kelly as you can see on the aerials photos there.

12 The next slide. That's just another -- that's a
13 map view of the same thing basically to show you where
14 that is. Sort of not too far from Malone Street there.
15 Now in the case of this PRB, it was a different contractor
16 the Air Force used and a completely different technique.
17 Instead of having to dig a big old trench down in the
18 groundwater, these guys were basically installing a series
19 of wells one after the other and you can kind of see
20 that. On the left-hand side is the tools they were using
21 to install the wells and on the right-hand side kind of
22 shows wells all lining up.

23 So basically they're going down and injecting the
24 matrix that will treat the contaminated groundwater out
25 into a curtain or a wall. And I kind of liked it from a

1 public health perspective because they're not having to do
2 the big excavation, making all the dust and bringing
3 contaminants from 30 feet down. So it's more of a in-city
4 type technique.

5 Next slide. The slide on the left is actually
6 not the Air Force contractor, but some adjacent
7 construction that we went ahead and monitored the dust to
8 make sure no action levels were exceeded. And one on the
9 right is actually my colleague Brad Watson who spoke to
10 you at one of the prior meetings taking some
11 measurements.

12 Next slide. And we have kind of similar
13 conclusions for Malone Street. We didn't measure any
14 detectable volatile organic chemicals or VOCs. We did
15 measure particulate matter or dust above the action on
16 five occasions. We did note that a large amount of dust
17 was produced from activities that weren't related to the
18 Air Force contractor, just from some adjacent activity
19 that was done. That's one picture of the guy on the
20 bulldozer.

21 And again, we documented the wind direction
22 during those excursions and it was generally away from
23 houses and nearby neighborhoods and more toward the Air
24 Force Base. And so, you know, once again, the Zephyr team
25 felt comfortable saying that we didn't see any issues

1 effecting public health and the environment related to the
2 installation activities themselves, during the Malone
3 Street installation.

4 MR. SILVAS: Are the Air -- the Air Force, are
5 they doing any long term monitoring at these sites?

6 MR. ZUPAN: Well, I -- I think they plan to
7 and they certainly need to. My understanding of how a PRB
8 works is you have to pay very close attention to what's
9 going into it and coming out of it and making sure it
10 continues to work right and I think that's fully in the
11 Air Force's plan to do.

12 Next slide. Then the final -- the final
13 installations that Metro Health and Zephyr were overseeing
14 was the Commercial Street PRB and that's shown on that
15 particular aerial photograph. And I'm not as personally
16 familiar with that one since it was mostly Metro Health
17 staff that did that particular effort, but with the next
18 slide I think we kind of reached the same conclusions that
19 no VOCs were detected. PM was never in that instance
20 measured above the action level so we felt like that no
21 issue effecting public health and the environment related
22 to the installation activities were observed during any
23 phase of the project.

24 I think that it was kind of interesting for me as
25 an engineering -- environmental engineering professional

1 to see two different techniques -- two or three different
2 techniques of installing these PRBs and so we'll be
3 watching with interest to see how well they do with
4 respect to treating the groundwater.

5 MS. GALVAN: To your knowledge, they're fairly
6 new, the technology of the PRBs?

7 MR. ZUPAN: They are fairly new. I would say
8 PRBs haven't been in widespread use for more than ten
9 years really.

10 MS. GALVAN: Now they're only treating three
11 of the chemicals; right? PCE, DCE and VOCs. They're not
12 treating all of the chemicals that are in that groundwater
13 like mercury and all the rest of them; right?

14 MR. ZUPAN: Well, I would say that it's true.
15 And I'm not a PRB expert, but my understanding is that
16 these particular installations are going to be treating
17 the chlorinated solvent that we mentioned.

18 MS. GALVAN: So we still run the risk of
19 being -- I mean the homes still have this contaminated
20 water under their 20, 30,000 homes. The contamination is
21 still there as far as -- I mean the PRBs are like a
22 band-aid to me.

23 MR. ZUPAN: I think to use Mr. Weegar's
24 explanation, it's -- the Air Force is still there trying
25 to turn the coffee cup back up --

1 MS. GALVAN: The plume is --

2 MR. ZUPAN: -- and keep it from growing.

3 MR. GALVAN: -- large and it's using these
4 PRBs as little band-aids and I feel that contamination is
5 going to run its course and they're using the -- just look
6 at all this information they're giving us to monitor
7 natural attenuation. I mean this flier doesn't even say
8 how long it's going to take for the public to know.
9 Doesn't even have anything on there saying how many years
10 it will take for this to occur.

11 MR. WEEGAR: Well, let me -- let me clarify
12 something. The PRBs that are installed out there are
13 designed to treat voluntary organic compounds and the
14 reason they're there treating voluntary organic compounds
15 is because that's the only contaminants that are in those
16 plumes. There are not metals --

17 MS. GALVAN: You're saying there's nothing
18 else there?

19 MR. WEEGAR: There's not metal or other things
20 out there and --

21 MS. GALVAN: And that's groundwater
22 connotation.

23 MR. WEEGAR: In the area where those PRBs are
24 installed, they were installed to address volatile organic
25 compounds and that's all because that's all that is there.

1 MS. GALVAN: That's what you're saying?

2 MR. WEEGAR: Right.

3 MS. GALVAN: And you have proof?

4 MR. WEEGAR: We have the semiannual
5 groundwater monitoring report that are done. I mean
6 that's -- that's the proof is the groundwater monitoring
7 that's been done.

8 MS. GALVAN: Okay. Because that's not what I
9 understood when I first got on this RAB board.

10 MR. WEEGAR: Well, there -- there are metals
11 in groundwater on parts --

12 MS. GALVAN: I can go back to my --

13 MR. WEEGAR: -- parts of the base.

14 MS. GALVAN: -- notes and refer --

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

17 MR. WEEGAR: There are metals in groundwater
18 on parts of the base that are being addressed through
19 other technologies, but in the particular areas where the
20 PRBs, whether they were installed through injection or
21 through trenching, are in place -- they're designed to
22 treat the volatile organics because that's all that's
23 there.

24 If there were -- if there were large metal plumes
25 out there, that remedy would never have been proposed by

1 the Air Force or approved by TCEQ because it would not
2 have been effective.

3 MS. GALVAN: But I believe I said that. I
4 think you're just telling me -- you're repeating what I
5 just finished saying. That I understood what PRBs were
6 cleaning.

7 MR. WEEGAR: Right.

8 MS. GALVAN: And I even stated what it would
9 be able and capable of cleaning. I'm talking about the
10 other contaminants.

11 MR. WEEGAR: As -- and what I'm saying is in
12 the areas where these PRBs have been installed, there are
13 no other contaminants or VOCs.

14 MS. GALVAN: I'm not talking about those. I'm
15 talking about the other contaminants. I'll need to go
16 back to my notes and bring them back to you.

17 MR. WEEGAR: Okay.

18 MR. MARTINEZ: Is there anybody here that has
19 questions for Mr. Zupan? Yes, sir?

20 MR. SILVAS: How often should you come back
21 and monitor these systems?

22 MR. ZUPAN: Well, you're asking me for my
23 professional opinion. And again, I qualified myself by
24 saying that I'm not an expert in installing PRBs, but I
25 would certainly want to be monitoring them probably

1 quarterly.

2 MR. MARTINEZ: Any others?

3 MR. WEEGAR: I need a point of clarification
4 on that. You would be proposing to come back and do air
5 monitoring on these PRBs --

6 MR. ZUPAN: No, no. I'm sorry.

7 MR. WEEGAR: -- on a quarterly basis? Okay.

8 MR. ZUPAN: I thought the question was more
9 about monitoring the groundwater flow to see if it's
10 effective or not. In other words, upstream and
11 downstream. Was that your question or was there --

12 MR. SILVAS: Air monitoring.

13 MR. ZUPAN: They're done. Those things ran.
14 We don't need to do anymore air monitoring. I apologize.
15 I thought you were asking me a different question.

16 MR. SHENEMAN: What protocol --

17 THE COURT REPORTER: Excuse me. Could you
18 speak up?

19 MR. SILVAS: What protocol were they using to
20 run their tests? You just kind of went out there and
21 showed the exhibit things and said according to you as an
22 engineer, you've got some kind of a method or something
23 that you operated under. What was that?

24 Is it a (inaudible) register would be one type or
25 ASTM or something like that?

1 MR. ZUPAN: Right. It closely resembles a TOC
2 method nine from SDMZ (phonetic).

3 MR. SHENEMAN: You can't run a test closely.
4 It's got to be right on the money or it's no good.

5 MR. ZUPAN: Well, we were kind of doing some
6 hybrid knowledge on sampling. Again, we were trying to
7 see a worst case situation I guess to try to do a full --

8 MR. SHENEMAN: We've got to do the fruits and
9 nuts study the same way. The test method has got to be
10 very specific and according to a certain tester, you don't
11 just go out there and start making up things as we go.
12 You said closely because closely and approximately --

13 THE COURT REPORTER: Sir, can you speak up?
14 I'm having a hard time hearing you.

15 MR. SHENEMAN: Close to approximated something
16 nine, that's no good.

17 MR. ZUPAN: Well, I disagree with you just
18 because it's such a novel kind of installation that --

19 MR. SHENEMAN: You're an engineer. You've got
20 to -- you got to follow the method or else.

21 MR. ZUPAN: I tell you what, I did follow a
22 method that I thought would accurately capture
23 representative results of the site and I put my
24 engineering seal on it. So I feel like I'm standing by
25 the results of the work. I don't know that anybody has

1 written a method for how you do air monitoring for PRB
2 installation --

3 MR. SHENEMAN: Oh, you know better.

4 MR. ZUPAN: -- because it's kind of a new
5 thing.

6 MR. MARTINEZ: Thank you. We need to move on
7 to our next briefing.

8 This time I believe Ms. Landez is going to give
9 us an overview of the regulatory processes that are used
10 in conducting environmental cleanups. Ms. Landez.

11 MS. LANDEZ: Okay. I'm going to -- there
12 seems to be quite a few questions as to what process are
13 we using to clean up on Kelly Air Force Base so I'm going
14 to provide you a review of those processes that have
15 been -- have been used and are being used for cleanup.

16 And before Mr. Quintanilla raises his hand and
17 asks a question, can we go ahead to the next slide? We're
18 going to be talking about what CERCLA is and also the
19 Installation Restoration Program, what RCRA is and also
20 how we are doing it here at Kelly Air Force Base.

21 Okay. Now CERCLA, you've heard that term, it's
22 the Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and
23 Liability Act commonly known as Superfund and was enacted
24 by Congress in 1980. And it established quite a few
25 things to do and that were required by facilities and I'm

1 not going to read everything because I know you guys
2 are -- now how to read.

3 Then in 1986, there was an amendment or an act
4 that amended CERCLA. And at this point in time, one of
5 the things that it required Superfund action to do is to
6 consider the standards and requirements found in state and
7 other federal environmental laws and regulations. And
8 increase the state's involvement in every base of
9 Superfund.

10 So those are two points that really shine forth
11 in what was -- what was done in the Superfund SARA
12 amendments in 1986.

13 Next. Now at the same time -- as for some of you
14 who don't know, typically what happens when a federal, you
15 know, statute comes out like CERCLA and then again SARA,
16 what happens with the Department of Defense -- because
17 Department of Defense is also a federal agency, typically
18 what happens is the president signs an executive order or
19 something that says thou shalt -- you know, the federal
20 agencies are going to -- under the Department of Defense
21 are going to follow CERCLA and this is how we're going to
22 do cleanup.

23 And the Environmental Restoration Program, the
24 Department of Defense's program was the Installation
25 Restoration Program. And that's the cleanup program that

1 we started -- that Kelly Air Force Base started cleaning
2 up in 1982. So you keep hearing about CERCLA and RCRA and
3 we do -- have interfaced the two processes so I'm going to
4 show you the differences between each two.

5 Really it's more names than anything else. And
6 as Mark and Greg were mentioning earlier, this -- where
7 the community can or the public can participate and not
8 participate and where those come in, and it shows -- and
9 we've kind of taken it here at Kelly and interfaced that
10 and tried to do both so that in one regard we didn't lose
11 pace with what we were doing with the Installation
12 Restoration Program and the other to be able to meet the
13 RCRA requirements that were issued to us with the permit
14 in 1998.

15 So this is the process, the CERCLA/IRP process,
16 that we originally started using where we conducted
17 Preliminary Assessments and Site Investigations, or PASIs,
18 basically looking at doing record searches, conducting
19 remedial investigations and feasibility studies.

20 So if you go to our library, in the
21 administrative records, you'll see this nomenclature on
22 the documents. And we also have proposed plans where if
23 we want to do an interim action (inaudible) report
24 remedies were selected, then we would put out a proposed
25 plan or a feasibility study or if an alternative was

1 selected, we would put out a proposed plan that was
2 presented to the community and there was opportunity for
3 public comment by that community and then in that regard
4 we would do a decision -- decision document.

5 Now a record of this decision is done by NPL
6 sites. We do not do records of decisions here at Kelly
7 Air Force Base because we are not an NPL site. We do
8 decision documents and there are decision documents in the
9 administrative record.

10 Then we go next to the next phase, it's the
11 remedial design. And basically it's just the design of
12 what the remedy is going to be and then we actually
13 implement the remedial action phase. And then from there,
14 we go to operations and then monitoring that operation and
15 also at an NPL site we may go through an operating
16 properly, successfully determination and we also do that
17 for property transfer when there are remedies that have
18 long-term corrective actions that can on-go for a long
19 time.

20 We have to show the EPA that the operation is
21 operating properly and successfully so that we can go
22 ahead and transfer the property. And then once we're able
23 to meet our remedial action goals, we do site closures.

24 Now RCRA is the Resource Conservation and
25 Recovery Act. And it shows you how to pronounce it. And

1 basically it's an EPA program that was put out for active
2 facilities. So they wanted to track from cradle to grave
3 when you first started using or generating waste and
4 tracking it in transportation to a disposal facility where
5 things were being stored and where things basically ended
6 up, the grave. And it also set up frameworks for managing
7 hazardous water.

8 And this is how Kelly Air Force Base was managing
9 waste in beginning in the early '80s when the state rules
10 came out for waste management and we've been doing that
11 ever since.

12 And so basically, as I said, it focuses on active
13 facilities, which Kelly was before closure, and so that's
14 one of the other reasons that we have been doing not only
15 our active compliance when the base was open under RCRA
16 but also now our corrective actions being done.

17 So we don't use -- we aren't -- Kelly wasn't,
18 isn't, an abandoned site.

19 Next. This is the RCRA process. And basically
20 it's the same process as you saw before. You have the
21 assessment, which is similar to the PASI, the RFI, the
22 RS -- RAC. A Corrective Measure Study is the same as
23 feasibility study for the most part.

24 Now one of the things that I know that we've done
25 differently or we've had to do differently because of RCRA

1 is we have to go out and determine what the -- determine
2 the contamination out to background, which when we were
3 working under the Installation Restoration Program, it
4 wasn't required of us. We were going only to clean up
5 where say the MCL five were a volatile organic, that's
6 where we would stop our investigation.

7 So things are -- for many things that we had
8 originally started under the IRP process are a little bit
9 different for the base and how we can move forward under
10 the RCRA process.

11 Now the Corrective Measure Implementation
12 Workplan is the -- as Mark was stating earlier where the
13 permittee is directed by the state to do the public
14 comment period in the meeting and as we had one in January
15 for the zone 4 and 5, we are in a public comment phase at
16 this point in time.

17 Now the next. We go in and we implement that
18 remedy. We do the remedial action basically, complete.
19 We install the remedy at that point and then we go into
20 operations and long-term monitoring and eventually get to
21 site closure.

22 Now Kelly, for many reasons, as I said earlier,
23 we initiated the process of the Installation Restoration
24 Program in 1982. As part of an agreed order, the state
25 required us to submit closure plans for four sites on the

1 base.

2 And because of that, and the fact that we had
3 submitted part A permit application in the past, we were
4 required to submit those -- the application for the four
5 sites and then also an application for the compliance plan
6 and then in 1998 we were issued the Permit and Compliance
7 Plan that we're currently now operating under. It's
8 basically the bible on my desk that tells me how I need to
9 do my -- my Corrective Action Program.

10 And in regard to how we do community involvement
11 here at Kelly, we use both processes both at the -- for
12 the CERCLA stage, we do come out for the Corrective
13 Measure Study, which you -- as you noted on the
14 previous -- well, you can go to the next one.

15 This is kind of the -- the full thing that Kelly
16 does. We do the RFA, go do the investigation, do the
17 CMS. And at the CMS stage, which is not required by the
18 state, we put out a proposed plan, we have a public
19 meeting, we ask for comments to be submitted to us and
20 then we issue a decision document that has a
21 responsiveness summary in that decision document. That is
22 not required by the state under RCRA, but we do it for the
23 CERCLA process because that's the way the Air Force -- we
24 decided to do it as part of the Air Force.

25 Then we continue on and we do the CMI Workplan

1 and as part of the class 3 modification compliance plan
2 review at other public meetings and a comment period and
3 as Mr. Weegar said, that's your opportunity to request for
4 a contested case hearing if you're either an adjacent land
5 owner to the facility or an effected party to the facility
6 and all those names and properties are identified in the
7 modification that we submit to the state.

8 And again, we move forward to doing the
9 corrective action and operations and monitoring which is
10 in our Semiannual Compliance Plan Report that we submit to
11 state twice a year. And also we're doing property
12 transfers so we're required to do operating properly and
13 successfully determination reports when we get to final
14 remedy and then we can show the EPA that the remedy is
15 working and we can go ahead and transfer the property for
16 the most part to the port authority and then one day when
17 we meet our corrective action goals, we will have site
18 closure.

19 So that's basically the way Kelly is running the
20 process. So it is a combination of both CERCLA and RCRA.

21 MS. GALVAN: I have a question for you. On
22 that section that says focus feasibility study, speeds up
23 process to ensure protection of human health and the
24 environment. Where --

25 MS. LANDEZ: Focus feasibility -- I'm sorry.

1 MS. GALVAN: Go ahead.

2 MS. LANDEZ: Focus feasibility studies are
3 small, short studies that are -- it's basically a
4 Corrective Measure Study that's done on one area or one
5 site. Like we did one for site S-1 where we put a focus
6 feasibility study to determine the best way to do the
7 interim action, go ahead and remove the soils and put in a
8 soil venting system.

9 And so we did a focus feasibility study, put out
10 a proposed plan, had a public meeting and public comment
11 period and then we made the decision to move forward
12 with -- with your action. And so that gets into the
13 interim remedial action. It's basically an action that's
14 done before final remedy is set.

15 Now we have proposed in class 3 modifications for
16 the zones 4 and 5 that site S-1, the interim action that
17 we did for that site, site S-1, is now to be the final
18 remedy for that site. And so that's -- you know, it's one
19 of the -- it's a gamble that we -- the Air Force is taking
20 to put money and expense money up front before it
21 really -- the remedy has been selected as a final remedy
22 by the state and has been approved.

23 MS. GALVAN: I'm still a little confused.
24 You're saying you're putting money on something that
25 hasn't been proven to show --

1 MS. LANDEZ: No, no.

2 MS. GALVAN: -- that it's going to help.

3 MS. LANDEZ: I didn't say that. I said that
4 we are -- the Air Force takes a gamble and does a focus
5 study, determines what we think would be a good thing to
6 remedy a situation and we go out and we tell the public
7 what we're going to do and if we don't get any adverse
8 comments, then we go ahead and make the decision to do
9 it. We try to get money to do that action and it's not
10 something that we ask the state to say yea or nay to until
11 later on in the process.

12 MS. GALVAN: And remedy, what's -- what do you
13 mean by remedy, the protection of human health. How do
14 you -- what do you remedy.

15 MS. LANDEZ: Well, we're doing whatever
16 actions. Like for site S-1, we did a soil removal and
17 then we -- because we felt that we -- the sooner we remove
18 that soil, the sooner that the groundwater would stop --
19 it would stop -- the contamination would stop leeching
20 into the groundwater and out into the community.

21 And so we removed the soil, we put in a soil
22 venting system to get rid of any residual that was there
23 and we also put a pump and treat system to be able to pump
24 any contaminants that were in the groundwater. Okay?

25 MS. GALVAN: Okay.

1 MR. MARTINEZ: Any other questions?

2 MR. SILVAS: Yes. Robert Silvas.

3 How many focus feasibility studies were done in
4 the community?

5 MS. LANDEZ: What do you mean how many were
6 done in the community?

7 MR. SILVAS: Were there any done at all
8 besides on the base?

9 MS. LANDEZ: I think most of the -- if I'm not
10 mistaken, most of the focus feasibility were done for
11 sites that we felt we needed to attend to immediately so
12 that we could stop contamination from moving out into
13 the -- into the neighborhood.

14 MR. SILVAS: Okay.

15 MS. LANDEZ: And basically that's what we did.

16 MR. SILVAS: So safe to say none were done out
17 in the community.

18 MS. LANDEZ: At this point, I don't think we
19 did. I mean we had -- for the most part, most of our --
20 at this point in time, every remedy that we installed
21 either on site and off site except for site S-8, site S-4
22 and site E-3 are all interim remedies that we have
23 installed with -- you know, because the state has not
24 approved our class 3 modification yet, all of those
25 remedies have been installed but we don't have approval as

1 final remedies.

2 MR. SILVAS: And again, those are all --

3 MS. LANDEZ: At this point.

4 MR. SILVAS: Those are all on base.

5 MS. LANDEZ: No. I said on site and off
6 site. So all the PRBs that are installed off site, all of
7 those PRBs at this point in time do not have the state's
8 signature that those are the final remedies for the
9 state. I mean for the -- for the facility. So only three
10 sites do we have final remedy. As I said, S-8, S-4 and
11 E-3.

12 MR. MARTINEZ: Mr. Garcia had a question.

13 MR. GARCIA: Rodrigo Garcia. You say the
14 community involvement is driven by both processes.

15 MS. LANDEZ: Yes.

16 MR. GARCIA: Where is the community
17 involvement? You can't even advertise our meeting. How
18 many people here are community members? None. Not one
19 single one. That means you're not doing your job in
20 advertising our meetings so we can have people here.
21 Putting the ad in the newspaper is not good enough.

22 Second, you said -- talk about these public
23 meetings and public input. Where and when have all these
24 public meetings been held and how do we advertise them? I
25 needed to know how you do that process. I need a list of

1 all these public meetings and when they're going to be
2 held in the future and what are the results of past public
3 meetings.

4 I need to know why your public involvement and
5 community involvement does not exist and you can tell that
6 you don't advertise these meetings properly because
7 there's nobody here from the community. We should have a
8 full audience like the collaborative did. But the
9 collaborative went around and did some very, very heavy
10 advertising and did some very heavy community outreach to
11 grab the citizens and invite them to come to these
12 meetings and that's one thing that you don't do.

13 MS. LANDEZ: Now the public meetings that I've
14 been talking about are the public meetings that we hold
15 specifically for either the Corrective Measure Study or
16 the class 3 modification. It doesn't -- I mean we may
17 talk about it at the RAB.

18 We'll come in and tell you that we're going to
19 have a public meeting and in many instances we've already
20 briefed -- we briefed that document at the technical
21 review subcommittee meetings, but the public meetings are
22 the meetings we hold specifically for those -- for those
23 documents and for that -- that purpose because either the
24 Air Force is doing it for the Corrective Measure Study or
25 the state is requiring us to do it within a certain period

1 of time and we hold the meetings at a separate time from
2 the RAB so -- you know, and we send out the
3 advertisements -- the state sends out advertisements on
4 that public meeting on the public notices that we put out
5 in the paper to all of the -- the folks that are
6 identified in the class 3 modification.

7 There's -- as I said, there's a listing of
8 adjacent owners and also of effected parties and we do
9 send them out to the RAB. The last meeting we had was in
10 January for the zones 4 and 5 class 3 modifications.

11 MR. GARCIA: You put out this and you put out
12 that. You're sending invitations to selected people, not
13 to the whole public.

14 MR. WEEGAR: No. The -- the public meetings
15 that are held as part of the state's RCRA permitting
16 process, we provide the Air Force with specific language
17 and they're required to post it in the San Antonio Express
18 News. That's where it's required to be posted. It lists
19 where the documents can be found to be reviewed and things
20 that -- what the length of time is for the comment period
21 and who to send the comments to. They're also required to
22 have a public meeting.

23 But that is not -- that is specific to that
24 particular current modification and it is -- it is
25 separate and apart from anything else that Kelly is doing

1 as far as Restoration Advisory Board or anything else. It
2 is specific to that one thing and it's dictated by the
3 TCEQ. And they are public noticed in the newspaper but
4 every adjacent land owner is -- there is a list of I don't
5 know how many people, but they are also provided that
6 notice as a requirement of the rules.

7 So you may call it a selective group of people,
8 but it is what the statute requires them to send these
9 notices specifically to, in addition to what is posted in
10 the newspaper. That's what -- that's state law. They're
11 hot -- it's not some policy or process that they're making
12 up. They're following to the letter the state law.

13 MR. MARTINEZ: Any questions?

14 MS. LANDEZ: In the next briefing that we're
15 going to come up, we're not only going to show you the
16 status of where we are on site, but also the public
17 involvement that has been done for each one of those. Not
18 each one, but for the major sites what public involvement
19 has been done.

20 MR. MARTINEZ: Thank you, Ms. Landez.

21 All right. At this time we're going to have Mr.
22 Don Buelter and Ms. Sonja Coderre give you a briefing on
23 the status of the Environmental Cleanup Program for zones
24 2 through 5.

25 MS. CODERRE: All right. Okay. Well, good

1 evening, everyone. Mr. Buelter and I would like to take a
2 little bit of time to give you some up update information
3 on all of the -- well, a bunch of our sites as Eddie just
4 told you for the former Kelly Air Force Base.

5 So tonight we're going to talk about the update
6 on the sites. We're going to go through some detailed
7 information on some specific sites that have gained -- you
8 know, that folks ask questions about frequently.

9 You're only going to see a portion of the sites.
10 We have 687 sites and those are outlined on all those
11 posters. Adam talked about them earlier today. To go
12 through that would be really, really trying on the back
13 side I think so we're picking out the big ones and
14 discussing those in some detail and then we're going to go
15 through the future of the cleanup program here at Kelly.

16 MR. BUELTER: This kind of summarizes what's
17 on the charts in the back and this is showing the status
18 of the 687 sites and I'll explain a little bit what these
19 categories mean. Closed basically means that site has
20 been determined, submitted reports to the state, they've
21 approved closure. There is no human health problems left
22 at those sites nor is there any source material left that
23 may impact groundwater in the future. So those are sites
24 that are closed, all the paperwork is in.

25 The pending are sites that have been approved by

1 the TCEQ. The last step in our process is to actually do
2 a deed notice and these sites are in various stages of
3 that. Some of them we submitted the notice, others we're
4 still putting those together.

5 In progress are basically sites that are in the
6 closure reports that we've submitted to the state and
7 they're at various parts of review. Some like the EPCF
8 RFI, we've received comments back from the state. We
9 resubmitted that report and there are like 40, 50 units in
10 that one report. So those are actually reports that we
11 have submitted and we're either waiting comments or we've
12 received comments and we resubmitted those reports.

13 Further action required basically covers two
14 different types of sites. First -- it's split about half
15 and half of these are sites where we are in the process of
16 writing the closure documentation to submit to the state.

17 The other half, about 32 of those, are units that
18 are really involved in the longer term cleanups. They
19 include the IRP sites and some solid waste management
20 units that -- like at building 301, there were some sumps
21 that collected plating solutions. Those sumps, there are
22 eight of those, I think six or eight, are part of these
23 units and they're going to be part of the long-term, but
24 we can't close those sites until the groundwater has been
25 closed.

1 And there are a few sites, about 15 of these,
2 that are still under Air Force use. Some of them we're
3 using in part of our groundwater treatment plant. Others
4 they're still on the former Kelly, some Air Force
5 activity -- Air Force units still occupying buildings
6 there. And some of them have (inaudible) and oil water
7 separators so they're included in that.

8 This is -- I won't go through all these. You
9 have the chart in your packets. This is kind of how we
10 break out the different types of sites. Most of them are
11 self-explanatory.

12 The locations of concern and other compliance
13 sites are sites that really didn't fit these other
14 categories and they were -- when Kelly was put on the
15 closure list, we did a environmental base line survey
16 where we had to identify all the environmental units
17 across the base and that's really where a lot of those
18 were picked up. And it lists these out per -- and you can
19 see the highest number of sites at 687 are petroleum
20 storage tanks and 214 of those have been closed.

21 So again, we've -- of that, the number we
22 received the letter from Mark late so the total down at
23 the bottom is really 475 closed if you add that column
24 up.

25 MS. CODERRE: All right. So now we're going

1 to go through the Kelly environmental sites a zone at a
2 time. Zones at Kelly -- and we've got some maps over here
3 next to Don. The top map shows zone two. The bottom map
4 he's got there shows zone 3 so we've got different maps
5 and thank you for getting them here.

6 Zone 5 is the large blue zone. Zone 4 we refer
7 to as East Kelly. Zone 1 was realigned to Lackland. You
8 know, at some bases what we refer to as zones are called
9 operable units. So really it's just geographical grouping
10 and what we're going to talk about are the sites within
11 those different zones. If you'll notice however, zone 1
12 and the flight line portion of Zone 5 has been realigned
13 to Lackland Air Force Base.

14 So questions that you might have about the
15 environmental progress for zone 1, the information here on
16 the slide gives you some information about how to contact
17 the public affairs officer over at Lackland. And as a
18 matter of fact they have that the Restoration Advisory
19 Board, which at Lackland is called the Community Council
20 on Restoration, is going to be held a little later this
21 month at July 26th -- on July 26. So that information is
22 in your packet in the printout we've got for you.

23 MR. BUELTER: Okay. We're going to start
24 looking at -- primarily focusing on IRP sites. They are
25 kind of the larger of our sites so we'll start in zone 2

1 which mentioned is down south of Military Drive. Engine
2 test cells, the industrial waste water treatment plant is
3 housed in that area.

4 The first site we're going to look at is site
5 S-9. And here again, just the Southwest Military Drive is
6 here, at the top. Site S-9 is in this corner here. The
7 jet engine test cells were located in that area. So you
8 have this facility there. There were some actually two
9 different tank units there, one that we closed early in
10 the '90s and one that was part of the closure that we just
11 submitted and had approved.

12 So there were some fuel systems there. And
13 there's also some pre -- some test cells being built, some
14 sludge spreading was done in that area. What we did at
15 that site to meet closure, there were probably removed --
16 I can't remember, about 500 yards of soil. It was very
17 limited. Surface soil that exceeded human health criteria
18 so we removed that soil.

19 We submitted for TCEQ, gave approval, closed the
20 soil and groundwater under Risk Reduction Standard 2, and
21 what -- kind of officially closed the site with approval
22 of the Ecological Risk Assessment in November. We
23 submitted deed certification for the site in April. The
24 letter Adam talked about was the approval of the deed
25 notice and we received that in fact yesterday. So this

1 site is moved from the pending into the closure.

2 MS. CODERRE: Community involvement for site
3 S-9 dates back to July 19, '95 when we held public
4 meetings, comment periods, posted public notices about the
5 feasibility studies and the proposed plans. Community
6 involvement continued through 1997 with the public
7 involvement in the proposed plans for the soil clean up
8 and in December of 2005, the notice of proposed corrective
9 measures was published for public notice and public
10 comment.

11 MR. QUINTANILLA: Excuse me. Just one
12 second. Right here and I won't ask it again. Where was
13 this public meeting held?

14 MS. CODERRE: I don't have the location.

15 MR. BUELTER: It was in this building.

16 MR. QUINTANILLA: In this building.

17 MR. BUELTER: Yeah. It was like in December
18 of that year.

19 MR. QUINTANILLA: In this building?

20 MR. BUELTER: In December of last year.

21 MS. CODERRE: Mr. Garcia.

22 MR. GARCIA: You talk about pending closure of
23 the jet facility. How much pollution did it -- this jet
24 fuel dump into Leon Creek and has that been taken care
25 of?

1 MR. BUELTER: Yes. At that site there is no
2 groundwater --

3 MR. GARCIA: They're no --

4 MR. BUELTER: -- contaminants.

5 MR. GARCIA: -- longer dumping pollutants into
6 Leon Creek?

7 MR. BUELTER: Based on the sampling that we
8 took at that site, it never did pollute Leon Creek.

9 MR. GARCIA: How about the cleanup plan you
10 have there?

11 MR. BUELTER: It's -- we're finished with the
12 cleanup. The site has been closed.

13 MR. GARCIA: You shut down that plant
14 already?

15 MR. BUELTER: The site S-9 as a unit is
16 closed. It's not a plant that --

17 MR. GARCIA: The one we took a tour of.

18 MR. BUELTER: That's the groundwater treatment
19 plant. That's still operational. There's no groundwater
20 contamination there.

21 MR. GARCIA: Under -- under the test cells,
22 they didn't spill any jet fuel and do groundwater
23 contamination from jet fuels spilling out of that -- that
24 jet fuel test facility.

25 MR. BUELTER: Their initial closure was in

1 1990. There was some contaminated soil that was dug up
2 with the tanks. There was no residual --

3 MR. GARCIA: It didn't get into the ground
4 water and pollute way down? The only --

5 MR. BUELTER: Initially there was a little bit
6 of an overhang. The natural attenuation of fuel once you
7 remove the source happens very rapidly. And by the time
8 we submitted closure for the sites, groundwater was below
9 the risk levels for jet fuel.

10 Next site is site FC-2. It's located a little
11 bit south of site S-9. There was a fire training area and
12 the soil there was contaminated with fuel like
13 components. They would actually spray fuel and burn the
14 fuel and practice fire training. That was the practice.

15 We used bioventing at this site, basically adding
16 oxygen to the soil to help the microbes. It was initially
17 put in in 1992, expanded after we saw it was working.
18 Basically triple the size in 1996. We went back out and
19 did more sampling in 2001, 2003. We submitted closure,
20 met the Risk Standard 2. Again, this is one of the sites
21 where we just received approval or the deed certification
22 for and this site is now an official closure.

23 MS. CODERRE: Community involvement for site
24 FC-2 mirrors the same community involvement that took
25 place for S-9 since they were both part of the zone 2

1 groundwater cleanup.

2 MR. QUINTANILLA: Just one question here. The
3 soil cleanup, what kind of cleanup did you there.

4 Bioventing or --

5 MR. BUELTER: Yes.

6 MR. QUINTANILLA: Was it bioventing?

7 MR. BUELTER: Yes.

8 MR. QUINTANILLA: It wasn't removed?

9 MR. BUELTER: No.

10 MR. QUINTANILLA: Okay.

11 MR. BUELTER: Okay. The next site is --

12 MR. SHENEMAN: I had --

13 MR. BUELTER: Oh, I'm sorry.

14 MR. SHENEMAN: One question. Let's talk about
15 what do you mean by bioventing.

16 MR. BUELTER: Bioventing is -- basically it's
17 you take a blower and you blow just ambient air into the
18 ground. It supplies oxygen to the microbes. It works
19 very well for fuel contaminated sites like FC-2. So it's
20 just a means of getting oxygen down for the microbes to
21 break down that organic material.

22 MR. QUINTANILLA: How far deep into the ground
23 do they blow the air into?

24 MR. BUELTER: Very shallow. It's probably 10,
25 15 feet max. Pretty much from the surface.

1 MR. QUINTANILLA: You can blow air into the
2 ground, but you can't reinject water into the ground; is
3 that correct.

4 MR. BUELTER: It's easier to do the air than
5 it is the water.

6 Next site is the original wastewater treatment
7 plant at Kelly was down here in this southern part of zone
8 2, kind of south of where the groundwater treatment plant
9 currently is. It began as -- back when the base opened,
10 actually there was a sewage treatment plant there. It
11 converted to industrial in 1970. In 1985 when the new
12 wastewater treatment plant came on-line, that one ceased
13 operation.

14 Again in 1996, we started to remove the concrete
15 components of those units that were down there. There was
16 some rather large concrete tanks and some batch treatment
17 units. We submitted closure for this site. It was
18 approved and we submitted deed certification and this is
19 also one that was just approved as part of that same
20 approval.

21 MR. GARCIA: For any of this work, did you do
22 any air sampling or air monitoring or air grabbing to see
23 what kind of pollutants they put into the air?

24 MR. BUELTER: This plant was operational -- it
25 stopped operation in 1985 so there were --

1 MR. GARCIA: How about everything else? The
2 jet fuel facilities, did you test the air in that to see
3 how long they had been polluting the air by doing air
4 monitoring sampling, air grabbing, air monitoring? Did
5 you put any air monitoring afterwards to see the
6 residual --

7 MR. BUELTER: Well, we're required -- our
8 permit requires us to basically look at soil and
9 groundwater contamination. We did not look at historic
10 operations as part of the Air Force IRP process.

11 MR. GARCIA: So you didn't care to do air
12 monitoring. If you kill the people around there, that's
13 fine.

14 MR. BUELTER: The base may have and there
15 were -- I mean the base was operational, there were Clean
16 Air Act provisions. That was not done by the Installation
17 Restoration Program portion of the environmental
18 management at Kelly Air Force Base. The air program was
19 separate.

20 MR. GARCIA: Did you comply with any of the
21 programs under air restoration to make sure that the air
22 was close to the original conditions for all the dirty air
23 and all the air damage they did when they had all this
24 stuff running?

25 MR. BUELTER: There were various permits that

1 were required for active operations to meet. And as with
2 any permit, there is allowable ranges of contaminant
3 that's allowed to be released and so the Air Force
4 monitored those.

5 MR. MARTINEZ: Ladies and gentlemen, can we
6 hold our questions until the end so we can move on? Just
7 write them down, jot them down and then we'll get to them
8 at the end or in the question and answer period. Please.
9 Thank you.

10 MS. CODERRE: Community involvement for the
11 former IWTP also began in 1995 with a feasibility study
12 and proposed plans for zone 2 groundwater cleanup and that
13 community involvement continued with public notices and
14 public comment period in September of 2002 for the
15 proposed corrective measures and then also through
16 December 2005 with a notice of proposed corrective
17 measures where public notice was posted and a public
18 comment period was held.

19 MR. BUELTER: Site CS-2, there is a area south
20 of Leon Creek. It's -- the history of looking at this
21 site, really from what I had seen from this work, photos,
22 it's more of a drum storage area more so than anything
23 else. May have been used as maybe a landfill, but I don't
24 think we ever really found that. We put a lot of soil
25 borings in that area. There was a small fire control

1 training area there and there was some history of I don't
2 know what kind of engine testing that was done over there,
3 but there was probably some.

4 As part of the overall groundwater in zone 2,
5 there was a groundwater recovery system installed in the
6 fall of 1993. We basically went back in and
7 re-established -- we did -- it's on the north site of Leon
8 Creek. We put in some new recovery wells.

9 In 2004, the PRB ancillary wall, not just slurry
10 walls, was installed basically to capture the groundwater
11 that was coming this way. We submitted a closure report
12 for the soils and I think we finalized the report in
13 October of 2004.

14 And again, this is one of the sites that was in
15 the -- that we submitted to the state.

16 MS. CODERRE: Community involvement for site
17 CS-2 mirrors the same community involvement activities
18 that were conducted for site FC-2 and site S-9.

19 MR. BUELTER: Site E-1 is -- was down in the
20 very southern -- near the southern tip of the base.
21 Basically it was a series of evaporation pits that
22 supported metal plating operations in the former building
23 545.

24 And this is one where there is groundwater
25 contamination and this is the process that we followed in

1 our program. There was a groundwater recovery system
2 installed in 1993.

3 At all these sites, the first thing that we did
4 was put in groundwater containment systems. In this case,
5 it keeps the groundwater from impacting Leon Creek. We
6 updated that barrier in 2004 and basically replaced that
7 recovery system with a new one. We just recently removed
8 just over 15,000 cubic yards of contaminated soil,
9 back-filled with clean soil so we also put some organic
10 substrate down in the residual groundwater to make sure
11 the bioremediation would continue.

12 So as you'll see, -- and this will be the
13 pattern. We put in containment groundwater systems. We
14 have systems in place or will be in place to address the
15 source soils behind that containment system for all these
16 sites.

17 The corrected measure study was approved in May
18 of this year by what's determined in our compliance plan.
19 We have -- in November we have to submit the CMI Workplan
20 for this site.

21 MS. CODERRE: Community involvement activity
22 for site E-1 dates back to July of 1995 with a feasibility
23 study in the proposed plans for zone 2 groundwater
24 cleanup. Continued through August 1997 with proposed
25 plans for zone 2 soil cleanup. Public notices, a public

1 comment period was held and public meetings were held.
2 And then in February 2002, with the proposed interim
3 cleanup for soil and groundwater at site E-1. And then
4 last in July of 2004, a public comment period was held and
5 public notice was published and a public meeting was held
6 for the final proposed plans for zones 2 and 3 soil and
7 groundwater.

8 MR. BUELTER: Site E-3 is located back over
9 here adjacent to -- for those who have been to the
10 groundwater treatment plan, site E-3 is next to that. It
11 was a chemical evaporation pit that is basically a place
12 for waste oils to be stored, kind of in conjunction with
13 the former IWTP.

14 Quite a bit has been done at this site.
15 Initially when the pit was closed, soil and sludge was
16 excavated. That was back in 1985. Groundwater recovery
17 system was put in place in 1993. We put in more efficient
18 wells in 2000. Along with that, installed some soil vapor
19 extraction systems that's been operating since 2000.

20 This is one of -- one of the four RCRA regulated
21 units that Norma had mentioned that we have on the base.
22 And so with the -- when we had the compliance plan issued
23 in June of 1998, this groundwater recovery system we had
24 in place became the final action. And again, groundwater
25 recovery to put in containment first and then we followed

1 up with soil remedies to take care of the source.

2 MS. CODERRE: For site E-3 our community
3 involvement dates back to March of 1993 with focus
4 feasibility study final report for groundwater
5 contamination and the decision document for IRP E-3, site
6 E-3, and continued through July 1995 and then again in
7 August 1997 and in November of 1998, we had a public
8 notice or public comment meeting, a public comment period
9 and held a public meeting regarding the notice of partial
10 facility closure.

11 MR. BUELTER: Site SD-2 is located south of
12 site E-3. It was a sludge drying bed for the wastewater
13 treatment plant. Operated up until 1984 when a sludge
14 processing plant was put on the site, dewatering
15 facility.

16 At that site, we removed the sludge dewatering
17 facility in 2002 as part of the IPF removal. Submitted
18 closure report. There were a little bit of soil that was
19 taken out with those units through the state. And again,
20 this is one that was just -- the deed notice we just
21 received approval of yesterday.

22 MS. CODERRE: For site SD-2, community
23 involvement dates back to July of 1995 and then through
24 December 2005 where we held a public comment period and
25 put public notice out for notice of proposed corrective

1 measures.

2 MR. BUELTER: Site OT-1 adjacent to the former
3 IWTP. It was a liquid waste incinerator operated in
4 the -- kind of the early mid '80s. It was demolished over
5 a number of years from 1986 to 1990. Once that was
6 demolished, we've done several soil investigations. This
7 site was approved for closure under Risk Standard 2 in
8 October 2003.

9 Because of its location, and eco risk as well, we
10 didn't submit deed notice for this site until we received
11 approval for the other sites that were adjacent to it and
12 we submitted approval for that deed notice yesterday.

13 MS. CODERRE: Community involvement for site
14 OT-1 dates back to 1995 similar to site S-9 and through
15 August 1997. And last in February of 2004 when a notice
16 of proposed corrective measures was published and a public
17 comment period was held.

18 MR. BUELTER: Site D-10 is located in the very
19 southern part of the facility. Really what this site was
20 was a -- there was a refinery that had spread some waste
21 soil and sludge across various portions, some of it
22 happened to be put on the Kelly property.

23 We did the investigations. In getting this late
24 2002 through 2005, we were removing soil and closing of
25 appropriate facilities. We're in the process of now --

1 and as an internal draft of our closure reports that we're
2 finalizing and probably within the month we'll be
3 submitting that to State of Texas for Risk Standard 2
4 closure.

5 MS. CODERRE: Community involvement for site
6 D-10 started in July of 1995, like site S-9 did, and
7 continued through August 1997 with the proposed plans for
8 zone 2 soil cleanup. We held a public comment period and
9 public meeting and published notice.

10 MR. BUELTER: Building 522, located basically
11 in this area here. And this is one of our long-term
12 actions solid waste management unit sites. That's not an
13 IRP site. Soil contamination of TCE, trichlorethylene.
14 We installed a soil vapor extraction system to remove
15 contaminated soil from the -- the contaminant from the
16 soil at that site.

17 Also, the downgrading initially recovery wells
18 along the -- along the north bank collected groundwater
19 contamination from the site, PRBs doing that now. Between
20 the SDE and some enhanced bioremediation at this site,
21 that's what we selected for the Corrective Measure Study
22 that was approved by the TCEQ on 15 May.

23 Again, this is one site that would be part of the
24 CMI Workplan which will be submitted for approval later
25 this year.

1 MS. CODERRE: Community involvement for the
2 north bank area where building 522 is located, in June
3 2004 published a public notice and held a public comment
4 period in a public meeting for the proposed plan for final
5 cleanup of soil and groundwater for zones 2 and 3.

6 MR. BUELTER: Zone 2 groundwater, really there
7 are a couple of areas in the CMS, site E-1, building 522.
8 We talked about. In a larger plume coming across from the
9 industrial area that worked its way into zone 2. We
10 looked at groundwater remedies in the CMS which were
11 approved in May and a CMI Workplan that was submitted in
12 November.

13 MS. CODERRE: Community involvement for
14 groundwater dates back to July of 1995 with the
15 feasibility studies and proposed plans for zone 2
16 groundwater cleanup and runs through June 2004 with the
17 public notices, the public comment period which was held
18 and the public meeting which was held to discuss the
19 proposed plans for final cleanup of soil and groundwater,
20 zones 2 and 3.

21 MR. BUELTER: Moving to zone 3 and you'll see
22 less sites, which is good. Most of our sites are down in
23 zone 2. Zone 3 is really the industrial area of the
24 former base so basically where the engine work was being
25 done and the airframe work, this is kind of this area that

1 we'll be looking at.

2 The first site we're going to look at, site S-4,
3 which is down in this area here. For those of you
4 familiar with the base, this is Berman Road. Here is the
5 UPRR yard, building 361, 365, adjacent. Groundwater
6 recovery system was installed at this site in 1989.
7 Actually included wells that extended over to Quintana
8 Road. We optimized, putting in better wells in 1999.
9 Groundwater recovery trenches were installed along
10 Quintana Road down in this area here, Quintana Road, to
11 collect groundwater contamination.

12 The soils in this -- of this site were really
13 petroleum contaminated soils. They were closed under Risk
14 Standard 2 in August of 2000. The groundwater
15 contamination in the site S-4 is really from upgrading the
16 sources, probably building 301. And the CMI Workplan and
17 class 3 modifications of the compliance plan was removed
18 in September of 2004.

19 MS. CODERRE: Community involvement for site
20 S-4 goes back to August 1997 with a proposed plan for zone
21 3 soil OU-1. Continued through September of 1999 with
22 public comment notices and meetings for the Corrective
23 Measure Study for contaminated groundwater associated with
24 site S-4 through June 2002, February 2003 and in July of
25 2005, a public comment period was held. Public notice was

1 published and public meeting was held for the class 2
2 compliance plan modification.

3 MR. BUELTER: Site MP is located up in this
4 area of the base. Here's a major road, Tinker Drive by
5 Kelly. Was a metal plating shop, building 258, 259, and
6 that -- those buildings were demolished in 1981. What
7 we've done at that site, 1996, some groundwater recovery
8 wells were installed, downgrading of the site again.

9 Again, we optimized those in 1999, put in better
10 recovery wells. The slurry walls installed around the
11 site contained -- there was three phase tetrachlorethane
12 at the site so we wanted to make sure we contained that
13 while we continued on with our process.

14 The Corrective Measure Study, again, was approved
15 15 May of this year. CMI Workplan we submitted in
16 November 2006. And as part of that CMS, the final
17 corrective action for this site will actually be the
18 excavation and proper disposal of the soil contamination
19 and we'll also dig down to recover the DNAPL that's at
20 that site.

21 MR. SHENEMAN: Don, that's the question Ms.
22 Galvan keeps bringing up about organics versus
23 inorganics. Your PCB is going to take the VOCs out. I
24 can buy that. But she keeps bringing up over the years
25 the inorganics. You've got a metal plating shop that

1 happens to involve things like the heavy metals.

2 MR. QUINTANILLA: Arsenic.

3 MR. SHENEMAN: Arsenic. Thank you, chemist.
4 Chromium, and other things. They're not soluble to the
5 best of my knowledge and belief, but they can migrate,
6 just in physical action. She keeps bringing that up and
7 we keep dodging it.

8 MR. BUELTER: Well, at this site we've
9 evaluated both organic and inorganic compounds with the
10 soil and groundwater. The only constituents found
11 basically above cleanup levels in both the soil and the
12 groundwater at this site are the chlorinated solvents.
13 There's very little chrome or nickel or any of those
14 plating type aspects in the groundwater of the site.
15 There was really none there.

16 So all I can do -- same saying with the other
17 plating shops is one that said the metals aren't that
18 mobile and, too, I think it just shows that in certain
19 cases, the plating solutions were cared for a little bit
20 better than some of the degreasers as far as how they
21 handled the chemical, that -- and I don't know why. But
22 they were probably really watched how they used those
23 plating solutions probably because they cost so much more
24 and they really looked after their cleaning solutions or
25 solvents, which is really quite a shame at this point

1 because we wouldn't have to be doing all this.

2 MS. CODERRE: But just to clarify, and this
3 was an issue that came up or a discussion point that came
4 up during the Kelly Area Collaboration, the final remedy
5 for site MP is not containment. It's removal.

6 MR. BUELTER: Correct.

7 MS. CODERRE: So community involvement at site
8 MP dates back to 1994 in April where we made public notice
9 and opened a public comment period for the focus
10 feasibility study final report for groundwater
11 contamination and the decision documents for IRP sites S-4
12 and MP.

13 Our community involvement continued through march
14 of 1998 and June of 2002 and last in July of 2004, we
15 published a public -- public notices, opened a public
16 comment period and held a public meeting for the final
17 proposed plan, zones 2 and 3 soil and groundwater.

18 MR. BUELTER: Next site is the Industrial
19 Wastewater Collection System, IWCS. And this is
20 collecting the industrial wastewater from the various
21 facilities, they converted storm water pipes, sanitary
22 sewer pipes and installed a dedicated pipe to make up the
23 system.

24 Again in 1972 there were many upgrades. The
25 original thought was this is a major contributor to

1 groundwater contamination in zone 3 and it may have
2 contributed some, but as we found out with further
3 investigation it didn't -- the active shops were much more
4 of a source than the IWCS.

5 We abandoned it in place in October or August of
6 2000. We had approval of the closure report in October
7 2004. Part of the system has gone under deed notice and
8 approval with the zone 2 portion that was just done. But
9 we're not -- until we get some more kind of closures
10 within the zone 3 area, we're going to kind of bundle
11 those sites in that area kind of together as far as deed
12 notice. So that's still pending for this site and
13 probably will be for some time.

14 MS. CODERRE: Community involvement for the
15 Industrial Waste Collection System dates back to August
16 1997 with the proposed plans for zone 3 soil. And then
17 begin in December 2005 we made public notice and held a
18 public comment period for the notice of proposed
19 corrective measures.

20 MR. BUELTER: Zone 3 groundwater is
21 basically -- because there are so many units within zone
22 3, we kind of looked at them as a whole so it kind of
23 covers the whole area.

24 Through our studies, we really focused on where
25 we found the plumes really originated were building 301,

1 building 360, site MP and site S-8. Yes, site S-8. And
2 those were the major sources of groundwater
3 contamination.

4 What we've done at this building 301 and building
5 360, we've installed permeable reactive barriers to
6 contain those high concentration source areas at the
7 sites. We have as part of this CMS, as part of the zone
8 2, 3 CMS, we have actions to take care of the source soils
9 at building 301. There's a small area inside building 234
10 that we're going to excavate.

11 At building 348, there was a oil water separator
12 that has some soil contamination of PC in the soil. We're
13 going to do a soil vapor extraction there and also treat
14 soils at building 360 with soil vapor extraction.

15 MS. CODERRE: So community involvement for
16 zone 3 groundwater goes back to July of 1995 with
17 groundwater zone 1, 2 and 3 feasibility studies.
18 Continued through February of 2002 and in July of 2004
19 with a proposed plan groundwater zones 2 and 3 will be
20 made public notice, held a public comment period and a
21 public meeting.

22 MR. WEEGAR: Before you go on, let me just
23 make one comment. For the sites that are in zone 2 and
24 zone 3 that have been briefed that are going to be carried
25 forward in the CMI Workplan and the class 3 compliance

1 plan modification, the public comment has not ended on
2 those sites. Public comment will go on in the form of
3 public notice, comment, public comment on the -- the
4 compliance plan modification and whatnot.

5 So for those sites still contained that are going
6 to be contained in the zone 2 and 3 CMI Workplan permit
7 mod, public notice has not ended. It is -- it will be --
8 there will be another opportunity for the public to
9 comment.

10 MS. GALVAN: Till how long?

11 MR. WEEGAR: Well, once the CMI Workplan has
12 been submitted and gone through admin review, technical
13 review, and a draft permit modification has been or final
14 has been issued by the agency, at that point there will
15 then be I think a 60-day comment period. That's also when
16 there's the opportunity for contested case hearing and all
17 that good stuff.

18 MS. CODERRE: We'll make sure that we provide
19 notice of those future public comments so -- and I regret
20 if anything indicated that public comment was closed on
21 sites -- only on sites that are closed. But those that
22 still require action, absolutely. Mr. Garcia.

23 MR. GARCIA: Mr. Weegar, can I ask you
24 something?

25 MR. WEEGAR: Sure.

1 MR. GARCIA: Is there a way that maybe we can
2 get -- since you may know this information, is there any
3 way that your agency can put us on your mailing list and
4 tell us when you're going to have a public comment period
5 for this particular thing or that particular thing?

6 MR. WEEGAR: I think -- I think the RAB
7 members are provided that special consideration of being
8 notified --

9 MS. CODERRE: Absolutely.

10 MR. WEEGAR: -- and briefed in meetings and
11 whatnot.

12 MR. GARCIA: But I'm talking about a letter
13 saying this comment period goes from here to here and this
14 is a specific item one, two, three, four, five, six,
15 seven, eight, nine, ten you are requested to comment on,
16 something like that so we can get -- not just give a
17 general idea of what we should comment on, but give us
18 some specifics on what we need to comment on.

19 MR. WEEGAR: Well, you will be commenting on
20 the corrective measures implementation workplan itself and
21 only what's in that plan and only the proposed
22 modifications to the compliance plan. Now I can check and
23 see -- you may be able to write the chief clerk's office
24 and ask that you be placed on the mailing list. I don't
25 know how that -- I don't know how that process exactly

1 works.

2 MR. GARCIA: I'm just asking when we can find
3 out some information so we can get the plan that we can
4 get a copy of the plan that's going to be implemented and
5 specific directions on what you want comments on and what
6 it can be said based on --

7 MR. WEEGAR: Well I --

8 MS. LANDEZ: Just a point of clarification.
9 In the notice that is put in the paper, there are
10 instructions that if you want to be put on the mailing
11 list for everything that the agency sends out regarding
12 the public notices, then there is directions as to how to
13 submit your name to the chief clerk's office. And I think
14 the January ad that we put in had those instructions so we
15 can give you -- send you a copy of that notice again.

16 MS. CODERRE: Would you like that, Mr. Garcia,
17 for us to provide how to get on the chief clerk's mailing
18 list?

19 MR. GARCIA: Well, yeah. You can send me the
20 information yourself, one of the two.

21 MS. CODERRE: Well, we'd be happy to produce
22 that. We'll bring the information to the RAB or send it
23 to you in the next packet on how to get on the chief
24 clerk's list. When we publish or when we have public
25 comment periods, we do make sure that this RAB is informed

1 that the public comment period is being held, what the
2 dates are and you're provided that same information. But
3 we'll bring that information to the next RAB meeting.

4 Yes, Kyle.

5 MS. CUNNINGHAM: When you give public notice,
6 it's in the newspaper and in an ad so if a community
7 member wanted to monitor that themselves, it would be in
8 the classified section?

9 MS. CODERRE: No.

10 MS. CUNNINGHAM: No? Where?

11 MS. CODERRE: We -- we purchase display ads
12 which are nonlegal notices and so they appear somewhere in
13 the newspaper as a display ad. It encourages the
14 likelihood that it will be seen. Many people don't look
15 through classifieds unless they're shopping for something
16 so our rules tell us we can't put notices back there. We
17 put them up in the paper to help ensure that it's going to
18 get seen.

19 MS. LANDEZ: And the state doesn't allow you
20 put in legal notices.

21 MS. CUNNINGHAM: Right. I was just kind of
22 wondering if the community wanted to monitor it themselves
23 and look for the public notice, they would just have to
24 read the newspaper cover to cover.

25 MS. CODERRE: Yes, ma'am. And that's the

1 benefit that the RAB has is we make sure the RAB members
2 get copies of the announcement as what's in your packet
3 this evening. And if the RAB meeting is not being held in
4 time to provide RAB members an opportunity to participate
5 in the public comments, you know, we make sure we get that
6 information as soon as we can out so --

7 MS. CUNNINGHAM: Thank you.

8 MS. CODERRE: Sure. Thank you, Kyle. Don.

9 MR. BUELTER: Zone 4 look at it. And again,
10 to clarify, zone 4 is not -- is the portion of East Kelly
11 just north of where we are right now. But it also
12 includes the off site groundwater that's associated with
13 the sites on zone 4. Sites -- there's also Industrial
14 Wastewater Collection System on East Kelly up in this area
15 here. There was an engine repair shop kind of where St.
16 Phillips College is now.

17 The IWCS was removed during removal of the
18 facilities. We use organic substrate up there for
19 bioremediation of the contaminants in the groundwater and
20 it's actually worked very well at that location.

21 We have submitted this part of the class 3
22 modification for zones 4 and 5 that was talked about
23 earlier.

24 MS. CODERRE: Community involvement for the
25 IWCS dates back to March of 1998 with the focus

1 feasibility study report continued through June 2000
2 through February 2001 with the zones 4 CMS Interim
3 Technical Memorandum, which we made a public notice and
4 had a public meeting. And in June 2002, we had a public
5 comment period and posted public notices and held public
6 meetings regarding the Corrective Measure Study and
7 proposed plans for the zone 4 and zone 5 cleanup.

8 MR. BUELTER: Groundwater zone 4, site SS052
9 basically is a groundwater plume that was impacted from
10 this area up here in the north part of the base and site
11 MP which kind of sits about over here. So it's that whole
12 groundwater plume that's kind of east of East Kelly and on
13 the base itself.

14 In 2000, we put in the horizontal well system to
15 contain groundwater on East Kelly. PRBs have been
16 installed south of Malone Street, along UPRR and along
17 Commercial and Collingsworth. And again, this is also one
18 of the sites in the zone 4 and 5, class 3 modification,
19 CMI Workplan.

20 MS. CODERRE: And community involvement for
21 the zone 4 groundwater goes back to March of 1998 through
22 the June 2000 to February 2001 public information
23 meetings. The June 2002 zone 4 Corrective Measure Study
24 and proposed plan and lastly is January of this year we
25 had the public notice, public comment period and public

1 meeting regarding the receipt of application and attempt
2 to obtain a class 3 modification, as we keep calling it
3 class 3 mod, for compliance plan zones 4 and 5.

4 MR. BUELTER: Zone 5, the rest of the base,
5 included originally for the Kelly IRP program. This whole
6 area, that warehouse area is up here and the admin part of
7 the base is here. The flight line and then units that are
8 now part of Lackland basically from here -- from this
9 point of the flight line west have been realigned to
10 Lackland.

11 First site I want to talk about in zone 5 -- oh,
12 go ahead. This also includes, again, groundwater
13 contamination of that -- is in the community kind of
14 this -- was in this area and in here. So it is also off
15 site groundwater.

16 Site S-1, located on the very north part of the
17 base, was a waste oil storage facility. Was actually part
18 of a soil or oil recycling facility that the DRMO had
19 run. We've actually done quite a bit at this site.

20 Initially the first thing we did was install
21 recovery wells containing groundwater. Contamination here
22 was chlorobenzene that actually flowed off north of the
23 base. Groundwater containment was put in, stopped the
24 flow of groundwater off base. There's no more
25 chlorobenzene that we find off the base or anywhere in

1 that area.

2 In 1998 we excavated the source soil to take care
3 of that mainly contamination. Installed some more
4 groundwater recovery, mainly soil vapor extraction in that
5 area and this is also one of the sites that's in zone 4
6 and 5, CMI Workplan.

7 MS. CODERRE: In April of 1994, we started our
8 community involvement for site S-1 with the focus
9 feasibility study final report where we published a public
10 notice and held a public comment period. Public outreach
11 activity continued through December of 1998 with a focus
12 feasibility study for contaminated soil associated with
13 IRP site S-1 and then through June of 2002 was a proposed
14 plan and most recently in January of this year, the class
15 3 modification will be held at public meetings and had a
16 public comment period and made public notice.

17 MR. BUELTER: Groundwater zone 5 is kind of
18 groundwater that's in the zone and the off base areas.
19 We've installed PRBs along those boundaries here. The
20 contained groundwater flows into the (inaudible) Village
21 area here. This area here now was above the cleanup level
22 and is now below. The groundwater sampling is done out
23 here.

24 The PRB on 34th Street here contains -- actually
25 to treat Kelly PCE and containment off base PC source

1 that's commingled with ours. Various sites, we've
2 enhanced bioremediation with organic substrate injection.
3 This area here is down, this site here and that area
4 nearby the old post office on base. The groundwater
5 contamination here is also part of the zone 4 and 5 CMI
6 Workplan.

7 MS. CODERRE: And community involvement for
8 zone 5 groundwater, in June of 2002 we made a public
9 notice and had a public comment period and held public
10 meetings regarding the proposed plans, zone 5 Corrective
11 Measure Study and proposed plan. And then in January of
12 this year, the class 3 modification public notice comment
13 and meetings were held.

14 MR. BUELTER: So where do we go from here? As
15 we mentioned, the correct number is 475 out of 687 sites
16 have been closed. We've installed what we have proposed
17 for groundwater remedies. Those have been installed.
18 Estimated cleanup is 15 to 20 years. Some areas are a
19 little faster than others. And we still have some source
20 area remediation to be done. This includes the excavation
21 of the soil and actually down into the groundwater to get
22 the DNAPL for the three base mods, site MP so we're going
23 to remove that source. Remove the source at building 301,
24 building 360, 348, 324, and also do a little additional
25 organic substrate at building 522. All right.

1 MS. CODERRE: So questions? Okay. Can we
2 have a five minute break?

3 (Off the record from 9:15 to 9:18.)

4 MS. CODERRE: Well, there were a couple of
5 questions. I think, Ms. Galvan, your hand shot up first
6 so why don't we start with you.

7 MS. GALVAN: You know, we're talking about all
8 these proposed plans. Where in the proposed plan does it
9 show where the Air Force will follow-up the high rates of
10 breast cancer among the men and women and the elevated
11 mortality among ex-Kelly workers? Why has the Air Force
12 not made any plans to conduct studies of and about the
13 mortality of ex-Kelly workers and their families?

14 That's my question to the health and the aspects
15 of the community and the ex-Kelly workers. And we have
16 not even -- I don't think they have touched even the
17 tip -- the tip of the iceberg of all of this.

18 MS. CODERRE: Well, you're right.

19 MS. GALVAN: That follow-up should have been
20 done a long time ago. And it needs to be done.

21 MS. CODERRE: The proposed plans that we
22 discussed here tonight that Don has talked to you about
23 are about the Environmental Restoration Program. The Air
24 Force has funded a Public Center for Environmental Health,
25 five million dollars over ten years to conduct those

1 health-related studies and I will turn to Kyle and -- and
2 ask that question about what studies they have proposed
3 that you might be interested in following up with.

4 MR. GALVAN: Oh. Well, she needs to answer
5 those questions I just asked.

6 MS. CODERRE: Well, Kyle, would you like to
7 field that?

8 MS. CUNNINGHAM: Well, I can tell you, we are
9 looking at doing some additional studies. We're in the
10 middle of the liver cancer feasibility study. And then
11 we're looking at doing some other follow-up type study.
12 We did go back to the Texas Cancer Registry, ask about the
13 cancer rates, and we're looking at that some more.

14 The one that was really shown to be elevated was
15 the liver cancer. But it's not to say that we have
16 dropped any of them. I would ask you to take a look at
17 it. It was just put out today and released today, the
18 Healthy Profiles 2006, which is a report that the San
19 Antonio Metropolitan Health District puts out yearly to
20 the community.

21 It will be available on the web if it's not
22 already and it kind of gives you a look at what -- not
23 just this area, but all of San Antonio, some of Bexar
24 County, what it -- what we're seeing in the way of
25 illnesses and things that we need to look for.

1 MS. GALVAN: Okay. You didn't address my
2 question on ex-Kelly workers.

3 MS. CUNNINGHAM: On ex-Kelly workers?

4 MS. GALVAN: Yes.

5 MS. CUNNINGHAM: That's something we've
6 actually just been talking about recently and I wanted to
7 talk with Air Force. A while back we were told that, you
8 know, it had to be something that came through OSHA for
9 that.

10 I know that there are some records on ex-Kelly
11 workers and that was something we were going to address
12 again about being able to get access to those records so
13 that we could study it.

14 MS. GALVAN: Why can't you use the actual
15 people? They're there at Lockheed-Martin, at Boeing.
16 There's ex-Kelly workers that are alive.

17 MS. CUNNINGHAM: Well, and what we would like
18 to do with that -- in fact, there's -- we've done about
19 2000 I think now. I wish Linda and Melanie were here
20 tonight. They both wanted to tell you-all that they were
21 sorry. They just had conflicts in their schedules that
22 they couldn't be here.

23 But the individuals that we have seen through
24 Linda's assessments at the center, some of those, many of
25 those, were ex-Kelly workers. Now all of a sudden we've

1 started getting more calls to do additional assessments
2 and all of these calls have been basically from ex-Kelly
3 workers. She's continuing to do assessments. I would
4 invite all of you-all to please come to the Roundtable,
5 which is going to be in August.

6 MS. CODERRE: August 26th, Kelly Area
7 Collaboration.

8 MS. CUNNINGHAM: It's on a Saturday and it
9 will probably run from I'd say 9:00 to 1:00, what we did
10 at the last one. We haven't set times for this one, but
11 to please come to that Roundtable. And at the Roundtable
12 we'll be -- we'll have additional information.

13 You know my background is really environmental.
14 I get into the health aspects because of the people that I
15 work with and also because our effort is to try and link
16 the health effects or the health problems with the -- are
17 there any links to the environment.

18 But at the Roundtable, you know, we'll have --
19 the RNs will be there, the docs will be there and they can
20 get in depth with the -- with the actual -- you know, the
21 really -- the human health part of that.

22 MS. GALVAN: Okay. I guess I'm going to have
23 to ask my congressman to again go back to why the
24 follow-up was not -- you know, you're saying that there is
25 one, there's -- if it's on the web site on ex-Kelly

1 workers, I'll look for it. If it's not there, then --

2 MS. CUNNINGHAM: No, no, no. I didn't say
3 that there would be a follow-up of your questions. I said
4 a ex-Kelly workers study should be done. I'd really
5 rather let the epidemiologists and docs speak to that
6 rather than from me from my environmental background.

7 MS. GALVAN: Okay.

8 MS. CUNNINGHAM: But what is there, what
9 should have gone on the web probably today, tomorrow, is
10 Healthy Profiles 2006, which is something that the -- that
11 we do, the San Antonio Metropolitan Health District does
12 yearly to look at the health of the community and then to
13 be able to report that out. That's going to cover the
14 whole -- the whole community, not just ex-Kelly workers.

15 But there have been some other things that I know
16 that have been done by others like -- but I don't
17 really --

18 MS. GALVAN: But you're aware that the
19 community that was there is longer there. I mean they've
20 moved out all over the city. That original community that
21 was exposed to has already been dispersed in different
22 ways. There is some there, but there has been another
23 community coming in.

24 MS. CUNNINGHAM: Any time you do health
25 studies, you run into complications.

1 MS. GALVAN: You run into -- yes.

2 MS. CUNNINGHAM: That's one of things that has
3 to be taken into consideration. Now my -- when I go out
4 into the community and a lot of people that I visit with,
5 the families have been there for years, the families are
6 still there.

7 MS. GALVAN: Yeah. Those are the ones --

8 MS. CUNNINGHAM: I'm not saying they're all
9 there, but --

10 MS. GALVAN: They're the ones --

11 MS. CUNNINGHAM: -- what they very much -- I
12 think in San Antonio the feeling of community where you
13 really do have the -- the neighborhood community, I feel
14 that more on the south side than I do any other places of
15 San Antonio.

16 MS. GALVAN: Uh-huh.

17 MS. CUNNINGHAM: So, you know, but no, people
18 don't stay in one spot. That's for sure.

19 MS. CODERRE: Are there other questions?

20 MR. QUINTANILLA: I just have one. I just
21 want to say this, Kyle. Do you need say a resolution from
22 a group such as this that we need a follow-up study?
23 Because the population was young then. It's a little
24 older now and they did not have enough data.

25 Is there sufficient data for them to do a more

1 thorough study, a follow-up study like they promised they
2 would or said that was needed?

3 MS. CUNNINGHAM: Well, from some of the
4 studies that I'm going back and thinking about things that
5 I've read here recently, but I can remember with the ALS
6 study, they said that there really needed to be a
7 follow-up done in ten years. We looked back and looked --
8 not us, but the group. Went back and looked at could that
9 follow-up be done in five years. Could it be done quicker
10 and it was decided, determined that no, you really
11 couldn't.

12 You know, one of the things that we're looking at
13 now, and I don't know where it will go, is can we do an
14 ALS study and talk to people that have been diagnosed with
15 ALS now that are still living.

16 MR. QUINTANILLA: And some are dying.

17 MS. CUNNINGHAM: Well, yeah. That's one --
18 but at any rate, the folks that are still living, talk to
19 them while they're still alive because when you go back
20 and try to talk to the families, they -- they don't really
21 know what those exposures were. It's real hard for them
22 to be able to fill those in.

23 But -- so that's something that's being looked
24 at. I would really -- again, when you asked what do we
25 need from the community, that's the whole point of the

1 Roundtable is to listen to the community, to hear what the
2 community's concerns are having to do with their health
3 and to try and figure out where we go from here. The
4 whole point of the Roundtable is to go forward. To go
5 forward in a positive way.

6 MR. MARTINEZ: Your names will be added to the
7 invitation list for that meeting.

8 MR. QUINTANILLA: Now will this subject of
9 breast cancer be part of the agenda?

10 MS. CUNNINGHAM: I'm sure it will. And
11 actually the way it -- the way I can't speak for the
12 care -- for the whole group, but I think that the
13 community and the people that attend will probably help at
14 that agenda. Will probably actually be setting the agenda
15 because you're going to bring up your community's concerns
16 and we go from there.

17 MR. MARTINEZ: Ladies and gentlemen, we need
18 to get back to questions related to this presentation,
19 please.

20 MR. QUINTANILLA: Thank you, Kyle.

21 MR. MARTINEZ: I don't mean to down-play the
22 health Roundtable. Go ahead, sir.

23 MR. GARCIA: Zone 5, how about the -- they all
24 probably have over and over and over again with the jet
25 engine fuel facility we had along those roads. Which one

1 is that? Where are the fuel tanks? I don't see them
2 there.

3 MR. BUELTER: This is the unit right here
4 that's part of this 1592 tank system for the --

5 MR. GARCIA: Well, I'd like to make a motion
6 and get a request that we get some more data and the
7 results of what's going on because there's a lot of people
8 that are sick here in North Kelly Area Gardens because of
9 that -- those fuel tanks were there and I need to get some
10 more contamination data on the status of all of that and
11 how it's effecting the people around that, especially the
12 contamin -- that contamination. It may have gone in the
13 groundwater, how polluted is the dirt? We needed to get
14 some more information because we have a lot of sick people
15 living on Valencia, Barney, Wescott, 35th and all this
16 area in here. We need to deal with that some more. And
17 this --

18 MR. ANTWINE: That site closed.

19 MR. GARCIA: We still need a long way to go,
20 Adam. We need to take --

21 MR. ANTWINE: That site is closed.

22 MR. GARCIA: Adam, listen to me. Adam.

23 MR. ANTWINE: Yes.

24 MR. GARCIA: Listen to me. Now we have to
25 take every -- we've covered almost every site that's

1 getting ready to close and have public meetings. Now we
2 need to know the status of every active site. What is the
3 status now? How many years is it going to be taking to --

4 MR. ANTWINE: It's all right there, sir. It
5 will tell you.

6 MR. GARCIA: But how many more years? How
7 many years?

8 MR. ANTWINE: It will tell you when it's going
9 to be submitted for --

10 MR. GARCIA: Does it have all the years? Does
11 it distinguish the difference between chemical treating
12 and scientific method against natural attenuation? You
13 didn't tell us the difference, how much of that means
14 natural attenuation and how much of that is -- is
15 scientifically done --

16 MR. ANTWINE: That's what all the reports we
17 put together do. That's what all the reports --

18 MR. GARCIA: -- or what the contaminants are.

19 MR. ANTWINE: -- on those sites provide you
20 with. What the contaminants are, what the recommended
21 solutions are. I mean that's what this information is
22 provided for.

23 MR. GARCIA: Does it tell me how much of that
24 is going to be present and how much is going to be --

25 MR. ANTWINE: No. I mean if the decision

1 hasn't been --

2 MR. GARCIA: -- natural attenuation and how
3 much is going to be by scientific methods.

4 MR. ANTWINE: -- made, no. Because not all of
5 them are at that stage. But for those that we are at
6 point where the remedy's been selected and it's ready to
7 be constructed, yes. Depends on where it is in the
8 process as to whether some of those questions you're
9 asking can be answered. It's in the reports that we
10 submit to these guys every day. You just got to go find
11 it.

12 MR. GARCIA: We still have a long way to go.
13 Also one of my main concerns here is I supported you at
14 the collaborative and you see how the collaborative
15 worked. They have real professional employees.
16 Professional employees that know how to fire -- follow
17 professional guidelines for people like people that have
18 degrees in public administration.

19 What do you do when you want people to come to a
20 meeting like this? You network with your community. You
21 want me to bring you a book on public administration and
22 show you how to network with the community so we can have
23 at least two citizens from the community show up at a
24 board meeting? Apparently all these people,
25 intellectuals, are not doing their job in bringing in the

1 community to our meetings and I'm fed up with that.

2 MR. ANTWINE: Well, that's part of your
3 responsibility as a RAB member to bring those people in.

4 MR. GARCIA: That's why we have you here for.

5 MR. ANTWINE: You're supposed to have a
6 constituency that you bring as well. That's part of your
7 job as a member. That's your obligation to this
8 community, to bring those people in.

9 I don't know where all those people are. I don't
10 know who --

11 MR. GARCIA: You don't know --

12 MR. ANTWINE: -- they are. You say you know
13 them all.

14 MR. GARCIA: -- the community networking that
15 they teach you when you get a degree in public
16 administration?

17 MR. ANTWINE: I don't need that. I got
18 professionals sitting all around me that have degrees in
19 what you're --

20 MR. GARCIA: Then how come they're not doing
21 their job then?

22 MR. ANTWINE: Well, maybe there's people out
23 there who believe we're doing the right thing and that
24 they don't need to show up here.

25 MS. GALVAN: Okay. I think we're --

1 MR. GARCIA: I don't think there are --

2 MR. ANTWINE: Well, I mean that's your
3 opinion.

4 MS. GALVAN: -- getting out of control.

5 MR. MARTINEZ: Let's move on. We need to move
6 on.

7 MS. GALVAN: We don't --

8 THE COURT REPORTER: Excuse me.

9 MR. QUINTANILLA: I just have a question for
10 Mr. Antwine. Mr. Antwine, is that all -- all of those
11 sites have a date that the sites will be restored.

12 MR. ANTWINE: Tell me which one you'd like to
13 know the date of the next action on, we'll be glad to
14 provide it.

15 MR. QUINTANILLA: Site E-1, when that will
16 that be restored?

17 MR. ANTWINE: I think we covered E-1 already.

18 MR. QUINTANILLA: When will it be restored
19 completely?

20 MR. BUELTER: 2019 or 2020.

21 MS. GALVAN: 2020.

22 MR. QUINTANILLA: Okay. Now site S-3.

23 MS. CODERRE: All of these sites are in the
24 packet of information and material.

25 MR. QUINTANILLA: No, no, no. You're

1 interrupting, Ms. Coderre. I'm asking the question --

2 MR. ANTWINE: Maybe we covered that when you

3 went out. Look in your briefing. They're all there.

4 MR. SHENEMAN: The soil --

5 MS. LANDEZ: Soil radio -- the closed.

6 MR. QUINTANILLA: It doesn't give --

7 THE COURT REPORTER: Excuse me. Excuse me.

8 One at a time, please.

9 MR. LANDEZ: Site S-3 is closed.

10 MR. QUINTANILLA: Pardon me?

11 MR. LANDEZ: Site S-3.

12 MR. QUINTANILLA: Is closed.

13 MR. LANDEZ: Is closed.

14 MR. QUINTANILLA: See there?

15 MR. ANTWINE: Thank you. But it is in your

16 briefing packet.

17 MR. MARTINEZ: Okay. We've got to move on.

18 MR. ANTWINE: Yeah. Look at it.

19 MR. QUINTANILLA: I'm not through yet. But

20 that's all right. Go ahead. Go ahead. Go ahead and move

21 this thing along.

22 MS. CUNNINGHAM: I was thinking -- I may have

23 just misheard, but instead of 419 it should be 475?

24 MR. BUELTER: Correct.

25 MS. CUNNINGHAM: Okay.

1 MR. MARTINEZ: Thank you.

2 MS. CODERRE: If Mr. Quintanilla wasn't
3 finished, --

4 MR. QUINTANILLA: That's all right.

5 MS. CODERRE: -- please, Mr. Quintanilla,
6 finish.

7 MR. QUINTANILLA: Well, I was -- I'm not going
8 to say another word.

9 MS. CODERRE: Mr. Sheneman, did you have
10 something you'd like to say?

11 MR. SHENEMAN: It's a question. A year ago in
12 May we were down in Charlie Rodriguez's office and a lady
13 who had some connection with the board way back yonder
14 wanted to have a reverse mortgage on her house.

15 Okay. So no problem until it was underwritten by
16 HUD and then HUD said her house was sitting on
17 contaminated property. What became of that?

18 MS. CODERRE: That is not an issue that the
19 Kelly --

20 MR. SHENEMAN: Hell it isn't.

21 MS. CODERRE: -- Restoration --

22 MR. SHENEMAN: It's contaminated property on
23 Bay Street.

24 MS. CODERRE: As far as individual citizens'
25 financial information and mortgaging, reverse mortgage,

1 that's not an issue that we have information on --

2 MR. SHENEMAN: It has to do with contaminated
3 property.

4 MS. CODERRE: -- regarding that.

5 MR. QUINTANILLA: HUD said that they could not
6 do anything with that property because it's going to
7 remain contaminated for a hundred years.

8 MR. SHENEMAN: Where does the contamination
9 come from?

10 MS. GALVAN: That's another government agency.

11 MR. MARTINEZ: Okay. Let's go ahead and open
12 up the -- well, actually we had a couple more agenda items
13 that Mr. Silvas wanted to bring up. That was the breast
14 cancer study or the related cadmium? What did you want to
15 do on that, sir?

16 MR. QUINTANILLA: We want a follow-up on that
17 Mr. Chairman -- cochairman.

18 MR. SILVAS: Yes.

19 MR. QUINTANILLA: We need a follow-up study on
20 it.

21 MR. MARTINEZ: So you would like to recommend
22 that as an action or as an agenda item for --

23 MR. SILVAS: Yes.

24 MR. MARTINEZ: Is that what I'm hearing?

25 MR. SILVAS: Yes.

1 MR. PEREZ: I second that.

2 MR. MARTINEZ: Okay. That takes care of that
3 one. Now the golf course. What was the action on that?

4 MR. SILVAS: That initial report that was
5 brought in early in the opening statement.

6 MR. GARCIA: Way back in the middle '90s it
7 was part of the Kelly RAB when Patrick McCullough was here
8 and that was part of AS -- ASTR or ASTI report.

9 MR. MARTINEZ: So basically there was --

10 MR. GARCIA: Made out to Kelly.

11 MR. MARTINEZ: -- an action item --

12 MR. GARCIA: Yes.

13 MR. MARTINEZ: -- to investigate the golf
14 course in the past.

15 MR. GARCIA: Well, I'm going to find -- I
16 have to call. I couldn't find his number and I need your
17 phone number. I'll call you. I'll give you the report
18 and you can get it for the RAB members because this is
19 part of the Kelly issue back then and we still haven't
20 resolved it yet.

21 MR. MARTINEZ: Okay. Okay. If you'll give
22 that to me --

23 MR. GARCIA: I'm going to call you and give
24 you that number. I'll give it to you. I need to find it
25 though. ASTR report number.

1 MR. MARTINEZ: Okay. Thank you, sir. Does
2 that address those two items for you?

3 MR. SILVAS: Yes.

4 MR. MARTINEZ: Okay. Mr. Weegar.

5 MR. WEEGAR: I'd like to ask Mr.
6 Quintanilla -- he's so familiar with the RAB rule to read
7 what the RAB rules says about restora -- issues that
8 aren't related to restoration activities.

9 MR. QUINTANILLA: It allows for the cochair,
10 the installation cochair, to refer that item to the proper
11 official.

12 MR. WEEGAR: Basically -- basically what the
13 RAB rule says is if it's not -- if there's not something
14 that's not environmental cleanup related, that's not the
15 purview of the RAB. And the Air Force is supposed to
16 assist in finding the appropriate avenue for addressing
17 those issues.

18 So basically what -- I guess what the RAB rule
19 would be saying is that from the issue of requiring the
20 Air Force to do some follow-up on this breast cancer
21 thing, all they're going to -- all the RAB rule is going
22 to say is that they're to provide you with some other
23 source, which I would imagine a great place to begin would
24 be this environmental health Roundtable that's coming up
25 in August. That's -- that's what the RAB rule says.

1 MR. QUINTANILLA: Aren't you the Air Force
2 agency that conducted that study? That this is the wishes
3 of the RAB?

4 MR. MARTINEZ: We'll take that action item.

5 MR. QUINTANILLA: Thank you.

6 MR. MARTINEZ: Anything else?

7 MR. SILVAS: Yeah. Furthermore, I'd like to
8 get a consensus on the -- have the documents in the main
9 library perhaps funded for a TAPP project for review and
10 go through the library and see what improvements can be
11 done on that.

12 MR. MARTINEZ: So you're saying that you would
13 like a review of the documents currently contained in the
14 library to see if any of those are potential for TAPP
15 review?

16 MR. SILVAS: No. What we can do to get that
17 library current, up to date and make sure it's --

18 MR. QUINTANILLA: It's more accessible.

19 MR. ANTWINE: That's not review of the
20 technical documents so we couldn't do that.

21 MR. QUINTANILLA: Then how --

22 MR. ANTWINE: That's a file management issue.
23 I mean we're working to put all those documents in
24 electronic format to put them on a website. That's an
25 ongoing project, but that wouldn't be an appropriate

1 project to request for technical review of a document
2 under the TAPP program. You wouldn't -- you wouldn't get
3 very far with that request.

4 We will be glad to provide you the progress of
5 where we are with, you know, getting the documents in the
6 library up to date, ensuring that they're available
7 electronically on a web site and that's where this whole
8 document and record management program is moving. More
9 towards making these things available to the public
10 through other venues so that you don't have to go
11 downtown. You know, you can -- you can find it in other
12 locations, on your -- on your website, on your computer.

13 So that's where that's going. But it wouldn't be
14 something you would be able to get reviewed through a TAPP
15 project.

16 MR. MARTINEZ: At this time I'd like to open
17 it up for public comment period. Any community members
18 would like to make a comment? No? We'll move on.

19 That pretty much concludes this meeting so --

20 MR. SILVAS: Before closing, I'd like to
21 submit this article out of the Birmingham News dated
22 September 27th, 1987. It's approximately five pages and
23 it states that the surplus in Louisiana was receiving
24 shipments of herbicide of 245T and was supplying it
25 throughout the State of Louisiana and I'd like these

1 handed out to the members.

2 MR. MARTINEZ: All right. Well, that
3 concludes this meeting. Any other questions?

4 MR. QUINTANILLA: Wait a minute. Before you
5 close up, I had something for a future RAB meeting. I
6 believe we need a briefing on the RAB rules at the next
7 meeting.

8 MR. MARTINEZ: I believe that was addressed in
9 the action item report.

10 MS. CODERRE: That was an action item report.
11 We're working on that, Mr. Quintanilla.

12 MR. QUINTANILLA: On -- on the briefing of the
13 final RAB rule.

14 MS. CODERRE: We're working on that.

15 MR. QUINTANILLA: Fine. Also we need to put
16 on the agenda for the next meeting, approval of frequency
17 and location of meetings as outlined in section 202.7 of
18 the RAB rules. It states that: The RAB will determine
19 the frequency and location of meetings.

20 MS. CODERRE: Noted.

21 MR. QUINTANILLA: Okay. Also Lackland. You
22 know, you-all -- at the beginning of the meeting I think
23 Lackland -- someone had a meeting with the BCT or somebody
24 on -- on the -- on the golf course in that area, that
25 contamination there. We need to find out when they're

FINAL PAGE

ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD

FINAL PAGE