KELLY AFB
TEXAS

ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD
COVER SHEET

AR File Number 3252.1

* *

KELLY RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD (RAB)

* *

SPECIAL MEETING TO DISCUSS
ATSDR REPORT
NOVEMBER 9, 2004
6:30 - 9:08 p.m.

KENNEDY HIGH SCHOOL
1922 S. GENERAL McMULLEN
SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS

APPEARANCES:

Dr. David Smith;
Mr. Robert Silvas;
Mr. Pete Muzquiz;
Mr. Rodrigo Garcia;
Mr. Armando Quintanilla;
Mr. Tim Sultenfuss
Mr. Michael Sheneman;
Mr. John Joseph;
Mr. Sam Sanchez;
Mr. William Ryan;

Mr. David Fowler;
Mr. Brian Kaplan;

Mr. Glen Wilkinson;
Mr. Nicholas Charles;

Ms. Esmeralda Galvan;
Ms. Carol Vaquera;
Ms. LeighAnn Fabianke;
Ms. Larisa Dawkins;
Ms. Robyn Thompson;
Ms. Abbi Power;
Mr. Sam Murrah;
Mr. Gary Miller;
Mr. Henry Galindo;
Mr. Daniel Gonzales;

Ms. Maria Teran-MacIver;
Ms. Kyle Cunningham

Mr. Genaro Rendon;

And others in attendance who were not identified.

MR. SILVAS: Can we take a roll call and then we'll find out if we have a quorum?

DR. DAVID SMITH: Yes. I'll do the names. If you'd answer "here," please.

Ms. Converse? Not here.

Mr. DeNuccio? (No response)

Mr. Galindo?

MR. GALINDO: Here.

DR. DAVID SMITH: Thank you.

Ms. Galvan?

MS. GALVAN: Yes.

DR. DAVID SMITH: Mr. Garcia?

MR. GARCIA: Present.

DR. DAVID SMITH: Mr. Gonzales? He's going to be late, I think I heard him say.

Mr. Murrah?

MR. MURRAH: Here.

DR. DAVID SMITH: Mr. Muzquiz?

MR. MUZQUIZ: Here.

DR. DAVID SMITH: Mr. Perez? (No response)

Mr. Person? (No response)

Mr. Rice?

MR. QUINTANILLA: I'm here for Mr. Rice. Armando Quintanilla.

DR. DAVID SMITH: Thank you, sir.

Mr. Sheneman? (No response)

Mr. Silvas?

MR. SILVAS: Here. Present.

DR. DAVID SMITH: Ms. Vaquera?

Mr. Silvas, we do have a quorum.

MR. SILVAS: Okay. We can start the meeting.

DR. DAVID SMITH: I'd like to begin the meeting with the Pledge of Allegiance. If you'd stand, please.

(PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE)

DR. DAVID SMITH: Thank you. And a moment of silence, please.

MR. SILVAS: Before we go on, there was something that was brought up to me for the community. They were wondering if it would be possible to move up the community comment before the ATSDR did their presentation. So, if we can go throw that out on the table.

DR. DAVID SMITH: All right. Yeah, real quickly. Just the goals for this meeting are simply to review and comment on the ATSDR Health Consultation Past Air Emissions Report for Kelly Air Force Base.

RAB members, do you have any problem with making adjustments in the agenda to move the community comment period up early?

MR. QUINTANILLA: I have no complaints. It's up to the chair.

DR. DAVID SMITH: All right.

MR. SILVAS: So far move it to -- have it before the meeting.

DR. DAVID SMITH: Would you like to move that then immediately? Is that --

MR. SILVAS: Well, after we discuss those for the meeting, I guess.

DR. DAVID SMITH: I think we're there, Mr. Silvas.

MR. SILVAS: Yeah.

DR. DAVID SMITH: Anything special about community comment period that we need to know at this time?

MR. SILVAS: Yeah, there's a three-minute limit time for each individual. So if they need to have a few extra minutes, we'll address that as it goes.

DR. DAVID SMITH: Okay. Do we have comment cards at the moment? Let me get these cards and we'll get us rolling.

I only have one. I think I have one more coming. Genaro Rendon.

MR. GENARO RENDON: Good afternoon, everyone. My name is Genaro Rendon and I'm an organizer with Southwest Workers' Union and the Committee for Environmental Justice Action, which is a local community organization that's been battling for a clean-up of their community, for health care for their families, and for also revitalization, not only inside of Kelly USA, but also outside those fences for the communities that have been

impacted by decades due to the negligence of the Air Force.

We're here today because ATSDR, the agency for toxic substance and disease registry has done it once again. They're here in San Antonio releasing another study that again makes no connections between the contaminations that exist in this community and the health impacts that communities are facing.

Now, we know what we say ATSDR is flawed by design. They probably, over the last ten years, have done over 12,000 assessments and probably under a handful of those have found a connection between the contamination and the health impacts the communities are feeling.

So we're here to let ATSDR know that we're not in agreement with the flawed assessment that you did on past air emissions. One, because you were working with very little information. Secondly, there's no type of community participation in the development of these assessments, which is one of the crucial pieces in the work that ATSDR does. They do not include communities, they do not talk to folks in the communities to find out what those real impacts are.

So we're here to let folks know from the community, from the RAB board, that we're definitely not in agreement with the current study that ATSDR is releasing on past air emissions. We're not in agreement with the assessments that they did in 1999. We're not in agreement with the assessments they did in 2001. Again, again, and again, you see ATSDR being a rubber

stamp for the polluter, and we say that ATSDR supports those polluters from getting out of their responsibilities to deal with the health problems that communities are facing due to the negligence of the Air Force.

So, you know, it's very disappointing that there's not community folks here. But, again, it's also part of that confusion and that fragmentation that exists amongst the government agency in trying to keep everything separated. ATSDR, you know, has gone into several communities -- including Memphis, Tennessee and other communities around the nation -- and has found the exact same thing. Which is no surprise that there is not a connection between the contamination and the health problems, which we totally disagree with.

So, again, this was unannounced for one. You know, again, going back to the piece on public participation. There was no type of information put out there for folks in the community to know that ATSDR was going to be here today. Even us as an organization, we were notified late last week that ATSDR was going to be making a presentation here today.

So, you know, we're just totally disappointed with ATSDR, their lack of respect to the communities and their continued support of the polluters, not only here in San Antonio, but across the nation.

Thank you.

DR. DAVID SMITH: Thank you, sir. Our next one is for

Mr. Wilkinson. Mr. Wilkinson, would you mind using -- we're going to try this mike here and see if that will work a little bit better.

MR. WILKINSON: I'm here once again to ask the Board members to be responsible -- especially the DOD, DOLA, DRMO, Kelly RAB Clean-up Committee, Kelly Air Force Base Operation Ranch Hand -- to go to 2103 Ackerman Road and remove their Agent Orange drums buried that the sight, that is buried over the San Antonio aquifer.

I returned Seguin River, which is part of the Texas Water Commission in 1980. I have found S-7 Site, which led to an S-2 Site. I have found now that Union Pacific was in participation to ship Agent Orange from Mission, Texas, which is the most deadliest spot in the State of Texas, other than Lake Tawakoni. Their tracks lead direct from Mission, Texas to S-7 Site.

A Mae Wong, a prosecuting attorney -- a month and-a-half after she turned in EPA for covering up Phil Bynum's lack of forwarding information, which he withheld for nine years to take the Agent Orange which was sold in the State of Texas. She later went to the FBI. Whereas -- who took over her investigation? Where did what investigation lead? Nowhere. Because she turned in Region 6.

The EPA is here to regulate state agencies, not to protect them. The EPA has done nothing. They have super glue on

their seats in their lily white building, ivory building, in Dallas, Texas. Through the ten years of fighting, I have only seen two EPA people, him and Mae Wong. May Wong had an FBI agent present with them -- and Mae Wong went all the way to Washington D.C., to the U.S. Justice Department, to report that Phil Bynum withheld information that Agent Orange was sold by the truck load through the State of Texas from S-7 Site, from Carswell Air Force Base.

None of these sites were -- Agent Orange is a cradle to the great chemical. That means when it was made in Mission, Texas the DOD took fully 100 percent responsible for it. When they shipped it to S-7 Site, if there was a derailment, they would have been 100 percent responsible for it. When they contaminated S-7 Site, S-2 Site, they were 100 percent responsible for it. When they sold it to Lake Tawakoni, to the Water Commission and the EPA, they were 100 percent responsible for it.

DR. DAVID SMITH: Mr. Wilkinson --

MR. WILKINSON: Where is the responsibility of all these people? They're hiding behind the Texas Open Records Acts and the Freedom and Information Office. I have been repeatedly denied by Jarver Durn --

DR. DAVID SMITH: Mr. Wilkinson, your three-minute mark --

MR. WILKINSON: -- and the U.S. Attorneys Office in the

State of Texas. I have not received no information on them. And they are covering it up and I have documentation on it.

DR. DAVID SMITH: Yes, sir.

MR. WILKINSON: Thank you.

DR. DAVID SMITH: Thank you, sir. Thank you.

We have one more presenter. I'm sorry I'm struggling a little bit with the last name. Nicholas Charlee.

MR. NICHOLAS CHARLES: Charles.

DR. DAVID SMITH: I'm sorry.

MR. NICHOLAS CHARLES: That's fine.

Hi, Board. My name is Nicholas Charles. I live here in the community. I am also a member of the Southwest Public Workers' Union. I am president of the Board of the Union, State of Texas. I'm here to represent a lot of people that are not here. Why? Because we just heard a while ago, well, this is just all of a sudden happening, this meeting.

I mean, it's sad when something like this comes into the community and then we know that everything has happened here in the community, but yet the community is not aware. Just like the stuff that was here and is still here. People don't understand why these things are happening. You know, a lot of times our children are asking us, Dad, why am I bleeding from my nose? Dad, why are these white spots coming out on me? How come I keep having these headaches?

You know, we have our doubts. We got to take

responsibility. I work here in the Edgewood School District. When I see something going on wrong, I speak. And I say, you know what, this has got to stop. And if you have responsibility in your job, I don't care what it is, ATRSA, whatever it is, you have a responsibility as an adult, as a parent to see what is right and what is wrong.

I don't care about the government. The government is run by the people, not the people -- not government runs the people. We got to make this understanding to the people in the community, we are in charge. And if you're not really there taking that stand and really being in charge, get your butt off that chair and let somebody to the right things. We need real leaders. We need it from the heart. Not just for yourself, but for your children, your grandkids, whoever is behind them on your bloodline, people that you know that has passed on.

You know, you got to take it inside yourself and say, you know what, I got to stop this. This is real, I got to stop and I got to show the reality, what is really going on. If the water is contaminated, I'm going to have to say it. If the ground is contaminated, I'm going to have to say it. If the air is contaminated, I'm going to have to say it. And if you're not going to say the truth, get your butt off that chair and let somebody else take that place and let them do the right thing.

You know, a lot of us are struggling in the United States. Not just the United States, all over the world. And if

we don't stand for justice and believe in what we stand for, what are we going to show the nation? What are we going to show the world, if in our own back community we're lying and we're stealing. What else can we say?

You know, we got to be human beings and we got to do the right thing. If we don't do it, the hell with everything. That's like my dad used to say. The hell with everybody, mijo. People don't care. Well, I'm a person that cares. Are you? If you don't, you're going to have people like me up here speaking. And if we don't do something about it, somebody else is going to do. That's why people go crazy. They go crazy and then we say, why did they go crazy? Because crazy people make the mistakes. But not saying the truth, first about it, they're really the crazy people. Think about it.

You know, we all have the little things in our minds and our spirit and our soul and our body that says yes, no, yes, no.

DR. DAVID SMITH: Thank you, Mr. Charles. Those are all the community comments that I have.

MR. SILVAS: I'd like to address as far as the logistics and the time in all this. It took some effort to get it changed from a TRS meeting, which we thought would be better to have it for a special RAB, maybe have a larger turn out. I noticed that there was an effort to make a contact through the media and so on.

I also want to remind you that there's a deadline by November to make comments on this. So on your way out, there's copies that you may want to take and turn those in.

DR. DAVID SMITH: Okay. Thank you, sir. Next item on the agenda is the report on the ATSDR, the registry of community update past air emission report. My understanding is that Mr. Fowler is going to set that off. Is that correct?

As you all recall, one of the strategies we've used in the past has been if there are particular questions that you know that you want to ask, sometimes it would be helpful if we can get them out. The folks up there can write them on the board. Perhaps the presenter can address them during them during the presentation, rather than having to come back around that way.

So, are there some particular questions that you would like to ask and be raised at this point so we can get them on the board, perhaps get them responded to?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Will we have questions and answers after they speak?

DR. DAVID SMITH: We shall do that too. We shall do that too.

Any questions?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Did the ATSDR find any connection with the heath problems in the community and the chemicals being used inside the base?

DR. DAVID SMITH: All right. Thank you. Okay. We will ask you to then hold your questions until the end of the presentation. We'll try to get everything written down that we possibly can and get those responses noted and try to stay within some kind of time boundaries on that.

Mr. Fowler, let me get out of your way and give you a little room to work here.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Can I ask another question?

DR. DAVID SMITH: Sure.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: How many times has ATSDR sided with the community on health assessment rather than the agency or corporation?

DR. DAVID SMITH: They will put that on the board.

MR. WILKINSON: Is the EPA here?

DR. DAVID SMITH: I'm sorry. We're dealing with the ATSDR right now.

MR. WILKINSON: He's part of the government. He needs to give us a definition of chemical rain.

DR. DAVID SMITH: We're going to stay with the report tonight.

MR. WILKINSON: Well, the ATSDR can give us the definition of chemical rain.

DR. DAVID SMITH: Put that on the list of requested information.

Yes, ma'am?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: My question is: Why does the ATSDR reach conclusions when they do not have sufficient data to make it up? And how many times has ATSDR sided with the community rather than --

MS. ROBYN THOMPSON: I didn't get the last part.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- federal facilities, agencies, industries, corporations?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I have one of those wells that are capped around here. Are they leaking?

DR. DAVID SMITH: Are the capped wells leaking? Is that correct?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.

MR. WILKINSON: I have a question. You're taking contaminated water, dumping it into whatever that creak is...

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Leon.

MR. WILKINSON: That in turn dumps into Medina or whatever. I haven't followed it. Then it ultimately ends up in San Antonio River, which goes to San Antonio Bay, which gets into the our ship channels and our channels and pollutes the bay of Corpus Christi. What are y'all doing? Y'all are moving one contamination to another site. You're not destroying it. You're just removing -- you're just moving it to a different spot. Same thing with the Robstown.

DR. DAVID SMITH: Mr. Wilkinson, is there a question?

MR. WILKINSON: Yes. Why are you not destroying the

chemicals of -- instead of just redistributing these chemicals?

DR. DAVID SMITH: Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I live behind Kelly field where jet fuel tanks were. I have a very bad smell behind my house where I can't let my grandchildren play in the backyard because they are close and it penetrates to our bodies and into our clothes. And I want to know if they're going to get rid of that smell.

DR. DAVID SMITH: Okay. We'll make sure we got that question.

Tim, are you catching that one?

MR. SULTENFUSS: I'm going to write down: Is the Air Force going to address the smell near my house? Is that okay?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah, because I have a very bad smell behind my house where the jet fuel tanks were. And we can't go outside and my grandkids can't play outside because of that smell and when they come inside the smell is very bad and our clothes smell very bad. And we have health problems with our being there too.

DR. DAVID SMITH: Thank you. We'll come back and respond to these questions.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: What is the ATSDR community involvement plan or how do they do that? Why do they not involve community members when developing plans?

DR. DAVID SMITH: Anything else?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Did ATSDR find any connection to the workers' health? Did they do a worker survey and compare it to the chemicals that were used and what were those? What were those impacts? Are they the same as health products in the community?

MS. GALVAN: I'd like to ask a question to ATSDR. I know that in the past -- I read many articles on the studies that ATSDR did. They were going to go back and do a study on the ex-Kelly workers, and I don't know if they've ever done that. Is that ever going to get done; a study on their cancers and see if they can cluster them, see if there's any kind of connection there to what they were exposed to.

DR. DAVID SMITH: Okay.

MR. WILKINSON: And make a note if they do a specific study on the workers that S-7 Sites.

MS. GALVAN: I'd like to have that done too. Especially that site where there's -- I haven't seen the evidence, but the actual evidence that he's presenting or may present in the future to -- hopefully we can make some kind of explanation as to why ex-Kelly workers are coming down with cancer and dying at the present time. Before they keep dying.

MR. SULTENFUSS: I have, "Is the ATSDR going to do a study on past Kelly workers?"

MS. GALVAN: Well, they brought it up. It's mentioned several times in their studies.

DR. DAVID SMITH: What happened with that?

MS. GALVAN: I'd like to know what happened with that study? Why haven't they done it?

DR. DAVID SMITH: Robyn, would you flip your chart back. We don't have all of that.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: You left off about half of the question. It was: Was there any connection with the health symptoms that workers suffered or were they similar to the community health symptoms?

And did ATSDR survey the workers, do a health survey, to find out what chemicals they worked with and the connection to their health problem?

MR. MUZQUIZ: I'd like to know who ultimately pays for ATSDR?

DR. DAVID SMITH: Who ultimately pays for ATSDR action?

MR. MUZQUIZ: Right. Which agency?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Is it going to take five years before the final draft of this report is released?

DR. DAVID SMITH: Okay. Are we ready for presentation? Mr. Fowler, let me get you on that. I'll turn it to you.

DR. DAVID FOWLER: Thank you. I'm David Fowler. And this is Brian Kaplan. This is Maria Teran-MacIver.

MR. SILVAS: Get closer to the microphone.

DR. DAVID FOWLER: We are from ATSDR in Atlanta. We were asked to come here by our management during the public

comment period to answer any technical questions about past air emissions, how that document was conceived and how it was -- the methodology that was used to form our findings.

The ideal was for us to come during the comment period so that you would still have time to make public comments, written comments to us about the document.

I would like for people to read the document, see what the document says. It seems all too often people listen to what other people say and don't read the document for themselves. And we're here to try to help you get through some of this technical stuff.

Now, we're asked to come here just for the past air emissions. The other issues are beyond our control. We're just technical people to do this. We would like for you to hold questions until the end and let us go through what we have to offer.

We will be coming back in December or January. Maria will talk to people about when the best time for that will be to be -- to go through an entire thing about what's happened at this site since the petition came about. What all has happened, what the findings were and try to tie things together. Over this long period of time, people lose sight of what's happened and we want to try to tie that together for everyone.

I also will have people here to address each of the other issues that we can't address. The health outcome data, you

know, we can't address that. Someone will be here for that. And we'll have somebody to address East Kelly. We'll have someone to address each of the other documents for the site.

But tonight we're going to talk about the past air emissions and we're going to explain what we did to come up with an estimate of those emissions. For a -- just an overview of why we did past air missions, think back to 1999, the original EHA, the original health assessment that was issued, we identified elevated liver cancers, elevated birth defects, elevated low birth weighs and leukemia in the community.

Now, when you identify these kinds of things, you have to look to see if they might be from any environmental exposure.

For the liver cancer, we determined that it was so widespread throughout most of South Texas that it is unlikely that it was due to Kelly.

For the birth defects and low birth weight, they were issues that are happening within a year. So the emissions at that time were very low, so it's unlikely that they would lead to -- the environmental exposures would lead back from Kelly, from the data we have.

For the leukemia, however, any cancer typically has a latency period. When we identified the elevated leukemia, it was from 1990 to 1994. Leukemia latency, the time after the exposure, before the onset of the disease, probably runs 5 to 20

years. So that meant we had to look at air emissions back to about 1970 for that. That meant going beyond 1994. In 1994 they changed jet fuels from JP-4 to JP-8. So what we had to try to do was reconstruct what past air missions may have been during that period of time.

Brian has done a great job because this has not been done before. A reconstruction like this, normally what happens is you say, well, we just can't go back there and do it. It wasn't monitoring air facts. But we felt like because we knew they were emissions that -- from JP-4 that -- JP-4 contains more benzene, for instance than JP-8. So that, coupled with the elevated leukemia, comes a little smoke that we felt like we had to look at to clarify for the community.

So, in looking back over this, in reconstructing this, the tough part was the methodology. How in the world are we going to do it because we didn't have any expertise and operations and jet aircraft and all the many facets of it. It was a very complicated exercise to go through. And Brian's done a great job going through this, and I'd like for you to get a feel of what he did going through the methodology that he developed to look at this and see what we looked at, how we developed it. Then we'll talk about what those findings coming out of that may mean.

So, Brian will come up and...

MR. BRIAN KAPLAN: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen.

Good evening, Board. It will take me a second to calm down here and get comfortable.

Like David said, I'm going to go through methodology. In the science of environment, historically when you go back to, say, pre 70's, there hasn't been a lot of ambient data collected, but there has been some data collected on what industry had and what they were emitting.

So for us to reconstruct the past, we had to rely on that data. The data wasn't one hundred percent complete, it might not have even be 50 percent complete. We dug through the data and I'll present some of that to you tonight. And if you have other ideas of where we can get that data, we would love to hear it.

I didn't do this alone. I had some help, and here is three of the people -- three of four of the people that helped me. There were a number of data sources that we need to obtain. A number of data that we needed to get. Charles Williams was our point and contact when we started this work several years ago. He obtained a lot of the information that we got on jet aircraft that I found in the literature. He also helped us get some historical information on the actual industrial operations.

So when I'm talking tonight, I'm going to be talking about industrial operations and aircraft operations. At the end we sort of bring those two together.

Evert Douglas, he's with the Navy Aircraft

Environmental Safety Office. If there's one person you need to go to talk about aircraft exhaust, he's the man. He helped us interpret some of the data on aircraft engine testing.

Vincent Tino and George Siple at DCM, they're our contractor that did the initial air disbursement modeling for the aircraft. They divided it so that we can then take their results, their model, and they were able to run different scenarios on it to test -- do sensitivity analysis, different number of operations and different number of claims. They'll become clear in a moment.

As I was saying, the reconstruction of past air concentrations, there was no monitoring data so we had to run a air disbursement model, which is basically a mathematical formulation to simulate the environment. But you need to know where the emissions locations are, whether it's industrial or aircraft. And I'll show you some details of that in a moment.

Also, you need to know the emission perimeters, what chemicals are being emitted, how much, how fast, and under what conditions. Chemicals in a staff gas that are released at higher temperature are going to float out of that stack much higher than emissions that are more colder or any ambient temperature that may settle back down to the ground. So you need to know temperatures.

And then of course the model. We used a model called Industrial Source Complex Short-Term Version III Model. It's a

model the EPA has been using for a number of years, and it's a pretty robust model that the EPA has been using as well as the states.

But you also need the -- the model has been reviewed, peer reviewed, and has been pretty well tested, but it does leave uncertainties in it. And then the model parameters, how you run the model is also a concern. I have a slide or two on that also.

Of course, there's a lot of uncertainties and limitations in trying to reconstruct anything from the past. One is the model itself. Does it adequately model? Does it adequately simulate the environment? Under the best conditions, the model we used can estimate the actual results about plus or minus 100 percent. Which means that if you had a model result of one microgram per cubic meter, the actual results can be .5 to 2 micrograms per cubic meter. Which in the scheme of things is pretty good, and I'll show you why at the end.

Model inputs. By and far, that's the largest uncertainty that we have in this case, and any test modeling exercise. Where were all those emission locations? How much were those emissions? What were those chemicals?

How about -- a lot of times you'll have data from routine releases, such as from a factory or so forth. But if there's unusual circumstances, upsets or spills, those are not always captured in the data. But they may have occurred and it's very difficult for us to obtain any of that.

And then another -- a large uncertainty is emissions averaged over a year. Meaning, when you look though these records, you usually get an emission amount over a year. Say, ten times per year. However, for an amount of the exercise, we have to average that out over the entire year. We have to assume that that emission amount is up -- is coming from that factory or that aircraft 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, 365 days a year. However, if that industrial facility or aircraft had seasonal variations or daily variations, we weren't able to capture that because we didn't have the data in those cases. For instance, the factory may only be operating eight hours a day, five days a week. The aircraft may only be operating during the day. So, in effect, it smoothes out our numbers.

Some of the sources. Again, the largest uncertainty is the model of that emissions number, and this is how we got our data. Again, we broke it down into stationary and aircraft. For stationary, Kelly Air Force conducted several studies for us. It's a series of three reports. They look at historical records and they grouped the data into periods of emissions from '70 to '75 and '83 to '89. That was the -- those years, those periods, where the best data that they said they could get for us.

Current -- I threw current up there. It's 1995. We previously released the report looking at current emissions. And I just wanted to throw up the year up there for reference for our previous -- for the study -- for the data that we had from past

years. Current was defined as 1995 to base closure, and that's when we started working on Kelly Air Force Base.

So, again, when we're looking at past, when I talk about industrial emissions, it's from 1970 to '75 and '83 to '89. Those documents put that in perspective, the previous years into other emissions that the facility may be -- that Kelly had.

Aircraft. Aircraft we broke down into specific data in general studies. Specific data would be the types of aircraft that flew in and out of Kelly, the number of operations, the type of engines on those planes, and so forth.

The general studies are: What's coming out of those jet engines? Well, the Air Force, in the late 70s and middle 80s conducted a number of studies on aircrafts to actually determine what was coming out of those engines, what hazardous air pollutants was coming out of those engines. It was key for us to do that work. And I'll show you a sample of those results.

That work was done generally -- it wasn't done specifically for Kelly. It was done for Air Force base and Navy installation base-wide concerns about what was coming out of jet aircraft.

And then metrological data, you need that for the model. I won't go into that, but we had surface data from San Antonio. Okay.

Here are all the emission sources that we were able to identify represented in the red dots. There are about 1400

unique emission locations. Up in the northeast you can see there's dots representing the tank farm. I won't go each and every one of these dots, but in our report we list the buildings that we included in our modeling exercise. We did not include every building in our modeling exercise because we're -- we had to filter out -- and our filtering is based on quantity and toxicity. What were the risk drivers? When you see the results, you'll see how that falls out.

The blue dots represent the aircraft locations. And that -- those aircraft locations were simulated by us. Each dot represents a single model location, and those are approximately three seconds apart. I'll show a couple more slides on that in a moment.

Talking strictly about stationary sources for another minute. Other data -- I was talking about the physical parameters of the release. You need to know the temperature of the exit gas, the diameter of the stag gas that exits. These other parameters you might not be interested in. Sometimes these parameters were not available so we defaulted to conservative values, which are shown in parenthesis, so that when the chemical was released, it would be released so that the worse case most -- the most contaminated air would occur. And I'll show you how that plays out in a moment.

Okay. I don't know if you can see this, but this particular slide highlights the emission points for methylene

chloride. There are 12 -- this is just an example. I'm not going to show -- this is the only one I'm going to show of the emission locations. Those are shown in yellow. There are 12 locations for methylene chloride, three of them highlighted with numbers. The one in the center it says 2.6 pounds per hour. I don't know if you can see that. Maybe I need to point it out.

MR. WILKINSON: What is methylene chloride?

MR. BRIAN KAPLAN: Methylene chloride it's used in stripping paint.

Can you hear me okay?

Again, these yellow locations represent the places where there are methylene chloride releases. And I only highlighted a couple ones. The greatest ones that were emitting -- here's 2.6 pounds per hour, and that was, I believe, a painting and stripping operation. Paint stripping operation.

MR. WILKINSON: Is that where the B-52s caught on fire?

MR. BRIAN KAPLAN: Sorry, sir?

MR. WILKINSON: Is that where the B-52s caught on fire, in that area?

MR. BRIAN KAPLAN: I do not know that -- where that location is. The question is: Is that where the B-52 caught on fire? I don't know. Perhaps you can point -- tell us when and we can figure that out.

MR. WILKINSON: That's the general area.

MR. BRIAN KAPLAN: Okay. Okay, this chart is a little

complicated, so let me explain it. Along the bottom is distance from the source. Along the "Y" access is concentration. In this particular case we modeled chromium emissions from one single source. We tried different model parameters. The point I want to make is that you can run the model under rural dispersion and urban dispersion. Here's world dispersion in green dots and in red. We took a conservative approach and used rural dispersion.

You can also adjust the heights of the different stacks. For default, we used 6.2 meters, which is -- results in higher concentrations. So when we didn't have staff parameters, we went with conservative concentrations.

It also shows that -- this is on base, so if you're going from an emission point out in a north or south direction with the base boundary being here or here, even though you change the model parameters, the result is large differences in concentrations on base. But when you reach the base boundaries, the mixing results in similar concentrations. So, we went with conservative approaches. Although in the end it may not matter, depending on where you were on the base, where the emission plant was on the base.

Okay. That's all I have to say about our methodology for stationary industrial sources. I will show you results in a moment for that, but we're moving to aircraft. We have to know the types of planes and engines, the frequencies of take-off and operations, the locations and emission factors and time and mode.

Mode is taxiing, runway roll, climb out, and so force. So you need to know how long each plane was in one of those modes. And I've got an example of that in a second.

Okay. Getting a list of planes for Kelly. Well, here is what I was able to put together. It came from the Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement. It also came from Kelly's official pictorial history book. How's that for a source?

MR. WILKINSON: Do you have a breakdown of which airplanes used what kinds of J-fuels?

MR. BRIAN KAPLAN: Question is -- can you repeat that please?

MR. WILKINSON: What specific airplanes used what specific J-fuels.

MR. BRIAN KAPLAN: J-fuels?

MR. WILKINSON: Yes.

MR. BRIAN KAPLAN: The question is: Do we have information about what particular planes to what particular fuels.

DR. DAVID SMITH: We'll note that question. Please hold questions until the end. We asked you to do that.

MR. BRIAN KAPLAN: Well, we assumed all the planes used JP-4.

There's also a study that was done on noise, historic noise, that had a list of aircraft too. Also this chart doesn't

show different variations of the planes; like a B-52 could come in a B-52-A, B, C, D; up through H, I believe. And so can a C-130 and C-141.

Now, I was talking about emission factors, what's coming out of the jet engine. And we got that from studies that the Air Force did in general. The planes shown in gold are the planes that we had emission factors for. For those other planes and other engines, there's no data on what was coming out of those jet engines. So, we're left with a choice.

And we didn't exactly know what exact fleet of planes were operating in and out of Kelly, so we took a conservative and less conservative approach. First we assumed all the -- based on the data that we had, the B-52 was the highest emitting aircraft. It had eight engines. It was emitting the most hydrocarbons. And we had breakdown of what those hydrocarbons were. Well, it was benzene and butadiene.

For a less conservative approach, we also looked at the F-16. It had one engine. And although it didn't exist in the 60's, it was our proxy for a less polluting airplane. So we were looking at a range emissions.

Okay. Here's a picture I found -- a quite interesting picture I found in a report to Congress in 1968. The report to Congress was done by a predecessor agency of the Department of Health and Human Services, and they're talking about aircraft emissions. In this particular picture, they're

showing how -- here's the typical engines on a B-52. There's two on each pod. But they're trying out a different angles to see -- to compare the results. And although it's very difficult to see, the caption says, "Note the absence of smoke from the JT-9-D engine right here located on the right wing at the in-board location."

So, the point of this is that the emission tests that the Air Force did were done in the late 70's and early 80's. It is -- it's sort of a jump to say that those tests represent engines from the 1960's, but it's an assumption we made. So we sort of tried to get around this by saying, in a moment, that we looked at all aircraft coming out of Kelly that were B-52s for one of our model runs.

Okay. Aircraft, number of operations. This was another key. There was -- in the Environment Impact Statement that Kelly did, this chart goes from '95 to '64 with the peek operations in '64 of 336,000 operations.

The blue diamonds with lines represent consecutive years where data existed. There was no data between '73 and '68 or from '68 to '64. You only can assume -- you can't assume anything in here. It could be higher or lower. But we modeled 336,000 operations because that was the best data we had.

We also looked at -- we took an average of '95 and '73 of about 12,000 operations and we used that in our model too to get comparisons to see what the model was going to say. And

we -- again, we assumed that this was all B-52s. It's my understanding there's not enough B-52s in the world to have 336,000 operations. But we also used F-16 up here too, as well as a B-52 and F-16 down here also. Okay.

Here's another schematic of the aircraft coming in and out of Kelly. Kelly is in white. You may recognize the roads. Here's the highways. The yellow squares represent the flight paths that we used in our model. This is approach, landing, runway roll, take off. We assumed all taxiing was on one taxiway. And each one of these dots represents about every three seconds of aircraft flight.

Okay. Here's an overhead shot just showing you again the taxiway. All taxis were on this one runway. We compressed it to that because we didn't have enough details on all the taxiing. And then we did straight in and straight out trajectories even though this sort of looks like it's curving. We didn't do model turns.

Okay. Here's a -- it's from the side to show you that we started our molding out at 5.7 miles and the plane was at 1570 feet. And take offs, it went up to 1.5 miles, up to 4500 feet. And the distances were determined by the time and mode.

So the time and mode for approach is defined as, I think, 1.5 minutes. So we got 1.5 minutes. The distance was determined by the speed of the plane. And take-off, it looks like -- I think this is four and-a-half minutes -- and take-off

is one and-a-half minutes. So that's what the distance was determined by.

Okay. I was talking about emission factors. This was the key for us to be able to do this. This is a sampling of only a few of the compounds. There were 61 compounds in this report, mostly volatile organic compounds, some semi-volatiles, and 11 PAH's, poly aromatic hydrocarbons.

In this case I'm showing butadiene, benzene, naphthalene, formaldehyde, acid aldehyde, and acrolein. And along the top, it's important to know what tower setting those engines were run on. And they're typically tested at four different settings -- idle, 30 percent, 75 percent, and 100 percent. And then data was reported in parts per million in carbon, which in the science of the atmosphere is a pretty common unit. We converted that to percent ratio over the hydrocarbons, percent of(inaudible) air pollutants for hydrocarbon. That comes into play in a couple slides when I sort of explained how we calculated what was coming out of the engine on a per second basis.

Couple things to point out here is that this is for the B-52-H, using JP-4 fuel. That at idle. That's the worse time for a B-52-H engine. It was emitting the most at idle. So when that plane's idling on the taxiway, that would be the worse case time for that plane. But that's not always the case for every plane. For the F-16, the worse time for that engine is

when it's on engine check at the end of the runway and when it's taking off.

Also note that formaldehyde -- of all these chemicals, formaldehyde was the largest emitter. Also, benzene, butadiene, formaldehyde -- all these compounds -- are typical pollutants from automobile exhaust. When we're looking at exposures, it's almost impossible -- in fact, I don't know of no one who's done it, try to extinguish exposure from exhaust from aircraft versus automobiles.

Okay. I talked about aircraft mode. These came from Air Force guidance documents. Again, the different aircraft modes are start-up, outbound taxi, engine check, runway roll, climb-out, approach, landing, in-bound taxiing, idle and shutdown. The guidance documents break that down into different thrust settings, idle, military -- which, is 100 percent power -- and afterburner, if the plane uses afterburner. And then we have the number of minutes in each one of those modes. From the emission test results, we can get engine fuel flow per engine per hour, the amount of hydrocarbons per engine. Combining it with that ratio I talked about, that hazardous air pollutant hydrocarbon, we can get a number of grams of benzene per second for each one of those yellow dots that I showed you. And that's how I was able to model the emissions from the aircraft.

Okay. So sort of putting it all together now, we have the red dots representing industrial sources, the blue dots

representing the locations of the aircraft, and each one of these dots represents a concentration coming out of that stack, or coming out of the back of an engine. You put that into the model with the meter -- with weather data, and the model calculates a concentration. And each one of these black dots we went out to about 12 miles and 14 miles in the east/west direction. Each one of these represents -- it's about 300 meters apart.

So the next slide -- so that's sort of the end of my methodology. But the next slide is going to show you the peek concentrations we came up from -- the peek concentration for industrial and aircraft is located in this area off base. In this particular spot, the butadiene levels were 20 micrograms per cubic meter. We have the scenario -- I'm only showing the B-52 up here. We're showing before 1973, which is the 336,000 operations per year. The period '73 to '94 is a 112,000 operations per year. That's concentrations. And then there's the same things for cancer risks that we're showing.

So for butadiene before 1973, the maximum concentration based on our model was 20 micrograms per cubic meter, and it dropped to about a third of that between '73 and '94. And the risk numbers for butadiene was about 3 times 10 to minus 5 before '73. And 9 times 10 to minus 6 between '73 and '94.

Now, I don't know how many people are familiar with risk numbers. I just blurted those out, but this is

approximately 3 in 100,000, meaning that the model or the risk calculations estimates there would be about three additional cancer cases in 100,000 above background. And background is generally about one in three or one in four over a lifetime. And this is a lifetime number.

For benzene, similar concentrations are 20 and 7. This is no surprise because the jet exhaust tests show that they're emitting about the same amount. The risks were a little bit higher. Benzene is a higher slope factor for cancer. We're looking at about five additional cancers cases in 100,000 before '73. And between '73 and '94 it's about two in 100,000 additional cancer cases from the emissions.

Formaldehyde, higher concentrations, 58 micrograms per cubic meter before '73. And between '73 and '94, it's 19 micrograms per cubic meter. Because of those higher concentrations, the model risk of additional cancer cases would be two in 10,000 before '73, and seven in 100,000.

Now, David is going to explain what these numbers mean in a little bit more detail.

DR. DAVID FOWLER: Thank you, Brian. I like being up here too so I can point.

Can we have the next slide, please. Let's talk a little bit about the levels that we find and what they mean compared to some other levels that we know. This is formaldehyde, the comparison for formaldehyde. Over on the far

end we've got the number 7, which is an average outdoor level for formaldehyde. The average indoor air level, notice, goes up to about 40. The indoor air levels of formaldehyde have been found to be higher than outdoor levels because of the building materials inside.

A smoky bar -- smoke-filled bar, the levels were about 65. At Kelly, the maximum, using the B-52, was about 58. The lowest level where we see health effects occurring is about 195. Now, that seems to be a whole lot higher than the levels that we find here, and it is, but we need to understand where these numbers come from also. For instance, the health effects that we usually can look at are -- they either come from occupational studies about exposures in the past where they didn't know a lot about the chemicals and people were exposed to high levels in the past. They're not exposed to those high levels anymore, so you have to go back to the past to study it, to look to see at what levels they may have been exposed at and what kind of diseases came out of that.

Another thing about looking at occupational studies like that is that that latency period occurs and a lot of the diseases show up later on.

The other way we get numbers is from animal studies. And with animal studies, you're limited as far as how many animals you can use, so you give them very high doses. Sometimes you don't know if that's going to extrapolate down to low doses

that you can tell anything about, but if you don't give them high doses, you may not see an effect.

When you look at some of the effect levels that we're talking about -- if you're talking about what Brian was talking about, some that were occurring in the 100,000 range. If you had one in 100,000, to be able to see that, theoretically, you would have to have 100,000 animals in a study to see one case. Well, you got have more than that to be able to actually see and know that this is an effect and it's not an anomaly that occurred.

So you're talking about you would have to actually have millions of animals. You know, this is just not feasible. You can't afford it. How would you feed a million rats? You know, the logistics of it are not there. So you give them high doses to try to see an effect and then you kind of see -- do the best you can to see what happens at lower doses.

Of interest to us, because of leukemia, is benzene. The levels that we know something about -- on the far end we have outdoor levels at about six, and the national exposure has been estimated to be around 15. At Kelly we had about 20. The same smoky bar that they did some testing in was at 30. ATSDR has come up with a safe interim level. This is not a firm level, but 32 being at a safe level, and a hazard level of 320. We use that hazard level because this is where health effects started occurring at.

Now, let's take a look at what that means. This 320

was found in occupational studies. All right. Typically workers are the healthiest segment of the population. So, if we have something occurring in them, someone else might be more susceptible. It's not always true, but that's a good indicator.

Also, this is based on leukemia mortality. In looking back at these occupational studies, these people died of leukemia. They were exposed to these levels of benzene, and this is the lowest level.

So, what happens, you know, at levels lower than this? Do people have effects that did not result in mortality? Well, we don't really know what happened in that because I didn't look at it. The only thing that can tell about the past is to go back and look at the mortality.

So, what happens between this 32 and 320, we're not sure about. In any event, you always have to look toward what kind of health effects might be in the community because that's the true test of it all.

In butadiene comparison, these levels were -- for suburban levels, less than one. For urban levels, about two. In this same smoky bar, they were about 11. At Kelly they were about 20.

Around come petrochemical areas -- and I believe this was Houston -- they were -- in the neighborhoods they were like 310, and health effects start at 2200, which is a high number. But we also know very -- a lot less about benzene than we do

about -- I mean, butadiene than we do benzene.

So even though there's a lot of gap in between there, we don't have a lot of studies to show up in there that give -- let us lower this number anymore.

Okay. Now, there's a couple ways we look at risks that Brian was talking about. We can look at risks from the individual contaminant level or we can look at risk from accumulative level. What we try to do in a screening process is look at the accumulative level to see the comparison we have.

So, I'll let Brian talk to you about how we arrived and what these numbers mean because this record -- this was converted from concentrations into an accumulative -- his looking at all of the chemicals that he found in the air emissions.

MR. BRIAN KAPLAN: Now, you remember that slide I showed up there with the different grid points, where we calculated the concentration of each one of those grids? Well, for each one of those grids we took the concentration. And for that one particular maximum we calculated a cancer risk for benzene, butadiene, and formaldehyde.

Well, we calculated that risk for each one of those grid dots and summed all those risks together. We did accumulative risk, and then we connected the dots. We connected dots that had similar risk numbers. I'm only showing a couple different lines. And I broke it down by aircraft and stationary or industrial sources. This particular line represents all the

dots I connected. They represent risks of 1 times 10 to the minus 4, or what that means is one in 10,000. One additional risk cancer case in 10,000. That's for aircraft, and this is for industrial.

What it quickly shows is that under our modeling scenarios and assumptions that the aircraft was the primary source of concern for air emissions historically.

Now, for industrial. I believe is the hydrazine area. This, I believe, is the jet testing area. This, I believe, is the degreasing operation for tetrachloroethylene. This, I believe, is a painting operation. But we quickly saw that the aircraft was the major player of concern when we're looking at releases to air to off-base populations.

The slide also shows zip codes in the gray boxes with the numbers. Because we wanted to show in the health studies that have been released today, they always talk about zip codes. What were the elevated risks of leukemia incidents or mortality in those zip codes? So, it overlays zip codes 78227, 78237, a little bit of 78238, and 78228, and down here also, 78242 and 78211.

The point being is that if we're going to look at health outcome data, we need to look at it from a north and south elongated perspective. A lot of studies they'll just take a mild buffer, a five-mile buffer. Well, if we do that, we're going to take populations that weren't at as high a risk as people living

north and south of the base.

This picture also shows -- this picture is from 1995. We recently obtained pictures from aerial photographs from the, I think, early 60's, 50's to '74. So we want to look at that and see who's living here in different timeframes to see who's going to be exposed.

All righty. You can see --

MR. WILKINSON: (inaudible)

MR. BRIAN KAPLAN: Can you hold that question. We're almost done.

I can see areas that there's no residential populations here, here, and here.

This represents the accumulative risks from butadiene, benzene, and formaldehyde. Now, the health outcome data show elevated incidences of leukemia. Of those three chemicals, benzene and butadiene are said to contribute as risk factors.

DR. DAVID FOWLER: If I can comment on that. Benzene is a known leukemogen. It causes leukemia in high concentrations.

Butadiene is an animal carcinogen. We're not really sure about humans, but there are some studies that have associated butadiene with leukemia and lymphomas also.

So what we have done to kind of -- to put things together, we like for things to either have the same mechanism of

action or same mode of actions, but we usually don't have enough information to tell all about that. So we look at target organs that are effected. And if the same target organs are effected, then we lump those together and look at those as a whole.

I believe in Brian's next slide it shows how he looked at benzene and butadiene compared to background.

One other note while we're here is, formaldehyde. While it was present in the highest concentrations, we didn't see in the health outcome data, the health effects, that might be attributed to it. At least -- there's some controversy about formaldehyde, but the -- generally it causes cancers where it comes into contact with natural mucosa or a lung, you know, inhalation types of things. It happens right there. It's a normal constituent of the body also.

There are some reports of some leukemia in morticians and medical workers, but their exposures were different because they have some dermal exposure too and they're exposed to some other things. And there's not a biological plausibility to show how that may have happened yet. So we don't consider it the same as benzene and butadiene in this case.

MR. BRIAN KAPLAN: So, the previous slides show the accumulative cancer risk from benzene, butadiene, formaldehyde. For this particular slide, we just wanted to show the cancer risk from benzene and butadiene which are -- which is two chemicals that contribute to leukemia, which has been identified as

elevated north of the base. So we entered those risks from -- cancer risks from benzene and butadiene.

We also wanted to somehow take into consideration background concentrations. Now, we can't go back in the 60s and 70s and pull air monitor samples because they didn't exist. However, for the last six or eight years, there's been an air toxic monitor on the east side of San Antonio. So, I pulled those numbers and I calculated a cancer risk that is being monitored currently for benzene and butadiene. And that current background risk is about one in 100,000; one additional cancer case in a population of 100,000.

I took that number and I subtracted that from the risk numbers that are our model is saying is attributed to aircraft operations from Kelly, and that's what this line represents. What it's saying is that everything inside this line, risk-wise, is above background. Again, it's important to note what zip codes this background risk is showing. Several to the north and one or two to the south.

David, did you want to ...

DR. DAVID FOWLER: One thing to know is benzene and butadiene are ubiquitous in the environment because of all the exhaust and other fuel burning. You have a lot of that, so we wanted to look at -- we don't know how much was in the environment to see how much came just from Kelly and not the whole thing.

MR. BRIAN KAPLAN: Yeah. We're also doing a temporal disconnect. We're looking at background concentrations collected in last six or seven years versus our trying to do past exposures in the 60s and 70s for Kelly. Cars have become cleaner over the years. Benzene in gasoline has been reduced. There's been -- there's more cars now than there were in the past, but the cars back then were less clean burning. So it's really hard to discern how that temporal disconnect falls out. But, again, it gives you some general idea what above background is.

DR. DAVID FOWLER: Okay. On the findings, to summarize those. The exposure to the individual chemicals, that's each one by itself, is not likely to result in health effects. As you saw from the graphs, the bar graphs, the levels at which health effects occur are much higher than the levels that were at Kelly. However, we don't know about a lot of that middle ground in there to other populations. Also, we don't know what exposure to the mixture would be. We call that "indeterminate," and I'll explain why in just a second.

The other conclusions were that there's not enough information on (inaudible) chromium before 1990 on misting or incineration. We didn't have data on that to evaluate.

Now, what I mean by "indeterminate" is we're not making a call on that because we don't have enough data. The data that we have we're not that sure about. We don't have data, for instance, on misting. You know, so we don't have a complete

picture of that. We don't know that some of the data that we found and we used is correct. We don't know that the -- it's a good thing to use the B-52 as the worse case. We don't know that this is the worse case. We think it is, and that's the way we constructed this to look at it as the worse case.

The exposure we're not sure about because we've calculated the cause of the model on a 24-hour annual average. Well, we know that's probably not how it occurred. Most of the flights were going to occur, for instance, we think, you know, during daylight hours. Maybe during week days versus weekends. And we -- to compare this annual average, it's spread out over 24 hours.

So the way that exposure occurs might be different. There's some indication that there's not just the duration of exposure that contributes to toxicity. Sometimes if you have higher levels for a shorter period of time, it seems to have an effect on some of these.

We're not sure about some of the toxicology because we don't know what happens when you get below levels where health effects have been reported at. We know where some safe levels are where they've never been reported. But in that grey area, no one can say about any particular individual. It's just, you know, in an area of increase.

We don't know about, like, the epidemiology. Epidemiology talks about associations, an association between

benzene and leukemia. It doesn't talk about cause and effect and it doesn't show cause and effect.

So, there are things we're not sure about. But what we've decided to do -- even if we found that levels were very, very high, what would be the next that we did? The next that we did would be to look to see if we had health effects in the exposed population. Now, these were expected health effects. In other words, for benzene we would be looking for leukemia. For other things we might -- for chromium, we might be looking for lung cancer.

So, we looked to see, are there health effects? Because that's always the defining criteria of an exposure. If it's high enough, were there health effects from it.

So our next slide, our recommendation is to investigate the elevated leukemia outcome. They're currently doing this and they've split out their investigation from cancer incidents and they also have reports on leukemia.

Now, at our next meeting we have to bring all these people together and go from the initial petition, what all has happened with it, and whose done what in the community and within the state and with ATSDR. So, we want to recap all those events. There will also be an update on the East Kelly Health Assessment and an update on the Health Outcome Data.

We have a few documents over here, if anybody would like those. And I think the public comment period ends the 30th

of November. So you need to have comments, you need to write those comments into us.

We thank you.

DR. DAVID SMITH: Thank you, sir. The vision here is that we'll have an opportunity to respond to any questions that can be responded to. We need to talk a little bit about when that next meeting is going to be, as I understand that. And also, to raise any additional questions that might want to be raised.

What I'm going to ask you to do, though, is if you all are willing, we've been -- RAB members at least have been sitting still an awful long time.

Would you suggest a break?

MR. SILVAS: Yes. Let's take a break and we'll come back and ask some questions.

DR. DAVID SMITH: Ten minutes or so?

MR. SILVAS: Ten minutes.

DR. DAVID SMITH: About a 10-minute break, please, and then we'll come back and answer questions.

(BREAK)

DR. DAVID SMITH: Okay, if I can get everyone settled in, we'll get started, please.

We are at that point on the agenda where we're going to try to be responsive as much as possible to questions that have already been asked; those ones on the board that didn't come

and then we'll pick up the new ones, if that's all right with you.

Tim, would you be willing to kind of read the question for us since it was....

MR. SULTENFUSS: Does the ATSDR find any connection between the health problems in the community and the chemicals used on the base?

DR. DAVID FOWLER: We've just been through all this. Did anybody answer that?

MR. WILKINSON: I believe your chart showed it did.

DR. DAVID SMITH: Okay.

MS. ROBYN THOMPSON: How many times has ATSDR agreed with the community rather than federal facility, agency, industry or corporation?

MR. WILKINSON: Which side of the fence are you on?

MR. BRIAN KAPLAN: That's one I can't answer.

DR. DAVID SMITH: Can't answer? Okay.

MR. SULTENFUSS: Why does ATSDR make conclusions without sufficient data?

DR. DAVID FOWLER: If you waited until you had everything, you might never have one. So, we bring what we know, the data used, and what we can decide about that to you. If there's not enough data to make the call, we call it indeterminate.

DR. DAVID SMITH: Thank you. Next question.

MS. ROBYN THOMPSON: I don't know if this is necessarily directed to you, but why are you not destroying the chemicals?

DR. DAVID FOWLER: I can't answer that.

DR. DAVID SMITH: All right. We'll save that one.

MR. SULTENFUSS: Are the capped wells leaking?

DR. DAVID FOWLER: I can't answer that.

DR. DAVID SMITH: Okay.

MR. SULTENFUSS: Is the Air Force going to address the smell near my house near the old fuel tanks?

DR. DAVID FOWLER: I feel sure they will.

MR. WILLIAM RYAN: Yes. I mean, if we have the name and the address of the lady who made that comment, we'll get in touch with her and see what we can do.

DR. DAVID SMITH: I don't know if you all can hear that. Mr. Ryan's comment was if you give him your name and address, he will follow that up for us.

Yes. Another question?

MS. ROBYN THOMPSON: What is ATSDR's community involvement plan?

DR. DAVID FOWLER: We have our community involvement specialist here. She might recap some of the things we've done since -- for the last eight years or so.

MS. TERAN-MacIVER: First thing that we did with the community is to have a session to ask for community concerns, so

that we had those up front when we went to do our study and looked at the data. When we look at data -- when we look to do a public health assessment, we look at three types of data. First, is the environmental data. Second, is the community concerns. And third, is health outcome data to see if there's any diseases in the community.

Also, we have held community education programs, we have held nursing and doctor education programs, and we've also had meet meetings in which we had facts sheets to tell the people our results. And we've also invited the community to help us to plan the meetings, and that's one of the reasons why I want to know from the community tonight whether they would rather that we had that meeting in December, 14th or the 15th, or have it in January. So...

MR. WILKINSON: December.

MS. TERAN-MacIVER: I have one December. Does anybody else have any ideas? The reason I ask is because in December a lot of people are doing things with Christmas, and so I'd like to hear from the community whether or not they'd like to have a meeting in December.

MR. SILVAS: I think before we leave here tonight we'll come to a decision on that, but December would probably be a good timeframe.

MS. TERAN-MacIVER: Okay. All right. So, that's some of the things that we do in community involvement.

DR. DAVID SMITH: Thank you, ma'am.

MR. SULTENFUSS: Why does ATSDR not involve communities in developing this assessment?

DR. DAVID FOWLER: We did.

MS. ROBYN THOMPSON: Is there a connection to the chemical and workers health? Were workers' symptoms similar to community members' symptoms?

DR. DAVID FOWLER: We don't address things are under the purview or OSHA or NIOSH. So workers are not really our thing. We did look at some on-base issues, not for the workers, but to other personnel who may have been on base that may not be protected by OSHA or NIOSH.

DR. DAVID SMITH: Okay. Thank you.

MR. SULTENFUSS: From Ms. Galvan. Is ATSDR going to do a study on the past Kelly workers and what happened with that?

DR. DAVID FOWLER: There was a mortality study that was done. ATSDR did not do it. I'm not familiar with it enough to comment.

MR. WILKINSON: Excuse me. Can you give me specific names of these people who are in charge of this so we can get ahold of them so they can answer the questions instead of they -- because all I've heard since 1984 is, they killed you. I want the name of the person that killed me.

DR. DAVID FOWLER: I'm not quite sure what the question is.

MR. WILKINSON: They always say, they.

DR. DAVID FOWLER: Maybe if you could write it down.

MR. WILKINSON: You do not specifically say a person. You say "they," and "they" is the whole world. You're not -- you're not giving me --

DR. DAVID FOWLER: Maybe if you could write it down we could get somebody to respond to it. I can't.

MR. WILKINSON: You write the names down --

DR. DAVID FOWLER: I can't respond to it.

MR. WILKINSON: Yeah, I know. You're covering up.

MR. SULTENFUSS: Is there any other discuss on that question?

The next question: Did ATSDR survey the workers to find out their health problems and the chemicals they worked with?

DR. DAVID FOWLER: No. We don't do things under the purview OSHA or NIOSH.

DR. DAVID SMITH: That apparently is a boundary that I think is helpful for people to understand, that ATSDR does not address OSHA or NIOSH.

MS. ROBYN THOMPSON: Who pays for ATSDR?

MR. MUZQUIZ: Who pays for the studies, in other words?

MS. ABBI POWER: I can help you on that one.

DR. DAVID FOWLER: Federal Government.

MR. MUZQUIZ: Is it the DOD, is it the Department of

Air Force?

DR. DAVID FOWLER: We're under the health and human services.

MR. WILKINSON: Texas? United States?

DR. DAVID FOWLER: You know, their budgeting process, I don't know.

MR. WILKINSON: Texas? United States? Which?

DR. DAVID FOWLER: The United States Government.

MS. ROBYN THOMPSON: Will it take five years to release the final draft of this report?

DR. DAVID FOWLER: I hope not.

DR. DAVID SMITH: Okay, let us see if we can get some other questions on the list here.

Mr. Quintanilla will you...

DR. DAVID FOWLER: I think what you need to do with the questions -- we're not going to be able to answer questions unless they're pertaining to the technical past air emissions. You're going to have to field those questions for someone else. As we said in the meeting we're coming back to, we'll have management representatives, people like that for you to talk to. But I can't answer questions for other divisions and management and other people that -- you know, I just don't know. This is just a technical thing on past air emissions.

MR. SILVAS: Well, can we just try and go ahead and answer what we can tonight and whatever's not, we'll carry that

to the next meeting?

DR. DAVID FOWLER: Well, if they're about past air emissions --

MR. SILVAS: Correct. Correct.

DR. DAVID FOWLER: -- sure.

MR. SILVAS: Open it up for questions.

MR. QUINTANILLA: I have one question. I don't feel -- we've been at this for a large number of years and we've burned a lot of tax dollars and a lot of time, both professional plus our time. We have a lot of professionals here that come in and listen to this and we don't have any good conclusions, and the reason is insufficient data.

This question is to Mr. Ryan and I have several other questions that will follow that. Mr. Ryan, is there any more air emission information in your area that you can give them that may help us put this thing to bed, the past emission air studies to bed? Do they have all the information that you have or is there any other information there left?

MR. WILLIAM RYAN: Mr. Quintanilla, you saw the acknowledgments at the beginning of the briefing that named some of the folks who helped put together that data. They were quite diligent but, you know, we were more than willing to take another look and see if there's any data gaps that we can fill.

MR. QUINTANILLA: That is relevant.

MR. WILLIAM RYAN: Sure. Right. I know. Specific to

these topics.

DR. DAVID FOWLER: If I can comment. What we have done is take the next step anyway. So other data, you know, is not going to change that. Yes, we want to look further at elevated leukemia.

MR. SILVAS: I'd like to add something to Mr. Quintanilla's question regarding information. Was there anything that was held back due to classification, being classified?

DR. DAVID FOWLER: No, not to my knowledge.

MR. WILKINSON: I have a question.

DR. DAVID SMITH: Just a second please.

MR. SILVAS: Mr. Quintanilla -- or Mr. Wilkinson?

MR. WILKINSON: When the military -- when the men and women started working together and they took off the draft, women were working on the lines cleaning and working on jets, cleaning, going inside, looking at fans and stuff. When they became pregnant, they were pulled, immediately pulled off the jet line. If they became pregnant and did not tell the military, they were dishonorably discharged. This is due to the fact that the J-4 fuels were causing mental retardation. Why don't you use that as a statistical study?

DR. DAVID FOWLER: I'm not aware of that. If you could perhaps give us the data on that and we will be happy to look at it.

MR. WILKINSON: Why don't you ask the DOD why they pulled female women off the lines.

DR. DAVID FOWLER: Actually, I guess, that would be under purview of NIOSH or OSHA.

MR. SILVAS: Mr. Quintanilla?

MR. QUINTANILLA: Yeah, the next question that we have, we heard, you know, from ATSDR. And I guess our next job is to get someone, an independent study, to look at what they've got and let them make some suggestions. And I'm talking about using our TAPP money. I think we already set some aside for this particular thing, look at this thing and find out what is needed. Maybe they Know what information is needed, the University of Maryland, you know. And then put it to bed, you know, that's it. Forget about the air emissions. But we need to -- you know, to wait four our five years for this air emission study and then not have enough data to be gathered in those four years for them to come up with something, that's a shame. That's a waste of tax dollars.

MR. SILVAS: I agree.

MR. WILKINSON: Big stall tactic.

MR. SILVAS: Rodrigo, question?

MR. GARCIA: I agree with Mr. Quintanilla. There's still too many questions that are unanswered concerning health effects, respiratory problems, as well as the things that you mentioned. You say that these health problems are indeterminate

and yet you show us maps that show us if you live in a red zone, you're probably susceptible to this, this, leukemia, and all this. I happen to live in one of those red zones and I see -- on 38th street -- and I see I am in there. And then I realize -- and they say health problems are indeterminate. That is wrong. We need to be more specific and do more detailed research on this. Air pollution causes health problems. There's no doubt about it. It's recorded and we need to tie it in and get some very specific work down. We need to get records.

Did you study the first Texas Air Study in 1952? What did that say about air pollution? Also, the Clear Air Act was passed in 1963. Did you study all the violations that Kelly had on the Clear Air Act, the changes to the Clean Air Act and the Ambient Air Program of 1971? Where did all these violations happen? Did you get all the Air Force records on air pollution and air emissions? Did you get all the EPA from Mr. Miller? Did you get all the EPA records of air emissions and air violations that Kelly might have? And from the state, and everybody else, did you get any studies from the Air Force on their employees that got sick or got retired early because they had health problems from working at Kelly?

There are too many questions that have to be asked, too many reports, and too much investigation that has to be done before you or anybody else can say these health problems are indeterminate. I am very strong on this because my father died

of cancer and he worked over here too. My mother died of cancer also. She worked at Lackland. I'm positive that Kelly has something to with them getting that cancer. And I am not going to rest until we get somebody that does a real study on these health problems and not tell us they're indeterminate. There's too much research to be done, too much records to be looked at, too much health records that the Air Force might have on their employees that got sick while working, too much studies on air pollutions and air emissions that they have that they probably didn't give you.

I'm sick of this. We can't put this to rest until we get some positive answers and get some real results of what this is doing to human beings.

DR. DAVID FOWLER: Well, we hope that when we pull everything together in the final thing, people will be there that can answer your questions.

MR. SILVAS: Mr. Ryan, are there any Air Force thoughts about further studies?

MR. WILLIAM RYAN: Well, I think -- I mean, I think we've -- as I mentioned to Mr. Quintanilla, we gave all the information that we have related to these emissions and emission sources. And, you know, we can check again and recheck, but we can only provide what we have. As you know, I mean, early in the 70s and 60s, you know, air emissions were -- the air program was first developing and we did what we needed to do as an industry

to comply with those the requirements. But the records, you know, back in the 60s, you know, just may not exist.

MR. GONZALES: I have a question, if I may. May I ask my question now? I just have a question, sir. Has the -- has the ATSDR done any studies on other bases that closed or air studies, past air emission studies, at other bases that they have been able to conclude conclusively that there were problems generated from past air emissions or that there conclusively were not problems as the result of past air emissions?

DR. DAVID FOWLER: I don't know of all the things they looked at. To my knowledge, this was the first base where we reconstructed past air emissions.

MR. GONZALES: Okay. Thank you.

MS. ROBYN THOMPSON: Mr. Garcia has another question. Are there going to be any future studies?

MR. WILKINSON: Can I ask a question? There is an incinerator and they were using it to burn cyanide with it. Can we get the specifications from the manufacturers of that incinerator to see if that incinerator was qualified to burn off cyanide at that temperature?

MR. SILVAS: Yeah, that is a question that I was about to ask, and that there was regarding the incinerator. Because looking back on the December notes for a meeting, you had mentioned that -- in our meeting that was an incinerator used for about a year timeframe. Is that correct?

DR. DAVID FOWLER: Yes.

MR. SILVAS: Well, Mr. Ryan stated on the minutes from that December meeting that it was in operation for probably three to four years. And I think that this incinerator is an issue because it doesn't seem to be getting addressed in the matter that it needs to.

The TCEQ -- we brought that up and it wasn't properly addressed. They said that it didn't happen; they didn't get into the in-depth study that was required. After a TAPP review was done by Mr. Lynch, concern came up about that incinerator, and the plume and the winds of that plume that were never followed up and studied. I think we need to look into that further. And if Mr. Ryan can go back and look up the specks, the company, and forward that information to you, I think that would be a help in reviewing and going over it again because there's things in here that are lacking and the incinerator is one.

The other one would be the benzpyrene that I had asked you about earlier. And again, would you explain that to, not just myself, but to the members here that polyaromatic hydrocarbons and the benzpyrene is from a fuel that's unburned.

DR. DAVID FOWLER: No, it's from burned fuel.

MR. SILVAS: It's burned?

DR. DAVID FOWLER: They can come from any type of combustion of organic material. PAHs will be a by product. When you grill a steak --

MR. SILVAS: All right. Well, not too many steaks are grilled out on the base. And when we found levels above safety work standards, that was a concern. And I don't know why it hasn't been addressed in your study when it should. I mean --

DR. DAVID FOWLER: Well, that was a known on-base thing and it was a soil contamination. Is that correct?

MR. SILVAS: If it's a soil, though -- that's correct -- however, it does come from a fuel. I mean, if it's airborne, then it ends up in the ground. That doesn't change the fact that it came from an engine.

DR. DAVID FOWLER: But there may have been a lot of activities where they burned organic material and left PAHs there, but that's an on-base thing. This is not going off base in the community.

MR. WILKINSON: How many pounds of unburned fuel are laying on Kelly Air Force Base?

MR. SILVAS: Anymore questions from the members?

MR. GONZALES: I just have one follow-up question that might be helpful to me. In the other base closures that -- this is a follow-up question to the original question I had -- would you be in a position to direct me to other bases that would be of interest to us regarding past air emissions that might be -- offer some correlation to what activity was going on here at Kelly?

DR. DAVID FOWLER: Right. We have a Federal Facilities

Assessment Program and they generally do all the bases. The reason that -- Kelly started there, but I was initially doing the Kelly PHA and I left to go to another job. And because I was that involved in it, they asked me to take that with me. But Federal Facilities Assessment branch handles all federal facilities.

MR. GONZALES: So if I check with them, then they can direct me to other -- what is it? Federal Facilities Assessment Branch?

DR. DAVID FOWLER: Right. They can give you -- ATSDR's main number is an 800 number. I can give you that and you can call them and they can direct you to it.

MR. GONZALES: Okay. Thank you.

DR. DAVID FOWLER: Or it's on the web.

MR. GONZALES: Thank you.

MR. GARCIA: Robert, you mentioned in incinerator, but how about other air emissions caused by fumes and vapors? There were other things besides the incinerators that should have been going to past air emissions. One was fumes and vapors from the emission shop -- from the paint shop, from the massive jet engine -- test engine testing facility on the south end of the runway across on Military Drive. How about the bad air emissions from there?

The plating shop? The paint shop?

DR. DAVID FOWLER: Those were --

MR. GARCIA: All these other facilities have now been turned down. What were their air emissions and how were their dangerous past air emissions? How did they contribute to this air pollution too? That, I believe, was or was not addressed in your report?

DR. DAVID FOWLER: That was addressed. They were stationary emission sources.

MR. SILVAS: How far back are those records?

MR. GARCIA: Each individual facility that I mentioned or just as a general note? And how far back did you study this?

DR. DAVID FOWLER: All of the ones that you mentioned from my recollection were stationary emission sources.

MR. GARCIA: Did you itemize each one and how far back did you study them?

DR. DAVID FOWLER: They -- I think Brian has already presented the information and it's in the document. I don't remember how far back it was.

MR. BRIAN KAPLAN: If you look in appendix B of the report, it lists the documents and the emissions amounts and the chemicals that were emitted.

And as far as what the emission rates were, they came from those studies that I mentioned. There were a series of three studies that the Air Force commissioned, and they looked at basically all periods, all time periods, but they -- based on the data, the best estimates were from '70 to '75 and --

MS. GALVAN: I have a question.

DR. DAVID SMITH: Just a second. We have a gentleman standing in the back here, then we'll come back to you. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I have two questions about the air monitoring for the air modeling stuff. On the data sources for hexavalent chromium, is that -- does it look like there's not going to -- they're basically not going to appear or are there some possibilities that you're following up on?

DR. DAVID FOWLER: What we recommended was either find them from another source, another base, or whatever. So either the Air Force would do a study on that or include it in the mortality study, the plausible outcomes.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So, possibly use data from another base, is that what you're saying? Okay.

And the other thing was, what's your confidence in the modeling results? Do you have any kind of environmental data that validates it or are the conditions around the base -- do they suggest that it's a valid model to use, that you'll obtain valid results? Basically, what's your confidence in the model output?

MR. BRIAN KAPLAN: We don't have any measure of our uncertainty. So it's more of a subjective observation that I would have. I would say that using the B-52 with that 336,000 operations per year, since that is the worse burning airplane out

there, that we pretty much captured the worse risk.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Seems like I heard something about airports not measuring that high levels. What does that suggest to you? New information or --

MR. BRIAN KAPLAN: There's been a number of studies done around the country. O'Hare Airport in Chicago; Midway in Chicago; LAX, which I think is just starting; Seattle's airport; Tacoma, I think that's just starting. There was a study done in Santa Monica, I believe.

And as part of our process for generating our documents, there is a predraft that we give the Air Force to verify that the data we're using is correct. And when they first saw our numbers, they went to Dallas Airport monitoring station, which is near the end of the runway in Dallas. And my first ideas were, the air monitor only runs once out of every six days, so it may not necessarily really capture.

They basically saw non-detects, I think, for butadiene, whereas we're estimating 20 micrograms per cubic meter. The planes are much cleaner burning today than they were before, so it's really hard to compare monitoring today than it is in the past.

I don't know if that -- I bounced around with answering that.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: But at least you feel reasonably confident. It sounds like you have better conservative

estimates, not necessarily middle of the road.

DR. DAVID FOWLER: Well, we also looked at F-16's and we sort of averaged F-16s with the B-52, also to try to get middle of the road. But for our B-52, which we base some of the risk numbers on, it's very conservative.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: If a person wants more health projected-type estimates, they go with B-52 model results. If they wanted more moderate estimates of the exposure, it might be F-16.

MR. BRIAN KAPLAN: F-16, which is only one engine. But it is interesting that the F-16 does emit formaldehyde overall more than the B-52.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you.

DR. DAVID SMITH: Ms. Galvan?

MS. GALVAN: Yes. I wanted to ask Mr. Fowler a question. A little while ago you mentioned that this air modeling was the first type of this kind to be used. Is it in Texas or the United States?

MR. BRIAN KAPLAN: That was by our agency. It was the first time we tried to reconstruct for ATSDR.

MS. GALVAN: Right.

MR. BRIAN KAPLAN: It isn't the first of its kind in the country.

MS. GALVAN: Okay. So it's the first kind in Texas or San Antonio?

MR. BRIAN KAPLAN: Probably San Antonio, my guess. Probably for an Air Force base.

MS. GALVAN: So there has been another base who has used this similar model?

MR. BRIAN KAPLAN: Not another base. From what I found in literature, the Midway Airport in Chicago was one that -- it was an air study of Southwest Chicago, which included Midway Airport.

MS. GALVAN: Can we find this study?

MR. BRIAN KAPLAN: I'd be glad to make -- I have a copy of it and I'll be glad to get you a copy of it.

MS. GALVAN: Okay.

MR. GONZALES: Mr. Quintanilla, do you know what the findings were on that? I mean, what did they conclude or was there any conclusion reached?

MR. QUINTANILLA: Yes, I think I have -- we want to look at charts 25 and 26. Those are the charts that -- or slides that talked about the butadiene and the benzene.

MR. BRIAN KAPLAN: Can I see that?

MR. QUINTANILLA: Sure.

MR. BRIAN KAPLAN: I don't have all the details in my mind, but off-base -- off airport, residential population from aircraft, the risk was about one in 10,000. And that was for 1990. And they had about, I want to say, 130 take-offs and landings.

Interesting -- more interesting is that the automobile exhaust presented a higher risk than the aircraft.

MR. QUINTANILLA: All right. But, you know, there you have benzene in that slide there. Is that what you're showing in the neighborhood areas?

MR. BRIAN KAPLAN: This slide represents the combined risk from butadiene, benzene, and formaldehyde.

DR. DAVID FOWLER: All together.

MR. BRIAN KAPLAN: All together. We summed them all together to get accumulative cancer risk and we separated out the aircraft from the -- no, the aircraft -- let me correct myself. The aircraft represents benzene, butadiene, and formaldehyde. The stationary sources represent all the chemicals that we modeled.

MR. QUINTANILLA: Now, butadiene, that causes leukemia, and we have a leukemia problem, perhaps, in that area.

DR. DAVID FOWLER: Benzene.

MR. QUINTANILLA: Benzene. Okay. Let's go to Chart 26 then.

MR. BRIAN KAPLAN: I think benzene was also -- can be a contributor to leukemia.

DR. DAVID FOWLER: Association, not cause.

MR. QUINTANILLA: I beg your pardon, sir?

MS. GALVAN: Association.

DR. DAVID FOWLER: Association. Not cause and effect.

It's just been associated.

MR. BRIAN KAPLAN: For epidemiological studies or worker studies or both?

DR. DAVID FOWLER: (inaudible)

MR. BRIAN KAPLAN: So the association between butadiene and leukemia in epidemiological studies of workers. But there's not toxicological mechanism that has been identified?

DR. DAVID FOWLER: Well, not thoroughly. It's been started. They know some of the mechanisms, but they don't know the whole (inaudible) of it.

MR. QUINTANILLA: Do we know the extent of leukemia in those areas there, in those boundaries?

DR. DAVID FOWLER: We know that from 1990 to 1994 there was elevated leukemia in two of the downwind zip codes and off-base housing.

MR. QUINTANILLA: Okay. And that's Chart 25 and 26.

DR. DAVID FOWLER: No, it's 27, 37, and 26.

MR. QUINTANILLA: Okay, but that's the slide number. I'm talking about the elevated levels of leukemia in there.

DR. DAVID FOWLER: They were elevated during that period of time.

MR. QUINTANILLA: And this slide more over than likely makes it a reality that, you know, that the air emissions are possibly causing the leukemia in that area.

DR. DAVID FOWLER: It's enough for us to investigate it

further. It may be coincidental. Who knows? But it needs to be looked at.

MR. QUINTANILLA: Not only that, but I think we ought to do something now also. We know that they had higher levels of leukemia there. Maybe we should send a letter to the Texas Department of Health and to the Metro Health Department.

Don't laugh, sir. Don't laugh, sir.

MR. WILKINSON: I called the Health Department and they said they would not study Agent Orange because AIDS is the worse problem than Agent Orange and they would not spend a dime on it. I've got that letter.

DR. DAVID FOWLER: I believe the Texas Board of Health is looking into that.

MR. QUINTANILLA: All right. And when will they complete that?

DR. DAVID FOWLER: I don't know.

MR. QUINTANILLA: Because that's important. We do have a health problem there, and you, you know, outlined it there in those areas on Slides 25 and 26. We ought to make sure that the health department, the San Antonio Metro Health and the Texas Department of Health and whoever else, you know, the Human Health Resources from Washington also look at this area.

You know, if our government is responsible for making these people sick with leukemia, our government should be doing something about it. That's all that I'm saying.

Now, I want to see some action in this and how do we -- how do we get them to report to us as to what they've done and how they're going to correct this?

DR. DAVID FOWLER: I can't speak for the Texas Department of Health. Our own people will be coming back in December, November or December to --

MR. SILVAS: December.

DR. DAVID FOWLER: -- to talk about it.

MR. QUINTANILLA: They're going to talk to us about that?

MR. WILLIAM RYAN: I thought I heard you mention in one of your slides that ATSDR is pursuing or looking at the health outcomes for leukemia specific to those zip codes. So that's -- so really, you are addressing what Mr. Quintanilla is bringing up.

Kyle, are you doing something in conjunction with -- through the PCH?

MS. KYLE CUNNINGHAM: Yes. Jeff, do --

MS. ROBYN THOMPSON: I'm sorry, could you all just speak into the microphone. The transcriptionist is having difficulty.

MR. JEFF SHIRE: As Kyle probably mentioned, I work with the State Health Department and I know that we as a group -- they had originally done -- they've looked at cancer, birth defects, and low birth weight for the time periods that they had.

And then now that a couple more years have passed, they're doing a reanalysis with the new data to include all the information they have to look at leukemia, liver cancer, all the different cancers, all the different birth defects, and the low birth weigh.

So my understanding is that that's going to be in about a month or two that they're -- those different entities within the State Health Department are going to be through with that report.

MR. QUINTANILLA: Okay. Will you be here whenever ATSDR wraps up this eight-year program that they have?

MR. JEFF SHIRE: Yeah, I plan to be here.

MR. QUINTANILLA: And tell us about this, what can be done to help those people?

MR. JEFF SHIRE: Yes, sir.

MR. QUINTANILLA: Okay. That's all that I want.

MR. GONZALES: I have just one follow-up question, please. This probably is pretty much in layman terms, but maybe I need it in more layman than this. There's a paragraph on Page 13, the last paragraph, that speaks to considerations, in particular child health considerations. And if you could just give me a snapshot of what that really states. And if you want to tell me what it says, that's fine. I'll deal with that, but I'd appreciate it.

DR. DAVID FOWLER: One of the things that ATSDR started

doing is we have a child health initiative. We also look strongly at, is there any reason a child might be more susceptible? Well, for medical (inaudible) that's ongoing with a child we think is in the development of that, that would make anyone more vulnerable to chemical influence.

MR. SILVAS: That's a known fact though. You don't think it, it's a known fact. Isn't it? It's a known fact, isn't it?

DR. DAVID FOWLER: The generality is known; however, there are no studies that indicate that children are more susceptible. In other words, there are no studies that have the numbers that show that they are. It's a concern of ours that they may be.

MR. SILVAS: Thank you. Appreciate it.

MR. WILKINSON: I have a question.

MR. SILVAS: Mr. Wilkinson?

MR. WILKINSON: Yes. During my ten years with the railroad, I have never seen shipments of pallets of drums. All chemicals that I've always ever seen were shipped in tankers.

In Mission, Texas, Agent Orange was shipped to S-7 sites. Were they shipped in drums which I -- I've never seen no drums. Or were they shipped in tankers and then emptied into drums, which would put out fumes into the general public by moving one pump to the other pump and then closing the lid and causing fumes and vapors and leakages and stuff like that. I

have never, in my ten years of railroad work, seen drums being shipped by the railroad. Those must have been tankers coming into S-7 Sites and then the drums were filled there.

Do y'all have any study on that?

MR. SILVAS: Excuse me. Was that a consideration; tankers offloading chemicals and maybe chemical spills, as far as petro or any other hazardous? Would that have been the logical research to bring up?

DR. DAVID FOWLER: There are events that would effect a short-term thing, spill.

MR. WILKINSON: Why don't you tell them the contamination --

DR. DAVID FOWLER: It might effect things on the short-term. What we were looking at -- health effects in the community is what we're looking at. We're talking about long-term events. Okay. Somebody's exposed to things a lot. Not on a spill and that adds to it in the day or a week or whatever and go forth. So, we didn't consider that would contribute to the overall thing that, you know, over 40 years it be more than an acute exposure.

MR. SILVAS: Well, over a time frame of the study that you did, I mean, you went and did a certain start date and ended at a certain start date. Spills accumulating over that time frame would oppose the long-term exposure.

MR. QUINTANILLA: We're talking about '65 to '71.

DR. DAVID FOWLER: Well, I doubt they would contribute much to the overall effect. In any event, you know, these kinds of things adding to it may not have been in there. But since we're going to the next step anyway, I think it's immaterial.

MR. WILKINSON: Immaterial? A chemical that once you catch it, there's no cure, no treatment. And you want to dodge the bullet. Thank you, sir.

MR. SILVAS: I got one last question, I guess, for the record. I asked you this earlier, would you again state your mission for your agency?

MR. BRIAN KAPLAN: Protect and mitigate public health.

MR. SILVAS: And again, out of the 50 or so base closures that you all studied, how many have you found that had any kind of like contamination to the public?

DR. DAVID FOWLER: I can't answer that question.

MR. SILVAS: Thank you.

DR. DAVID FOWLER: You're welcome.

DR. DAVID SMITH: Further questions, RAB numbers?

Okay, Mr. Silvas, would you help me think for a minute here how you'd like to look at the agenda. Do you want to do TAPP tonight? Do we want to take a break? How would you like do that?

MR. SILVAS: I think we can go ahead and get to TAPP and then we can just wrap it up and get this through, get out of here by 9:30.

DR. DAVID SMITH: All right. The next item on the agenda is a TAPP update with an opportunity for you to ask some questions pre and post that. Are there any -- before that update's done, are there any questions we'd like to get on the board?

MR. SILVAS: I don't know if it was put down there earlier about the incinerator, finding out the company that built it and the timeframe it was built.

DR. DAVID SMITH: All right.

MR. SULTENFUSS: I've have: Can we get some information from the manufacture for the incinerator and how long the incinerator was in operation?

MR. WILKINSON: And what chemicals -- why type of chemicals did it burn and not burn.

MR. SILVAS: Okay.

DR. DAVID SMITH: Okay. All right.

As we said, the next item on the agenda is the TAPP update. Ms. Dawkins has the responsibility for a brief presentation on that. You have documentation on that presentation in your folder. You had also received a similar documentation in October, RAB members.

Having said that, Ms. Dawkins, I'm going to turn it to you.

MS. DAWKINS: Good evening. My name is Larisa Dawkins. I'm the Environmental Health Analyst for the Air Force Real

Property Agency. At the request of the executive committee and other RAB members, we're just going to give you a brief update on the TAPP program, which is the Technical Assistance for Public Participation.

The TAPP -- basically just an overview of the program. It's a program that's been set aside by the Department of Defense and it provides an independent technical support to community members or restoration advisory boards. It's has been instituted to help the public understand and participate in the decision making process by improving their understanding of the overall conditions and activities. In this case, Kelly Air Force Base as it relates to the environmental clean-up program. And it also utilizes small businesses.

Projects that qualify for the TAPP funding are those that are reviews of restoration documents and reviews of the proposed remedial technologies, interpretation of health and environmental effects, reviews of relative risk evaluation, and also the development of certain types of technical training. So those are programs that are eligible for TAPP funding.

Programs that are not eligible, those that generate new primary data, those that are for litigation purposes or underwriting of legal actions, reopening final DOD decisions, political activity or lobbying in any studies that are of epidemiological nature or a health-related study, and also those for community outreach efforts. Those are not eligible for TAPP

funds.

With the TAPP funding program, a community is eligible for $25,000 per year or one percent of the cost of completing environmental restoration at that particular installation or whichever is less. And generally you're allowed up to 100,000 per installation. I think that -- maybe the next slide speaks to it. For Kelly we have already acquired $100,000 and later on I'll show you what you have left as a RAB board.

The TAPP process, what generally happens is that community members of the RAB -- and those members are also involved with the TRS -- come together and they define a project based on the environmental program at Kelly and what we're doing in that particular program. And then the members decide and they evaluate other potential sources of assistance, they complete the TAPP application, and then they submit the application to the Air Force Real Property Agency for review and approval, and then they complete a satisfaction survey on the contractor's work.

So basically what happens is that the RAB members or the TRS is given a list of things that the Air Force is going to be doing for that particular year, whatever programs or projects that we're doing as far as it relates to the environmental program. And then the RAB or the TRS decides on what programs or what studies that they would like an independent review of. And once you all decide what you want an independent review of, then you all also come up with whoever the independent consultant is,

and then that person would also report back to the RAB or TRS, usually both.

Next slide.

To date, these are the projects that the RAB has decided to use TAPP funds to review. In 1998 you all chose the ATSDR water report and you chose University of Maryland to do that. You also chose the '97 base-wide remediation assessment. You chose Clear Water Revival Company. You also chose the OU-2 work plan, and you used Neathery Environmental for that.

In 1999 you all chose to do the Zone 3 CMS addendum, the remedial investigation of Zone 4, OU-2, and you also chose a final Zone 5 corrective measure study.

In 2000 you chose a shallow groundwater report. The S-8 draft final, CMI, and then the site MP Draft final.

In 2001 you chose Zone 4 CMS and you also chose the ATSDR Health Assessment.

2002 you had the Zone 3 R-5.

2003, ATSDR Air Emission Study. And that -- these particular two are two that you're going to be having. You've already attributed or you've already set aside TAPP funding for the past air emissions and also for the Zone 2 and 3 CMS. And the Zone 2 and 3, I believe is going to be presented to the TRS next month.

So today your obligations are $91,200 and you have a remaining funding balance of $8,800.

MR. SILVAS: More than one year, right?

MS. DAWKINS: For additional funding, if there is a particular project that you would like to have reviewed coming up this year and it goes over that $8,800, you can request a waiver for more funding and that would mean additional funds and/or waivers. It must be requested through the Air Force Real Property Agency and it must be tied to a specific project.

Do you have any questions?

Thank you.

MR. QUINTANILLA: So right now you would approve any case -- you know, we'll be applying for $25,00, you would approve it, Mr. Ryan?

MR. WILLIAM RYAN: Well, we've already been -- we've already been funded about $100,000.

MR. QUINTANILLA: I know that. Say that we didn't have any money as of this moment and we won't have -- possibly in the next six months we won't have any money. We will come to you for the money, for $25,000 and we have to list some projects that we want to review or get interpretations on?

MR. WILLIAM RYAN: We would have -- we would prepare the TAPP application.

MR. QUINTANILLA: We'd submit it to you?

MR. WILLIAM RYAN: You would submit it to me and I would submit the request for funding.

MR. QUINTANILLA: Okay.

MR. SILVAS: What is the -- like a basic review cost? What is the past cost?

MS. DAWKINS: Generally it depends on the depth of the project.

MR. SILVAS: Okay.

MS. DAWKINS: Like Zone 2 and 3 CMS would be a larger document for an independent consultant to review. It just depends on the nature of the particular project.

MR. SILVAS: Okay.

MR. QUINTANILLA: If you want a specific number, I don't think we've pay anything over $8,000 so far.

MR. WILLIAM RYAN: Yeah, I think that's right. Mr. Quintanilla has been doing this for a long time. I think generally 6- to $8,000 is the typical project.

MR. QUINTANILLA: I don't remember one beyond that.

MR. WILLIAM RYAN: No.

MS. DAWKINS: Yes, sir, Mr. Garcia?

MR. GARCIA: Yeah, under TAPP guidelines can we apply for more specific small air emissions studies and more specific health studies to study how the air emissions has effected and caused health problems in the community?

MS. DAWKINS: TAPP funds are specifically for projects that are generated as a result of -- in this particular case with Kelly -- of remediation projects. And then you can have an independent consultant come and do an additional independent

review of that. But TAPP funds are not available to do something new, like a health related study. Those types of things are not eligible for TAPP funds.

MR. GARCIA: Are there any type of remediation guidelines for study or dealing with air emissions and air pollution to remediate the air emissions and air pollution?

MS. DAWKINS: I really don't know how to answer that question.

MR. GARCIA: Well, you don't have to answer it right now. You can explain it to me in a four or five-page letter.

MS. DAWKINS: A four or five-page letter, yes, sir.

MR. QUINTANILLA: If I may, I brought this from the experts from the procurement office, the ones that run the money. Usually it's to help us interpret the health of the environmental project that we got, the effects of it, put it in layman's language and answers any questions that come from that report. But it's very defined by the Department of Defense in their -- when they give us the money.

MS. DAWKINS: Basically it allows community members to have an independent company or person to interpret a report on your behalf because some community members don't have the technical expertise to review a document. So those funds have been provided to community members and they have an independent consultant review a project on their behalf and then provide the community the results in terms which they're supposed to be able

to understand, as opposed from a technical perspective. They actually interpreter the document for you.

MR. WILLIAM RYAN: And one of the TAPP contractors is a health professional and that's who we've used in the past to do other ATSDR studies. You know, and we also have experts from ATSDR and the Public Center for Environmental Health that can also help in that regard.

MR. QUINTANILLA: One of the things that we haven't used the money for is the development of technical training for the RAB. We have never used any money for technical training for the RAB. No TAPP funds have ever been used for that.

MR. WILLIAM RYAN: I believe that's allowable.

MS. DAWKINS: That is allowable.

MR. QUINTANILLA: Yeah, it is allowable. Yes.

MR. GARCIA: We need to look into that.

MS. DAWKINS: Mr. Sheneman asked a question.

MR. SHENEMAN: What type of chemical -- technical training would you want, Armando?

MR. QUINTANILLA: Whatever we need. Say that we don't understand PRBs. You know, you can bring in an engineer and he tells you about PRBs. Or we need some kind of a technical training in order to communicate better with a community. You know, we can get that, as to how we can communicate better with them, the RAB can. That type of thing. It's what I would, you know, look for.

MS. GALVAN: I like that suggestion, about having the engineers from the PRBs come down and give a good explanation of what they do and how long the history of it is, and what their validity and research has been on PRBs.

MR. SHENEMAN: You've got four community colleges here that have expertise.

MS. GALVAN: No, but the ones that are actually the makers of the PRBs that are being constructed in the neighborhoods.

MR. SHENEMAN: The manufacturers?

MS. GALVAN: No, the engineers. They were here at one time with the Air Force.

MS. KYLE CUNNINGHAM: We did that. The --

(MR. RYAN AND MS. CUNNINGHAM BOTH SPEAKING AT ONCE)

MS. KYLE CUNNINGHAM: -- method. And I think they did that at a -- I believe they did that at a --

MR. WILLIAM RYAN: I think it was a TRS.

MR. SILVAS: Yeah, that was some time back. Maybe it's time to have them out here again.

MS. GALVAN: We have a new RAB board with new members.

MS. DAWKINS: And you may have even more new members in January.

MS. GALVAN: Right.

MS. DAWKINS: So, it might be something the executive committee would like to take a look at.

MR. WILLIAM RYAN: Certainly, you know, we're at the point now where we're looking -- going to be looking for new projects for the TAPP. We can, you know, entertain technical training for the RAB as, you know, as one of the items. But we do need to look at -- as the gentlemen on the end there brought up, you know, we are supposed to look within the community for those resources. If they can be provided from resources within the community, that's where we need to go first.

MR. SHENEMAN: That's correct.

MR. WILLIAM RYAN: That's probably a good idea. But if that's exhausted, then we can certainly, you know, look for TAPP funds to do that.

MS. DAWKINS: And also the Air Force Real Property Agency provides tours for those people that would like to come out and, you know, ask questions specifically about any environmental remediation projects that we have ongoing or that are already put in place. So that's also available to you.

Yes, sir.

MR. SHENEMAN: There will be one November the 30th at 1:50, which I'm party to that other folks are welcome to come. That's a Tuesday. And then the following Thursday, December the 2nd, I believe it is --

MS. DAWKINS: Yes, sir.

MR. SHENEMAN: -- at 1:50 again. Any folks that want go see are welcome to come along because they've got it down

pretty good anymore. I been through the tour enough. And of course I've got my chemistry classes there, and so we get into it in a pretty serious way. And everybody seems happy with it.

MS. DAWKINS: Yes, sir. I've been a part of those tours. Very lively.

Yes, sir, Mr. Garcia?

MR. GARCIA: I'd like to make a recommendation that current RAB members, in consideration for new RAB members or future RAB members coming in January, that we put a list together for review stating all the wishes of all the training that we might want, and then we will work off that list and prepare a training manual and training classes on the particular items that current and new board members would be interested in learning about.

MS. DAWKINS: Now, usually every year after the elections in January we generally hold a RAB workshop in February. And those are some of the things that we can do at the workshop.

MR. QUINTANILLA: But that's not out of TAPP funds?

MS. DAWKINS: No, sir. Those -- that's not out of TAPP funds. So in addition to that --

MR. GARCIA: That would be the basic. And then after the basic, under the workshop, then we can move into TAPP funds.

MS. DAWKINS: Yes, sir.

Any other questions?

MR. SILVAS: Yes. Out of all the colleges we have here, are we currently trying to seek any kind of support from them or...

MS. DAWKINS: Now, the Public Center for Environmental Health -- and maybe, Kyle, you'd like to speak to this -- the Public Center for Environmental Health is partnering with colleges to address some of the issues that have been brought up in ATSDR studies.

Kyle, would you like to speak to that? Kyle is the program manager for the Public Center for Environmental Health.

MS. KYLE CUNNINGHAM: We have worked with some of the other colleges. Some of the colleges in San Antonio actually. We've been working with the Health Science Center. They're still the Public Health. And then also we've been working with Our Lady of the Lake. What we did is we put on the workshop in June.

There may be some other things that kind of work out of that or come out of that.

Does that answer your question?

MR. SILVAS: When in the foreseeable future do you see coming towards this committee? I mean, are they -- we see them attend, but I'd like to see them attend more often or maybe have them participate.

MS. KYLE CUNNINGHAM: Well, with the School of Public Health, we're looking at a mortality study. That's probably going to take a year to do or more.

MS. GALVAN: What about the students from UTSA, the ones that -- they've offered a program for environment.

MS. KYLE CUNNINGHAM: Right. I'm very familiar with that program.

MS. GALVAN: Bachelors Degree in Environment Studies.

MS. KYLE CUNNINGHAM: Right. I'm very familiar with that program and some of the professors over there.

MS. GALVAN: You didn't mention them right now, so I wondered what -- why you didn't mention UTSA.

MS. KYLE CUNNINGHAM: Why I didn't mention them?

MS. GALVAN: Yeah.

MS. KYLE CUNNINGHAM: Just haven't -- we don't have anything rolling right now with them, but are very much aware of them and they're aware of us.

MR. SILVAS: Could you forward their contacts for the colleges, that you're, you know, right now talking to?

MS. KYLE CUNNINGHAM: Sure.

MR. SILVAS: Sure.

MR. QUINTANILLA: Well, the colleges the past -- that was back in '94, '95, and '96 -- did come to various members of the RAB then to come speak to their environmental classes that they had. And these were the colleges I know of are Incarnate -- not Incarnate Word, but our Lady of the Lake, the University of Texas downtown, and Trinity University. They would call on different people. And they were always looking for someone to

volunteer for, you know, to come and speak to their classes on environmental issues.

MS. GALVAN: They could make a good study by studying Kelly Air Force Base.

MR. QUINTANILLA: They did. They would.

MS. GALVAN: Continued study for the rest of the 25 years, if we can live that long to see that day.

MR. SHENEMAN: While we're on the education side of things -- maybe I really shouldn't get into this, but I'm going to -- since I sat here listening to this, we talked about cleaning up the environment, but we don't talk about cleaning up the people who are employees, if you please, or toxic, if you please. We never talked about that.

As far as the medical side of things, I've got nothing against halopathic (sp), which is traditional in the medical community. But I'm reading something here from the Southwest Workers' Union that comes to mind because I don't know that physicians have the time nor the interest in what we're doing here because the people don't have any money to pay them.

MS. GALVAN: That's right.

MR. SHENEMAN: Now, if you all would like -- well, in the first place, on the December 4th here in town, Hilton, here will be all day seminar on matters holistic. In other words, cleaning up the body. And there will be people there from all over the United States, some people that I know quite well that

are top flight.

Now, I think eventually we need look into this kind of thing. You can call it alternative, if you like. I don't care for that. You can -- I prefer integrated with the traditional medical community because we're not doing that. I would not be sitting here had not -- I'll be 64 next month -- about 20 years ago out of desperation I got into this thing. I'm not a rabid anti-doctor or anything like that, but I know for a fact there's certain things that they cannot work with, out of balance body, mind, and spirit.

So, we're seeing sick people come in here. Again -- and I think Mr. Murrah brought up something very interesting that that's what prompted me to even broach this because I'm too new on the board. I've only been here not quite a year. But nature eventually will clean anything up. The body, given the right direction or materials to work with, will do it's best to solve the problem and bring it back to the homeostasis. It's a fact.

And this goes beyond what the typical medical communities will do. Yes, they're able to diagnosis, that's true. But I think we really, as a board, need to start looking this way for the people who can't afford. There's lots of things that people can do on their own for virtually nothing.

I thank you for listening to me. I've been sitting here for a long time with that thought in mind, but I want to see if we ever would come up and address this kind of thing. This

needs to be a separate operation altogether. And they're -- just within a 30-mile radius of where we're sitting, there are some folks who have awesome talents. I mean, I can't begin to tell you, homeopathy to the (inaudible) Association, even chiropractic. Lots of things that are possibly able to remove the toxins. Until you get rid of the toxins -- and all these chlorine and hydrocarbons they were talking about, virtually that whole list, that whole menu, those are all fat soluble. Guess where this is stored? In adipose tissue. They're not water soluble, they just don't go away. That's the reason why some folks have problems with livers and whatnot.

Anyway, thank you for letting me say that. But it's something -- I don't know if that's the answer. I really don't, but at least we can go into something, into a new area with some new input. I'm really telling you, in my own way, I just went through the discovery process with Step One through Step Seven, but I think we need to recognize the problem and then take some type of corrective action or at least an action plan. And if it doesn't work, well then that's fine. We should all take a shot at it.

Yes, sir?

MR. WILKINSON: Back in 1980 there was two workers at Seguin River. One was (a name), one was Sammy Hearst. Sammy Hearst sprayed Agent Orange in the lake. They listed his death as natural causes; therefore, the Sequin River Authority didn't

have to pay any restitution for it. They want us to die because it's cheaper because then they can write it off as a natural cause instead of them poisoning us with their chemicals.

MR. SILVAS: All right. We'll move on to the next issue and close this.

DR. DAVID SMITH: Thank you.

Thank you, Ms. Dawkins.

We are at that stage in the meeting where we're at the meeting wrap up. We do need to settle on some dates for return. Robert, you were suggesting that probably December made sense. Do we want to poll the RAB or something to see whether December is when you want the ATSDR folks to return?

MR. SILVAS: Yes.

MS. GALVAN: Do we vote or what?

MR. SILVAS: Shouldn't we come up with a date for them to return?

DR. DAVID SMITH: Yes. That's right. I'm sorry.

RAB members, do you have thoughts? December -- I guess December or January are really the options -- are they not -- that we have to chose from. Do you have thoughts on that?

Ms. Galvan?

MS. GALVAN: I was going to say that, yes, I feel like time is always running out, and the years are going by, and we just need to move faster on all of these studies and these meetings. So I believe in December we do need to meet because

time is running out for some people. And that's when -- what I mean is that some of us may come down with sicknesses or illnesses. We need to find answers to all these questions we have. And the more and the faster the meetings come from ATSDR and the studies, the better.

So, I agree. The faster, the better.

DR. DAVID SMITH: All right.

MS. GALVAN: December 14th, 15th, I'm ready.

DR. DAVID SMITH: Are there other thoughts on...

MR. SILVAS: Well, as far as the --

MS. GALVAN: I don't know how the others feel.

MR. SILVAS: -- the next TRS is on the 13th, which is a Monday?

DR. DAVID SMITH: That's right, Robert.

MR. SILVAS: And I'm not sure if they could free up themselves to be there. I mean, we need to know what their schedule is like.

MS. GALVAN: Didn't you say the 14th or 15th? That's a Tuesday, right?

MS. ABBI POWER: Tuesday and Wednesday.

MS. GALVAN: Tuesday and Wednesday. Tuesday, like today.

MS. TERAN-MacIVER: You want us to come to the TRS meeting too?

MR. SILVAS: Yeah, that's the next meeting of the TRS.

DR. DAVID SMITH: Let me make sure that I understand what we're suggesting here. I guess one possibility is to make a presentation to the TRS, but you're really talking about your very own meeting that you want to hold, really separate from any of these organizations, which is the ATSDR presentation that is going to be broader than today and you'll bring in the other folks. And what you're really asking this group for is not to sponsor your meeting, but to simply give you some input as to when would be a better time to have that meeting. Is that -- am I -- I don't mean to put words in your mouth.

MR. QUINTANILLA: Well, I have a question. When will that particular project, or whatever they're doing, be brought before the RAB?

MS. TERAN-MacIVER: We already brought it before the RAB. We brought the Public Health Assessment --

MR. QUINTANILLA: All right. You've already done that, but what are you bringing the next time in December?

MS. TERAN-MacIVER: We're bringing all of the team members that produced those documents that have the health outcome data, the East Kelly document, the past air emissions, the current air, the on-base water, and the PHA.

MR. QUINTANILLA: And what are they going to do?

MS. TERAN-MacIVER: Bring explanations to the people.

MS. ABBI POWER: Ms. MacIver, can you clarify. Is that a meeting that Kelly is having for the RAB or is that a

meeting that ATSDR is sponsoring for the general public as a whole?

MS. TERAN-MacIVER: ATSDR for the general public.

MS. ABBI POWER: Yeah, it's not associated. It's not a RAB meeting. It's their meeting at some location to be chosen and such.

DR. DAVID FOWLER: Really it's an environmental discussion and we'll have these people available with these -- about health outcome data and plus, you know, what presentations we have over the whole thing.

MR. QUINTANILLA: And you're going to say, this is what we found, and this is what ought to be done about it by somebody?

DR. DAVID FOWLER: By the people or --

MR. QUINTANILLA: Well, this is what I would like to see. You know, if you're just going to come out and say -- come up with the same thing and just throw it out there to the public and leave the public hanging, well, you know, we know that we got people sick of leukemia. Who is going to do what to make them better? That's what I want to see in December, otherwise, forget about it.

MR. GONZALES: From my point of view on that is that, if you would, once that meeting is set and scheduled, if you could extend the information to the staff here so they could get it back to us so that we can be properly informed as to when it's going to be held and those of us that decide to attend can go

ahead and do so in that matter. So, that would be appreciated.

MR. SILVAS: I'd like to add to that. I don't see why not to go ahead and hold that like we have on the 14th during that same week that the TRS is. That wouldn't be a problem for most of us I see. But, yeah, that timeframe would be good.

Mr. Wilkinson?

MR. WILKINSON: Yes. I talked to a lady that was an advocate who showed at the last meeting. The EPA, Water Commission, and the railroad, Union Pacific jumped on her. She was followed home. That is called retaliation. You all should look into that and kick these people off the board. They're malicious. They're going to set up and try to kill her. They tried to kill me. They use the Texas Intelligence -- the Texas Department of Public Safety Officers Intelligence Squad and I have not committed -- they did they same thing in Corpus Christi. And you all better watch the Water Commission, the EPA and all these people involved in their cover up.

MR. SILVAS: Thank you, sir. Thank you.

MR. WILKINSON: Because I will not put up with it.

DR. DAVID SMITH: In the meeting wrap up, action items from the previous meeting will be addressed at the next regular RAB meeting. Meeting summary will be approved at the next regular RAB meeting, which is back to the January meeting.

Our next TRS meeting -- and RAB members, will you look at this real carefully because your agenda says the next TRS

meeting is on Tuesday, December 13th, when in fact that's Monday, December 13th. It is a Monday.

MS. GALVAN: It's a Monday?

DR. DAVID SMITH: It is a Monday.

MR. SHENEMAN: Is that when we're doing it or is it originally the 13th?

MS. GALVAN: No, Monday is the 13th.

DR. DAVID SMITH: Monday the 13th.

And the next RAB meeting itself is Tuesday, January 18th, 2004, as it reads in the agenda. Please remember that that meeting is an election for new RAB members. The recruitment process continues to be underway, and applications are available if you have people who you'd like to recruit. That would be particularly important.

MR. GONZALES: Mr. Silva, if you would permit me on the -- while we're on minutes and stuff, the July minutes do not show me as being present and I was present at that meeting, so if at the appropriate time they can go ahead and make the appropriate correction.

MR. SILVAS: Okay, that's noted then.

MS. ROBYN THOMPSON: I just wanted to say that we've received very few RAB applications. We have extra copies in the back. LeighAnn has some here. So if y'all could please take them out, pass them out to people that you know. It would be really great if we could have a lot of candidates for the

election in January.

DR. DAVID SMITH: The other form, RAB members, that you have received is this request for information form. This is simply a form that is made available to you and to audience members so that if there are questions that remain unanswered after today that you would like to have a written response to, if you would please see to it that those get turned in and we'll try to get those responses back to you -- the staff will try to get those responses back to you as quickly as possible.

MR. SILVAS: Yes, I guess two last things. Have the RAB members that are up for their expiration on the terms, are they aware of who they are? Have they been notified?

DR. DAVID SMITH: I believe it has been discussed at the past meeting, but letters could be sent out if you would like to have that done.

MR. SILVAS: All right.

And another last thing is the attendance. Are we still tracking that? Have we noted that today?

DR. DAVID SMITH: Yes, we have noted that today.

Does that cover it?

Having gotten to that point, I guess the only question is to ask one of you to make a motion that we adjourn for the evening.

MR. SILVAS: Can we have a motion to adjourn?

MS. GALVAN: I move that we adjourn.

MR. MURRAH: I second it.

DR. DAVID SMITH: Meeting adjourned.

(9:08 p.m.)

RAB 11/09/04

STATE OF TEXAS)

COUNTY OF BEXAR)

I, Vickie-Lee Garza, Certified Shorthand Reporter, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript, to the best of my ability, of the proceedings held in this matter.

12/29/04
DATE

VICKIE-LEE GARZA, CSR

VICKIE GARZA
NOTARY PUBLIC STATE OF TEXAS
COMMISSION EXPIRES:
APRIL 15, 2008

FINAL PAGE

ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD

FINAL PAGE