

KELLY AFB TEXAS

ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD COVER SHEET

AR File Numbet 156.01

KELLY AIR FORCE BASE RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING OCTOBER 28, 1998

ORIGINAL



CENTRAL AND SOUTH TEXAS LOCATIONS:

San Antonio

(210) 377-3027

Toll Free 1-800-969-3027

Telefax (210) 344-6016

Laredo

(956) 726-3232 Fax (956) 725-3376

Austin (512) 478-6971

Corpus Christi (512) 881-8909 Fax (512) 881-9717

1	APPEARANCES:
2	BGEN. ROBERT MURDOCK,
3	Kelly Air Force Base co-Chair;
4	MR. DAMIAN SANDOVAL, Community co-Chair;
5	MR. MARK PUFFER,
6	Kelly Air Force Base;
7	MS. ANNALISA PEACE, Community Member;
8	MR. ARMANDO C. QUINTANILLA, Keep South San Proud and CEJA;
9	
10	MR. GEORGE RICE, Groundwater Hydrologist;
11	PROF. GENE W. LENE,
12	Academic Community;
13	MR. TRINIDAD ALMAGUER, (Sam Sanchez's Alt.)
14	San Antonio Metropolitan Health District;
15	MR. ED WEINSTEIN,
16	San Antonio Water System;
17	MS. YOLANDA JOHNSON, Committee for Environmental
18	Justice Action;
19	GEN. PAUL ROBERSON, Greater Kelly Development
20	Corporation;
21	MR. PAUL PERSON, Union Pacific Railroad;
22	MR. JOHN A. JACOBI, P.E.,
23	Texas Department of Health;
	MS. LAURA STANKOSKY,
24	Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6;
25	

1	MS. TANYA HUERTA, Community Member;
2	MR. GORDON BANNER,
3	TNRCC;
4	MR. SAMUEL MURRAH, Community Member;
5	
6	MR. JUAN SOLIS, JR., Community Member;
7	MS. DOMINGA ADAMES, Community Member;
8	
9	DICIE LEE EYTCHESON Certified Shorthand Reporter,
10	Registered Professional Reporter and Notary Public.
11	* * * * *
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
2 0	
21	
2 2	
23	
2 4	
25	
	I

1	On the 28th day of October, A.D.
2	1998, between the hours of 6:30 o'clock p.m.
3	and 10:00 o'clock p.m., the above entitled
4	meeting came on for discussion before said
5	MR. DAMIAN SANDOVAL and BGEN. MURDOCK, and the
6	following proceedings were had:
7	BGEN. MURDOCK: Good evening. I'd
8	like to welcome everyone that is here. Before
9	we begin, I'd like to start at the the far
10	end of the table, and have each individual
11	introduce themselves, and if in fact they're
12	representing an organization, if they could
13	indicate as such. So we'll start down at that
14	end, if you please.
15	MR. PUFFER: My name is Mark Puffer,
16	and I represent the residents of Kelly Air
17	Force Base.
18	MS. PEACE: Annalisa Peace, and I
19	represent San Antonio.
20	MS. ADAMES: Dominga Adames,
21	community residents.
22	MR. SOLIS: Juan Solis, I represent
23	the (inaudible) Association.
24	MR. RICE: George Rice, community
25	member.

1	MR. ALMAGUER: Trinidad Almaguer,
2	Metropolitan Health Department.
3	MR. QUINTANILLA: Armando
4	Quintanilla. I'm a resident of South San, and
5	I live in an in an area contaminated by
6	Kelly Air Force Base.
7	MR. WEINSTEIN: Ed Weinstein, San
8	Antonio Water System.
9	MS. STANKOSKY: I'm Laura Stankosky
10	with the Environmental Protection Agency in
11	Dallas.
12	GEN. ROBERSON: Paul Roberson with
13	the Greater Kelly Development Corporation.
14	MR. BANNER: Gordon Banner with the
15	TNRCC in Austin.
16	MR. PERSON: Paul Person,
17	representing the Union Pacific Railroad.
18	MS. JOHNSON: My name is Yolanda
19	Johnson, and I'm with the Committee for
20	Environmental Justice Action and that's the
21	neighborhood organization on the north side of
22	Kelly.
23	MR. MURRAH: Sam Murrah, I'm with
24	Clean Air & Water, and also on the Board here.
25	PROF. LENE: And I'm Gene Lene. I'm
ı	II

with St. Mary's University, and I'm a community 1 member. 2 I'm John Jacobi with the 3 MR. JACOBI: 4 Texas Department of Health. 5 MR. SANDOVAL: I'm Damian Sandoval, 6 RAB Committee co-Chair. 7 BGEN. MURDOCK: Thank you all. And 8 before -- As we begin the administrative 9 portion of our meeting, I'd like to turn the meeting over to -- to Damian for some remarks 10 11 that he has. Thank you, General. Ι 12 MR. SANDOVAL: just want to say thank you to all of the folks 13 with the community and Air Force wise that put 14 15 on this -- this pre-RAB tonight. everybody has probably noticed, these RABs have 16 17 been changing in the last six, eight months. The true spirit of partnership is they're all 18 19 involved to get these different groups out 20 there to different poster board stations. So I encourage everybody to -- if they get a chance, 21 to visit with them. 22 I want to welcome all RAB members tonight. 23 It looks like we have a full house tonight, and 24 25 that's great, we have a lot of exciting issues

to vote on tonight.

one thing I wanted to disclose to
everyone -- that's pretty much what we like to
do here at the RAB as public notice -- when I
first took the position of RAB co-Chair I was
working for the Department of Transportation.
Since then I have taken a new position. I
actually now work with a company in the private
sector called UniTech.

They're -- One of their main responsibilities is they're an Air Force contractor who works -- who supports all Air Force installations throughout the country. That does include Kelly Air Force Base.

The organization, the way it's structured now, is UniTech has two main primary focuses and that's the Air Force Center for Environmental Excellence. One is working on the BRAC side, which Kelly Air Force Base falls under; and the second is, Compliance and Worldwide Restoration.

My specific responsibility is working on the worldwide restoration portion where my main responsibility is, what they call, PAFCA, Pacific Air Force Major Command Area, so my

main responsibility is Hiccum Air Force Base, Hawaii.

The reason I felt it necessary to let everybody know was to, one, put the information out there to everybody so that everybody could make a decision if I should continue as a RAB co-Chair. The second was just to notify everybody of what I am doing now. We've established some relationships on the RAB and on the TRS.

Just -- and -- And the last thing I want to say is, I think we've done a lot in the last eight to nine months, and I think there's some major challenges, and some major cornerstones we're just about -- we're about to hit. So whatever the result is, I -- I encourage everybody to keep on moving forward with the responsibilities of a RAB member to insure this community is cleaned up, and to hold the Air Force and all involved to the responsibility that they're dealt with. Thank you.

BGEN. MURDOCK: As this issue is, obviously, a community issue, I turn the meeting over to those that would like to discuss comments made by Damian. It is not

1 appropriate for me to -- to comment one way or 2 the other, and I would encourage some 3 discussion among the community members relative to Damian's comments. So -- George? 4 MR. RICE: I think Damian has been 5 doing a very good job as community co-Chair. 6 7 And I don't see how this new position of his 8 will adversely affect his position here, and I 9 hope he remains as co-Chair. BGEN. MURDOCK: Paul? 10 11 GEN. ROBERSON: I was going to say, I 12 share that view. I think Damian has done a -a great job as our co-Chair, and I would 13 14 recommend that we -- he continue as the 15 co-Chair with the understanding that if he ever gets involved directly in Kelly issues he 16 should let us know about it. 17 But I think, 18 beyond that, he should continue. 19 MS. PEACE: I agree with Mr. Rice and 20 General Roberson. I think, Damian, you've done 21 a great job. I think you've been up to the challenge. If you feel there's a conflict, but 22 23 if you don't, you should stay on. BGEN. MURDOCK: Further discussion? 24

MR. JACOBI: As a public member, I'd

1	like to suggest that Damian has done an
2	exceptional job, and would like to see him
3	continue in that capacity. And if the Chair
4	would entertain a motion to that effect, I so
5	move.
6	AUDIENCE MEMBER: I'm sorry. You may
7	be able to hear this among yourselves, but in
8	the audience here we find it very difficult to
9	hear and understand what is being said. Could
10	somebody control the volume a little bit?
11	BGEN. MURDOCK: We'll try and Can
12	you hear me better if I talk more directly into
13	the mic like that?
14	AUDIENCE MEMBERS: (Indicating.)
15	BGEN. MURDOCK: Can everybody in the
16	back hear me when I talk in that manner?
17	AUDIENCE MEMBERS: (Indicating.)
18	BGEN. MURDOCK: I guess we've just
19	proved how we need to articulate our
20	conversation this evening, so we'll try and do
21	better. Wave back there if we are remiss in
22	not speaking loud enough.
23	There's been a motion made to continue to
24	have Damian Sandoval remain as the community
25	co-Chair. And I would ask if there are any

1	seconds on that motion?
2	GEN. ROBERSON: Second.
3	BGEN. MURDOCK: Second? I have to
4	turn to my foremost parliamentarian to keep me
5	straight with the Robert's Rules of Order. But
6	I'll ask for any discussion at this point, if
7	there is any?
8	(Indicating.)
9	BGEN. MURDOCK: No discussion. All
10	those in favor, if you would indicate by
11	raising your hand.
12	MR. McGHEE: It should be a community
13	vote.
14	MS. KELLY: It should be a community
15	vote.
16	BGEN. MURDOCK: Okay. Thank you.
17	I've been advised that it should just be the
18	community member of the RAB that vote. So if
19	those community members would indicate by
20	raising their hands.
21	(Indicating.)
22	MS. KELLY: You got it.
23	BGEN. MURDOCK: Those opposed?
24	(Indicating.)
25	BGEN. MURDOCK: Let the record show

I'm

that there was unanimous consent to have Damian continue as the co-Chair. MR. SANDOVAL: Good. Thank you. glad we got over that hurdle, now on to business. The next item I'd BGEN. MURDOCK: like to go over are the packets that the RAB members and some of the -- some of you out in the audience may in fact have.

> The first item that I'd like to go over is on the right-hand side of the package, as you're looking at it, towards the very end just -- just prior to this public participation and permitting. And it concerns the Action Items as a result of the July RAB meeting. And I will go over them very quickly, so that you know what our response to those Action Items were. And they are listed alphabetically.

> The first one being item (A) Mr. Quintanilla asked that -- for quidelines dealing with the information and repository and administrative record, and these requirements are contained at 40 Code of the Federal Regulations which, in fact, are in this RAB package.

1

2

3

4

5

6

We

24

25

members.

1 If you -- If you could, MR. McGHEE: the package the General was talking about looks 2 like this. (Indicating.) At the top of it, it 3 says, 29 July RAB Action Item Response; below 4 5 that, it says, Item (A). This is the package 6 he's going through; if you don't have that in 7 your folder, then sorry. 8 This is the response to RAB questions. can get you a copy of these, if you'd like. 9 These are RAB specific questions, and this is 10 11 our rely back to them. The General is going to 12 go through them one by one very quickly. if you'd like a copy of this, please see me, 13 I'll be right over here, and I'll get your name 14 15 and address and send you one. BGEN. MURDOCK: The item -- The next 16 17 item (B) TNRCC was asked to provide information 18 concerning reportable spills. I don't know if 19 they're in a position this evening to provide 20 that in -- in writing to the RAB members. 21 MS. POWER: We have it in writing in 22 these packets, and will be passed out tonight. BGEN. MURDOCK: We'll make sure that 23

this information is disseminated to all the

And, Damian, if you could, remind me

of that, please.

MR. BANNER: Thank you, Abbey. In case y'all don't know, that's Abbey Power with the TNRCC Regional Office here in San Antonio.

BGEN. MURDOCK: Damian has asked for some maps identifying the various zones. We've included zone maps in the RAB member packages.

The next item would be a request for the use of standard acronyms, and we have provided that in this package, too. Hopefully, that will be a help to those members and visitors that are not as familiar with the -- the environmental language.

There is a list in the package of those project members associated with cleanup activities at Kelly Air Force Base. This is in reference to Item (E).

Item (F) was a request for a discussion of the reuse or reinjection of treated groundwater, and a request for that discussion to take place at the TRS. And I believe, SAWS made that presentation on the 25th of August at the TRS meeting.

Damian requested on Item (G) a summary of the contamination of the Edwards Well Number

313 at Kelly Air Force Base. And we have included our response to that, and if there are further questions, we would certainly entertain questions on that.

I believe, also on this Item (G), the contamination of that particular well, this evening George Rice has asked for some time to make a presentation, and we have allocated time accordingly in the agenda. So if we can defer any questions and comments specifically about that maybe until your presentation this evening, George.

Item (H), Mr. Quintanilla said that he would contact ATSDR to see if the RAB could comment on the upcoming public health assessment. And I turn to Armando, and asked if you were successful in -- in getting a response from the ATSDR folks.

MR. QUINTANILLA: General, we were to comment on that report on September the 22nd. However, we never did get a copy of the report; it went directly to -- to your office or to your staff, and we never did get a chance to comment on it.

That -- The ATSDR was requested by this

1	RAB and by citizens from the community and, for
2	some reason, we we got cut off at the at
3	the gate by your staff. We did not get a
4	chance to review that. The RAB did not get a
5	chance to review that report.
6	BGEN. MURDOCK: Well, I just comment,
7	that it's not my report or our our Air Force
8	report. What What did ATSDR say when
9	when you called? Were they
10	MR. QUINTANILLA: ATSDR said that you
11	raised some questions concerning the air
12	sampling, and therefore, they had withdrawn
13	that report for peer review.
14	BGEN. MURDOCK: Okay. I have
15	MR. QUINTANILLA: The RAB never did
16	question it; it was your staff that questioned
17	it.
18	BGEN. MURDOCK: Okay. Let me provide
19	the latest status, not knowing what Armando was
20	able to find out, from the ATSDR folks.
21	I understand that they have, in fact,
22	released a public affairs press release on the
23	current status of the Public Health
24	Assessment. But I don't have that assessment;
25	I just have notes concerning it. And the notes

that I have suggest that ATSDR has determined that the modeling used in some of the conclusions -- because it is new modeling, they felt that verification of the modeling was necessary, and thus, have asked for a peer review.

This peer review, from my understanding, will take anywhere between four and six weeks. And then the process would, then, be to provide those organizations that provided data for the report to comment on that, followed by a public comment period, and the community, specifically our local Kelly Air Force Base and San Antonio community, will be afforded the opportunity to comment on the draft report prior to it being published.

I asked when that time frame might occur, and was told that, at the present schedule, they would -- they thought that it would probably not be until after the first of the year before the draft report has been processed through the peer review and available for public comment.

If anybody has anymore additional information that they've garnered, I -- I sure

would appreciate comment, but that's the latest
as I know it at least.

Armando, are you aware of any other time

lines that they've articulated to you?

MR. QUINTANILLA: It's four to six months, sir, just the way you mentioned it.

MR. SANDOVAL: Sir, you a question on -- on kind of the process, I guess, perception. When I came aboard, I wasn't involved in the ATSDR request; however, since then, it's been a topic of discussion.

I guess, I've heard some -- some discussions, some rumblings in the community, that if the RAB requested this study to be done, why wasn't the RAB included in the initial review process? And you probably can't answer this, but that's one question. The second question, or the second perception is, if -- that this report was completed in a draft format, it went to Air Force -- Kelly Air Force Base personnel, they didn't like the way the data looked, thus contacted ATSDR, and they rescinded the report, and now the result is a peer study.

Now, those are just, I think, two

1 perceptions out there that -- that are out there, and whatever we can do to kind of 2 3 resolve that, that would be great. BGEN. MURDOCK: I agree. And I would 4 suggest the RAB needs to ask those that 5 6 authored the report the ATSDR those questions. 7 The -- The question MR. QUINTANILLA: 8 is, General, that the report came to your 9 staff. Your staff should have brought it before the RAB. It was the RAB that requested 10 11 this; not your staff. It's not my report. 12 BGEN. MURDOCK: 13 I don't -- I am not authorized nor my staff authorized to provide a report given to them to 14 15 anybody else. It's not my -- It's not the Air 16 Force's report. 17 If you had not MR. QUINTANILLA: questioned the air sampling we would be -- we 18 19 would have reviewed the report by now. Someone 20 questioned the air sampling, and that's the 21 reason it was withdrawn, and we're not looking at it now. And it wasn't the RAB; it was Kelly 22 23 Air Force Base staff. 24 BGEN. MURDOCK: Well, I can't answer 25 what -- who -- who it was or who did it. All I

1	can suggest is, that you ask that question of
2	the authors of the report, the ATSDR folks.
3	MR. QUINTANILLA: I did. And that's
4	what they said.
5	MR. SANDOVAL: If I could take that
6	as an Action Item, that I'll draft up a letter
7	on behalf of the RAB, maybe, the community
8	members, and pass that along. And by the time
9	we submit that letter, maybe we can have it at
10	the next TRS meeting, and we can forward that
11	on to ATSDR. Would that suffice to try to get
12	our ans the questions resolved?
13	BGEN. MURDOCK: Okay. Item (J) is a
14	person.
15	MR. MURRAH: You skipped (I).
16	BGEN. MURDOCK: Did I skip one?
17	Sorry.
18	Item (I), Mr. Quintanilla requested that
19	Kelly contact ATSDR and request information on
20	the Public Outreach Plans for the upcoming PHA,
21	which is what we've discussed, and we have, in
22	fact, provided an E-Mail from Dr. Fowler, from
23	the ATSDR, which articulates how, in fact, that
24	outreach will occur.
25	Hopefully, that is helpful information to

you. But I would encourage you to, maybe, read that, and then also provide additional questions to the ATSDR folks if there is that interest in the community.

Item (J), the RAB requested a summary of public involvement opportunities. And that -- asked that the TNRCC give a presentation on the subject. I'll turn to the TNRCC folks for a response to that Action Item, if I could, please.

MR. BANNER: Right. We sent down a pamphlet that you'll find in the back of your package, this one here. (Indicating.) And this is a -- this is an excellent resource that the Office of Public Assistance at TNRCC put together. A lot of time and energy went into putting this together, and I think a lot of your questions, a lot of the RAB's questions on public participation and opportunities in the cleanup process can be find in this document.

So probably the best thing to do would be to take a look through that, and then if there are additional questions by the RAB members they can either give me or the Office of Public Assistance a call, or write us a letter.

BGEN. MURDOCK: Okay. Thanks,

Gordon, very much.

Item (L), was a request that Kelly provide information on the use and position of natural attenuation at Kelly Air Force Base. And a lot -- a letter addressing that subject is included in that package.

Item (M), was a request that Kelly provide a list of sites where institutional concern -- institutional controls are being considered, and a letter that addresses that issue also; and that's included in the -- in the RAB package.

Mr. Quintanilla asked that Kelly get a copy of the materials presented in California by the EPA on natural attenuation. Lisa -- and I don't want to speak for you -- but I understand you'll be attending a conference on that issue next week and will be bringing back some materials on that issue. Is that a satisfactory response, Armando, at this point?

MR. QUINTANILLA: That's fine, sir.

You may also try the Air Force Center for

Environmental Excellence at Brooks Air Force

Base, Colonel Selzner, (phonetic) I think, he's

1 got a complete set. BGEN. MURDOCK: Okay. We'll take 2 note of that. 3 Item (0), was a request for the most 5 recent BCT minutes. And they are -- in fact, were distributed at the August TRS meeting. 6 7 Item (P), was a request to see if Mr. Sandoval would be able to attend the BCT 8 9 meetings as an observer. Unfortunately, I am 10 guilty, as most, of using acronyms, so I 11 apologize. 12 BCT is the Base Realignment and Closure 13 Cleanup Team, and that organization is composed 14 of about four different organizations or 15 representations from the EPA, the TNRCC, the Air Force Base Closure Agency, and Kelly Air 16 Force Base. And this issue was brought before 17 18 that entity, and the vote was an unanimous 19 "No," that they would prefer to keep the 20 membership as it is. 21 MR. RICE: Question. 22 BGEN. MURDOCK: Yes. 23 MR. RICE: Could you tell us what the reasoning was behind that decision? 24 25 BGEN. MURDOCK: The factors that they

articulated were that the BCT meets once a month, and it meets either in San Antonio, Dallas, or Austin, it varies between the three locations. And the meetings are typically two business days at -- on every month, and they thought that this would probably be an unfair burden to Damian and his employer to expect him to be relieved from those duties -- from his normal work duties two days a month and traveling unreimbursed to those three different locations. If in fact, that's not a burden, I'd be glad to take it back to the BCT.

MR. SANDOVAL: Well, I think it may be better than just me as an individual person, it may be the next RAB co-Chair. I think that the opportunity should lend itself if the meeting is, in fact, scheduled in San Antonio a portion of the meeting may be attended by this individual. So at -- I think if we could get a clarification from the BCT if, in fact, a person can attend a portion of those meetings, if possible.

BGEN. MURDOCK: Okay. I guess, I would turn to a representative from the TNRCC or EPA who are members of that organization

1	that may be able to address that this evening.
2	And if no one is here that can address it,
3	we'll take it as an Action Item, and get back
4	with the RAB members.
5	MR. QUINTANILLA: I think that's a
6	wise idea, General. Because Environmental
7	Justice requires that people impacted by
8	contamination should be part of the decision
9	making process. So members of this RAB
10	Committee should be on that BCT Committee.
11	BGEN. MURDOCK: Okay. Noted.
12	MR. QUINTANILLA: On the basis of
13	Environmental Justice we should be included in
14	that.
15	BGEN. MURDOCK: Well, I don't see
16	anybody stepping up to the microphone, so we'll
17	take that to as an Action Item and get back
18	with you all.
19	MR. SANDOVAL: In the meantime, we
20	are going to get copies of the BCT meeting
21	minutes on a monthly basis?
22	BGEN. MURDOCK: My understanding was
23	that was not the request, but we can certainly
24	make that request. I believe, it was My
25	understanding was a one time what were the

meetings from the -- minutes from the last meeting, and we provided that. I didn't realize there was a recurring request, but we can certainly address that. I can put that request to the BCT, if that's the wish of the RAB.

MR. SANDOVAL: And a following question. Are the BCT meetings part of the administrative record; do they go to the library?

BGEN. MURDOCK: I can't answer that.

I don't know the answer to that. We'll have to find out. And we'll include that with the request that you've asked for.

Item (Q), was a request for the RAB to consider adding two more Board members. And we'll discuss that in just a minute; and get your input on that. And the last item -- So I'd like to defer that for the moment.

And the last item was Item (R), a request for information on the monitoring of the paint in the air during the demolition of the fuel tank out there in 1592 area. As most of you are aware, that tank was, in fact, demolished, and we've got a -- a paper that describes how

that was done, and the process that took place with regards to demolition of that tank.

With that, that concludes a brief run down of the action items from the last meeting. And I'd like, at this time, to go down and continue through the introduction portion of the -- of a vote on the minutes for the 29th of July meeting. If -- You all should have received the minutes in a timely manner, and I'd ask that you refer to them, again, in the packet.

MR. SANDOVAL: As everybody is taking a quick review of the meeting minutes, I'd like to say that at the last RAB meeting we voted upon the Charter that said that the Air Force should provide meeting minutes in a timely fashion, specifically within a two or three week time frame. And I do believe the Air Force did meet that requirement this time.

One other thing, sir, on that issue, though, would be, there's a lot of good information in these packets and, if at all possible, as somewhat of a courtesy to the RAB members if we could try to receive the packets with the advanced Agenda three or four days before the RAB meetings -- Is that a

possibility?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I would love that, BGEN. MURDOCK: because I would love to get it three or four days prior. But unfortunately, I can't -- It's difficult just because of the amount of work involved in getting that. We will try our very best to accommodate to get the -- the packets out earlier. It's an immense administrative burden, and in many cases, some of the issues for which we have responses in the package are being worked on up to and including the date that the RAB meets. So we try and balance getting a timely response and an accurate one with providing the information in advance. we will try to do our best to get the packages, certainly out to the RAB members, as early as we can.

MR. SANDOVAL: Is there a motion to approve the RAB meeting minutes from the July 29th meeting?

MR. QUINTANILLA: I have a couple of corrections, Mr. Chairman. The first correction is on the first page. Mr. Allan Hagel -- Hagelthorn was also Mr. Person's alternate. I -- I don't think that that is

ESQUIRE DEPOSITION SERVICES
7800 IH-10 WEST, SUITE 100, SAN ANTONIO, TX 78230
(210)377-3027 (800)969-3027 FAX (210)344-6016

correct, and nor is it legal. There's no place 1 in the Charter that states that another RAB 2 3 member can be the alternate for that RAB member, so I need a correction on that. 5 MR. PERSON: I'll respond. Mr. Quintanilla the -- my alternate was picked 6 7 at that time for that meeting to replace me. He did not, however, get to vote for me. 8 9 voted for himself. He can only vote for one. 10 I vote for myself, and Alan votes for himself. 11 He did represent me at that meeting; I will in 12 the future pick another alternate for me. 13 case I can't make a meeting, I'll have another 14 alternate there. 15 Thank you. MR. SANDOVAL: 16 Mr. Quintanilla, did you have something else? 17 MR. QUINTANILLA: Yes. 18 another one on Page 5 concerning Mary Kelly, 19 Kelly Air Force Base attorney. That's 20 Paragraph F-1, Mary Kelly, Kelly Air Force Base 21 Attorney-advisor, pointed out that the Department of Defense RAB regulations prohibit 22 reimbursement for travel and other costs 23 24 associated with individual personal training, 25 but that upon application and prior approval

1 TAPP funds may be used to pay for certain 2 technical training expenses. 3 I think that portion is not correct. 4 attended, as a RAB member, the San Francisco National Stakeholders Forum on natural 5 attenuation. It was all paid for by the Air 6 7 I think it ought to be corrected. 8 BGEN. MURDOCK: I -- If I can 9 speak -- ask Mary to speak to that. I'll direct --10 11 MS. KELLY: First of all, thank you, 12 Mr. Quintanilla for pointing that out. 13 regard to the minutes, the minutes are a 14 reflection of what was said at the meeting, and 15 that is a fair summary of the statements I did 16 make; and I stand by that statement today. 17 And with regard to your attendance at that 18 meeting -- at that conference in San Francisco, 19 there were special circumstances applicable --20 MR. QUINTANILLA: Under my 21 (inaudible.) MS. KELLY: -- they had volunteers to 22 23 attend that (inaudible). MR. COLLISON: Thank you. 24 I'm 25 Patrick Collison (phonetic) with the Air Force

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Center for Environmental Excellence here at
Brooks also a speaker at the conference that
you mentioned and also involved in some of the
initial organization.

When we found out about this issue with respect to other Restoration Advisory Boards across the nation, and it turned out that what this conference was, is the Center for Public and Environmental Oversight made a proposal to the Department of Defense and the Department of Energy saying that they thought it was necessary to provide a forum where stakeholders, like Mr. Quintanilla, could voice their concerns to EPA and via the officials that are essentially writing technical guidance on EPA's behalf, their -- their regulatory quidance. So essentially, they were provided those funds, and then the Center for Public Environmental Oversight decided who were the correct people to attend.

The purpose of attending that conference was not to achieve training or to receive training, it was -- You were there to provide the information necessary so that some more national changes could be communicated to EPA

and the Department of Defense.

So it wasn't meant to be training. You actually had a job there to provide guidance, and concerns, and issues, and -- and that's why, once again, the people that attended that conference were selected independently by the Center for Public Environmental Oversight,

Department of Defense, Department of Energy or the EPA did not play in selecting those individuals. And that's why it's different.

You had a role there, you had a job there, and it wasn't -- the goal was not essentially to provide classroom or training level experience.

MR. QUINTANILLA: I just have one question, sir. What regulation allowed that?

MR. COLLISON: The --

MR. QUINTANILLA: What regulation allowed that? I know that the public law allows for -- for RAB members to attend training and other -- other types of functions, the law says that. Even our Charter says that, our Kelly RAB Charter. But apparently with -- Did we go by the law or did we go by regulation.

MR. COLLISON: We went by essentially

what is regulation within the proper use of the 1 type of funds that are received for 2 environmental. So Walter King with the AFC is 3 our attorney, and he's issued an official letter that is supposed to be distributed on 5 6 And essentially, the funds that were 7 used in the Department of Energy, Air Force, and the US EPA, they allowed for funding of 8 9 activities involving community outreach and 10 technical exchange. So they can sponsor a 11 university or an independent not-for-profit 12 group to put together a conference or technical 13 workshop. So that's why they were able to fund the Center for Public Environmental Oversight, 14 15 which is a none-for-profit agency, and 16 essentially -- Not being a lawyer, I -- I now 17 understand that no one is going to go to jail, 18 because that was considered an appropriate 19 direction of funds. BGEN. MURDOCK: Well, what I --20 21 MR. JACOBI: First, I understand that 22 the funds -- federal funds were used to pay for 23 this trip out there. Those funds were not 24 Kelly RAB funds, were they; they were a

separate source of funds, independent --

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. COLLISON: Yes. No Kelly Air Force Base funds or base specific funds. McClellan had some people from California, and no installation or base level funds were used.

BGEN. MURDOCK: What I would like to do is -- because time is at a -- at a premium reiterate, again, that no Air Force funds were used for this particular event. But I think it's important that we be able to provide training for our RAB members, and to attend similar sorts of activities, and what I would like to suggest is, that we take it upon ourselves, we Kelly Air Force Base, for an Action Item, and look at the possibility of other governmental agencies that could, in fact, sponsor and reimburse our RAB members for attending these sorts of activities. Provide that list to the RAB, so that, in fact, we can encourage our members to attend these type activities and be reimbursed. I just don't know what those other agencies are, and the ground rules that they allow travel, but we'd be glad to try and compile a list and maybe that would be helpful.

MR. QUINTANILLA: I think that's a

(800)969-3027

great idea, General. The National RAB Caucus is having a meeting in San Francisco, I believe, in February, and they're also inviting people from all of the RABs over the United States.

MR. RICE: Gentleman, I think, that idea of a list is a good one. But I think along with that, if we could get some sort of concise statement as to what the policy is, because it's pretty confusing.

BGEN. MURDOCK: We will try and do that.

MR. JACOBI: One more comment.

Again, I don't have a problem with - with getting reimbursed to -- to go to one of these sessions, I think, it's an important function.

But if an individual is going to represent the Kelly Air Force Base RAB, I think the RAB ought to know who that individual is, and what the -- what the nature of his function is, if they're going to serve in an official capacity. And I do not know who selected the individual to attend this one, but I do not believe it was the RAB.

MR. SANDOVAL: That's correct.

1	BGEN. MURDOCK: I'll turn over to the
2	community co-Chair.
3	MR. SANDOVAL: I think
4	Mr. Quintanilla went as an individual, private
5	property landowner adjacent to Kelly, not as a
6	representative of the Kelly Air Force Base
7	RAB. Is that correct, Mr. Quintanilla?
8	MR. QUINTANILLA: I did not This
9	RAB did not send me there. I applied.
10	MR. SANDOVAL: Right.
11	MR. QUINTANILLA: Yes.
12	MR. SANDOVAL: You know, I I also
13	applied, and I did not get accepted to go.
14	MR. QUINTANILLA: You do not live in
15	a site that's contaminated by Kelly Air Force
16	Base.
17	MR. SANDOVAL: Are there any other
18	items that anybody else has noted in the
19	minutes that need correction?
20	MS. PEACE: First, could I just ask
21	that the people that are seated at the other
22	end of the table speak directly into the mic,
23	because we can't hear them at this end.
24	MR. SANDOVAL: Let's all on the RAB
25	Board just try to make a conscious effort to

1	speak directly into the microphone, please.
2	MR. JACOBI: You too, Annalisa.
3	MR. SANDOVAL: Okay. Are there any
4	other revisions to the meeting minutes in the
5	last RAB meeting?
6	(Indicating.)
7	MR. SANDOVAL: If not, is there a
8	second on the motion to approve the minutes
9	with the changes as stated?
10	MR. RICE: Second.
11	MR. SANDOVAL: George is that a
12	second?
13	MR. RICE: Yes.
14	MR. SANDOVAL: Can I have a show of
15	hands of all approving the meeting minutes with
16	the changes?
17	(Indicating.)
18	MR. SANDOVAL: Any folks not
19	approving the meeting minutes.
20	(Indicating.)
21	MR. SANDOVAL: Thank you. Let the
22	record show that the meeting minutes were
23	approved with noted changes.
24	The next item, Item (E), on our Agenda.
25	As many of us heard tonight, there is an

individual in the community that has been very outspoken, very verbal about her concerns with her community, concerned about how the RAB operates technical and both community questions that are very important to the functions that all of us have out here. This individual has petitioned the Restoration Advisory Board at Kelly to become a member. In everyone's packet there should be some information -- an application and an attached resume.

The current Charter, I believe, states that a maximum number of 25 individuals can be on the Restoration Advisory Board. We had 23; we had one individual who requested to be dropped from the RAB, so that leaves us -- We're at 22 individuals right now, I believe. Is that right, Mary?

MS. KELLY: That's right.

MR. SANDOVAL: So adding one person, a community person, would take our total back up to 23. So I take the -- if you could, take a couple of seconds to briefly look over the application, I would like to have a vote on that tonight.

Is -- As address everyone is looking

through the resume, Tanya, if you could step up to the microphone and maybe say a few words to the RAB members here, please.

MS. HUERTA: Good evening. I'm Tanya Huerta. I went to this Jr. High before it was built like this. I grew up south of here, and I came back here after ten years, and I also -- I still live on the south side and I work downtown. The address that you have, I hope is my work address. I have four daughters at home, so I don't publish my home address or my home phone number. Y'all are welcome -- you know, I'll give you ways to contact me; I just don't want it out there, because of my four daughters.

But I live about a mile south of the back gate of Kelly, where Security Hill is. And I've been attending the meetings for a year; I'm impressed how well things have come together in the year. I think, y'all are making some good decisions even though they're not easy decisions. So if I can answer any questions, I'll be glad to do that.

MR. JACOBI: I move we accept her application for membership.

1	MR. PUFFER: Second.
2	MR. SANDOVAL: Is there a point of
3	discussion?
4	(Indicating.)
5	MR. SANDOVAL: I'm just curious to
6	know, all in favor of accepting Tanya as a new
7	member of the Kelly Air Force Base Restoration
8	Advisory Board, please raise your hands.
9	MR. McGHEE: Community members only.
10	(Indicating.)
11	MR. SANDOVAL: Community members
12	only, I'm sorry. All opposed?
13	(Indicating.)
14	MR. SANDOVAL: Let the record show
15	that Tanya was unanimously accepted as a Board
16	member. Tanya, I believe, we have a seat up
17	here for you; and we also have a name plate for
18	you tonight, so you can join us.
19	MS. HUERTA: Thank you.
20	(Applause.)
21	MR. SANDOVAL: We didn't tell you,
22	the new RAB members have to buy coffee after
23	the meeting.
24	Okay. Moving right along. Item (F), and
25	there's a side issue to Item (F) I'd like to

add as well. Item (F) is going on and adding a water board member to the TRS, and then there's also another issue of changing TRS Chairmans.

I'd like to do the TRS Chairman real quick, if I could.

Initially, over the last year, I was acting as a TRS co-Chairman, which, as everyone can imagine, having two Restoration Advisory Board hats is very demanding. So at the last TRS meeting we decided that it would be best for -- in the interest of the TRS if I would step down and not to do -- have dual responsibilities. And the individual that the TRS selected is Dr. Gene Lene.

Dr. Lene brings a lot of experience and the support of academia behind him to have meetings at -- on campus at St. Mary's as we've been having for the last eight months. He also provides a specific expertise, and it's going to be very important, as Kelly turns the page into the next millennium.

So I would like to ask the Restoration

Advisory Board to accept my resignation as the

TRS Chairmanship first; we'll make that one

motion. And then the next motion would be to

1	accept the position of Dr. Lene as the new TRS
2	Chairman.
3	MR. JACOBI: I so move.
4	MR. ROBERSON: Second.
5	MR. SANDOVAL: Any discussion?
6	MR. QUINTANILLA: Question.
7	MR. SANDOVAL: Question? Is there a
8	question?
9	MR. QUINTANILLA: No. A question has
10	been called for.
11	MR. SANDOVAL: Okay. So can I see a
12	show of hands for all willing to accept my
13	resignation as the TRS Chairman?
14	(Indicating.)
15	MR. SANDOVAL: All opposed?
16	(Indicating.)
17	MR. SANDOVAL: Thank you. I have
18	I have resigned as the TRS Chairman. Now, for
19	the new motion.
20	May I have a motion for someone to request
21	that Dr. Lene be approved as the new TRS
22	Chairman for the Kelly Air Force Base RAB?
23	MR. JACOBI: I so move.
24	MR. MURRAH: I second.
25	MR. SANDOVAL: Point of discussion?
1	

1 (Indicating.) 2 MR. SANDOVAL: Can I have a vote? 3 All those in favor of Dr. Lene being the new TRS Chairman? 4 5 (Indicating.) 6 All opposed? MR. SANDOVAL: 7 (Indicating.) 8 MR. SANDOVAL: Thank you. Let the 9 record show that's also unanimous. There's donuts there with the second vote. 10 The next issue is incorporating or 11 12 adding an individual from the water board, I 13 believe it's specifically from SAWS, and that 14 would be Mr. Ed Weinstein. One of the reasons 15 we -- we requested someone specific from this 16 expertise area would be because of the new water issues that are related to the Kelly Air 17 18 Force Base. So I would like to make a 19 motion -- have someone make a motion to accept 20 the sponsorship or the individual, that's Ed 21 Weinstein, on the TRS --22 MR. SOLIS: So moved. 23 MR. SANDOVAL: Is there a second? 24 MS. PEACE: Second. MR. SANDOVAL: Point of discussion? 25

1	(Indicating.)
2	MR. SANDOVAL: May I have a show of
3	hands of all in favor of Mr. Weinstein?
4	(Indicating).
5	MR. SANDOVAL: All opposed?
6	(Indicating.)
7	MR. SANDOVAL: Let the record show
8	that, again, he has been unanimously voted in
9	as the TRS Chairman. Thank you.
10	And I think the task of the new Chair
11	TRS Chairmanship would be to identify the next
12	TRS meeting date by the end of the night.
13	MR. JACOBI: Let the record show
14	Dr. Lene is the Chairman. Mr. Weinstein is a
15	member of TRS.
16	MR. SANDOVAL: Oh, I'm sorry. So
17	So stated.
10	BGEN. MURDOCK: Thanks, Damian. The
18	ll vice and the second
18	next item I would like to move onto is the
19	next item I would like to move onto is the
19 20	next item I would like to move onto is the current community member term limits. The
19 20 21	next item I would like to move onto is the current community member term limits. The Charter that we approved at the last RAB
19 20 21 22	next item I would like to move onto is the current community member term limits. The Charter that we approved at the last RAB specifically articulates how the term limits

7

8

6

9 10

11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

program over to Mike McGhee who will explain how we plan on doing, as fairly as we can think of, coming up with term limits that will take this RAB membership Board through the calendar year '99, and the calendar year 2000, and with your assent, we will proceed in that direction.

So, Mike, if you could give a brief explanation as to what we will do and with the concurrence of the members we will come to closure with this issue?

The RAB Charter MR. McGHEE: Sure. was amended to include a way to address term limits, if you will, for RAB members. And what was decided was that we would start with the new calendar year for the next -- the next RAB meeting, 1999, and we would give folks the opportunity to draw lots to see if you're going to have, then, a one-year term starting at the beginning of '99 or two-year term.

So what I would like to ask is, first of all, if we could identify who here regards himself as a community member. And there's some -- there's some of you that -- you're with a particular agency, but you're not necessarily

1 here as an agency representative, you're here as a community member. So if I could ask you 2 3 to identify yourself by raising your hands, 4 what I will then do is distribute an even 5 number of year 2,000 and year 1999 lots. will place those in the hat and ask you to draw 6 This sounds kind of dramatic, but it's the best way we could come up with to make this 8 9 So if I could please ask the community fair. 10 members to raise their hand for a count? And, 11 Damian, could you get the count, please? 12 MR. SANDOVAL: Sure. One, two, 13 three, four, five, six seven, eight, nine, ten 14 eleven, twelve -- twelve. 15 MR. McGHEE: Okay. 16 MR. SANDOVAL: Are there any 17 community members that aren't here that we need to know? 18 19 MR. McGHEE: What we will do, then, 20 is, for the community members who are not here 21 we have a list of who we think those folks are, we'll ask Damian to draw for them. 2.2 I believe, 23 Mr. -- Did Mr. Quintanilla step out? 24 MR. RICE: Yes. 25 MR. SANDOVAL: Thirteen. We have

1	thirteen.
2	MR. SANDOVAL: 2000.
3	DR. LENE: Also, 2000.
4	MR. MURRAH: 2000.
5	MR. SANDOVAL: When you get your
6	numbers, can you announce what your date is,
7	please?
8	MS. JOHNSON: '99.
9	MR. PERSON: 1999.
10	MS. HUERTA: 2000.
11	MR. QUINTANILLA: I took one. It's
12	2000.
13	MR. RICE: 1999.
14	MR. SOLIS: 1999.
15	MS. ADAMES: 2000.
16	MS. PEACE: 1999.
17	MR. PUFFER: 1999.
18	MR. SANDOVAL: To clarify, too, Mike,
19	you might just want to mention, this just
20	delineates or identifies a term. It doesn't
21	necessarily mean that you cannot re reapply
22	to become a RAB member. So if your number is
23	'99, you can reapply for the next 2000 or 3000
24	whatever, as long as the RAB is in session.
25	BGEN. MURDOCK: Okay. What we're

1 doing now is trying sort through those community members that aren't here. And we'll 2 3 ask Damian to pick for -- for those members that are absent, if there are any. 4 5 MR. McGHEE: Yes. There are three. 6 There's Mr. Hagelthorn, Mr. Mixon, and 7 Mr. Jones. Damian, if you could --8 MR. SANDOVAL: The discussion is --9 is, rather than me or anyone taking a -- a vote for someone who -- who is not here, 10 11 specifically Carl Mixon, Mr. Jones, and 12 Mr. Hagelthorn. If, for whatever reason, I 13 pull out '99 and they're not happy with that, I 14 don't know how they would feel. I -- I would 15 rather let them pull their own number out at the next RAB meeting. I don't think it's a 16 critical issue we need to deal with tonight. 17 That would be my recommendation. What would 18 19 everybody -- how does everybody feel about 20 that. 21 MR. PERSON: I will draw for Alan. 22 MR. SANDOVAL: You will draw for 23 Okay. Is there any anyone that would Alan? 24 feel comfortable drawing for Mr. Jones? 25 (Indicating.)

1	MR. SANDOVAL: Anyone comfortable
2	drawing for Mr. Mixon.
3	(Indicating.)
4	MR. SANDOVAL: Okay. Let Let Paul
5	draw for Alan.
. 6	MR. PERSON: I'll draw for Carl,
7	too. 2000.
8	MR. McGHEE: 2000 for Mr. Hagelthorn.
9	MR. SANDOVAL: Okay. The remaining
10	members are just two, then, just Carl Mixon and
11	Mr. Jones.
12	MR. JACOBI: I'll draw for Carl, too,
13	and the remaining Mr. Jones.
14	MR. JACOBI: 2000 for Carl Mixon.
15	MR. SANDOVAL: And Mr. Jones gets
16	1999. Good. Thank you everybody for
17	participating in that little venture.
18	BGEN. MURDOCK: The last item in the
19	welcome portion of it is, to solicit a
20	parliamentarian amongst us. I think all of us
21	have very much appreciated Mary Kelly's defacto
22	role in that position, but I think it's
23	probably more appropriate that the
24	parliamentarian come from amongst the RAB
25	members. And so I would ask if there is anyone

1	amongst you that is interested in accepting the
2	position of becoming a little knowledgeable
3	about Robert's Rules of Order and helping us
4	out as the parliamentarian?
5	MR. JACOBI: I would like to comment,
6	if I may. I thought I think, that Mary
7	Kelly has done an excellent job of being a
8	parliamentarian. She obviously has the skills
9	and knowledge to do so, and I, for one, am very
10	comfortable with the services that she has
11	provided to this point.
12	MR. PERSON: I second that.
13	MS. KELLY: Thank you. We had Larry
14	Hoffman appointed; Larry has resigned from the
15	Board. And what I did, whenever Larry needed
16	back up, I offered that back up. I would
17	suggest you proceed with appointing a member,
18	and if you ever are in a quandary I'll be here
19	with my Robert's Rules.
20	MR. JACOBI: Based on that commitment
21	on Ms. Kelly's part, I'll volunteer.
22	BGEN. MURDOCK: Thank you, John, and
23	appreciate it. I guess, I would ask for a
24	motion so articulated?
25	MR. ROBERSON: So moved.

1 DR. LENE: So moved. 2 Second. MR. MURRAH: 3 Discussion? BGEN. MURDOCK: 4 (Indicating.) BGEN. MURDOCK: All in favor of Jack 5 6 as being the parliamentarian for the RAB, 7 please, say --8 (Indicating.) 9 All opposed? BGEN. MURDOCK: 10 (Indicating.) 11 BGEN. MURDOCK: Unanimous. Thank you 12 very much, John. I appreciate your stepping up 13 to do that. 14 MR. SANDOVAL: One quick issue, too, is a question about what's the tenure or the 15 16 responsible length of time for actual 17 regulatory agencies. And from my 18 understanding, there is not a time limit. 19 They're on the Board as long as the RAB 20 However, I think individual members on exists. 21 agencies can petition to get switched or changed as -- as Camille did, I believe. 22 23 MR. JACOBI: If I could make a comment, at this point. I don't think the 24 25 minutes reflect my affiliation with the Texas

2.2

Department of Health, but -- If we could correct the minutes to reflect that affiliation. Thank you.

I'd like to do is open the floor to any community member that would like to make a statement. If there is anybody that would like to do that, I would request that you state your name, and limit your comments to four minutes. At this time I'd more than welcome anybody from the audience, if they desire, to make a statement. Yes, sir. Please, come up to the microphone.

MR. DAVES: My name is Larry Daves, and I'm with the San Antonio Alliance for Democracy and with Jobs for Justice. I attended the series of these meetings here about three or four years ago, and I would like to express just as simply as I can, the thoughts that I heard as I was coming in.

As I was walking in this afternoon, there were some young kids out in front of the -- the facility, and they said, "We want a cleanup, not cover up." And I think it's -- that's the way that many people in the community feel,

not cover up." And I think it's -- t
way that many people in the community

ESQUIRE DEPOSITION SERVICES
BOO TH-10 WEST. SUITE 100. SAN ANTONIO. TX

that we would like to see the -- the Air Force respond to this horrible crisis that -- that faces San Antonio.

But the impression that I've gotten over the meetings that I have attended, and just by contact with the various members of the community is that, by and large the U.S. Air Force has conducted itself in a way, really, trying to cover up instead of trying to aide in the cleanup. And I hope we get a -- a new beginning to this, and move on with this problem, deal with this crisis, that affects the base and the community in a positive way so that we can look back on this later, all of us, with some pride in our community. Thank you.

MR. DOYLE: Good evening. My name is Phillip Doyle. I'm part of the legal team that currently represents the members of CEJA, many of who are -- are members of our RAB. I'm here tonight to make a very public statement to the RAB members, to the Air Force, and to the members of our regulatory community regarding our position on the use of monitored natural attenuation.

We have conveyed to both the EPA and the

TNRCC that we do not find the use of monitored 1 natural attenuation an acceptable form of 2 3 remediation. There has continued to be an awful lot of very public discussion about the 5 use of this program as an acceptable remediation process. We are stating to you 6 7 tonight, publicly, on the record, that we do not hold with the use of monitored natural 8 9 attenuation. And we will do everything that we 10 can to make sure that the Air Force engages in 11 a program that includes active remediation and 12 to remediate this problem in as short a term as 13 is humanly possible. Thank you. 14 BGEN. MURDOCK: Any other comments 15 that anyone would like to make and take the 16 floor? 17 (Indicating.) BGEN. MURDOCK: Thank you very much 18 19 we'll move onto the next item. 20 MR. SANDOVAL: The next item, Item 21 Number 3, report by Mr. Quintanilla on the Natural Attenuation Conference that he attended 22 23 in San Francisco in, I believe, September or 24 August. Mr. Quintanilla? MR. QUINTANILLA: First off, I want 25

to thank General Murdock and Mr. Sandoval for allowing me to be a part of this program today. This short presentation of my trip report on the National Stakeholders Forum, it was held from August the 30th through September the 1st, 1998 at the Western Bayfront Hotel in

As a matter of introduction Ms. Sherry W. Goodman, Chair of the Defense Environmental Response Task Force, or DERTF, in her report the Congress defines natural attenuation as follows:

San Francisco, California. Chart one, please.

Natural attenuation is process of containing and monitoring contamination and allowing the contamination to degrade naturally without active treatment while protecting human health and the environment. Chart two.

As to why this forum? First, because more and more responsible parties, that's the Army, Navy, Air Force, are preparing to address groundwater and soil contamination by relying upon monitored natural attenuation; reason Number 2 is, because of regulatory agencies have accepted this approach for the remediation of petroleum products BOC, such as TCE, and

ESQUIRE DEPOSITION SERVICES
7800 IH-10 WEST, SUITE 100, SAN ANTONIO, TX 78230
(210)377-3027 (800)969-3027 FAX (210)344-6016

20

21

22

23

24

25

(210)377-3027

inorganics such as heavy metals and short-lived radionuclide; thirdly, to provide a systematic regulatory framework for EPA to develop policy on monitored natural -- natural attenuation; and the fourth reason is, since there has been very few opportunities for public stakeholders, who live in contaminated sites, to express their views to the Center for Public Environment Oversight a program of the San Francisco Urban Institute hosted this Natural Stakeholders Forum. And its purpose was to bring the public, the RABs, into the decision-making process.

Approximately 58 RAB members from throughout the United States participated in this forum. Travel, lodging, and other RAB per diem expenses were paid for by the Air Force by Chart 3, please. Brooks Air Force Base.

The Agenda for the National Stakeholders Forum is shown on this slide. Because of the airline strike I arrived too late to participate in Sunday's activities.

Forum speakers included Tadd McCall, Deputy Assistant Secretary for the Air Force Environmental Safety & Occupational Health;

Felicia Marcus, Region 4, EPA Administrator;

Todd Weidemeier, Associate Technical Director
of Parsons Engineering Sites; Mr. Lenny Seagal,

Director for the Center Public Environment

Oversight; Air Force Center to Environmental

Excellence; and top environmental scientists,

engineers, and toxicologists from leading

institutions, and universities from throughout
the United States participated as speakers.

Chart 5, please.

The panel on natural attenuation of contaminants focused on the degradation of fuels, DOCs, inorganics, and the perspective of stakeholders. Panelists on groundwater contamination gave an overview of groundwater as a resource, groundwater regulatory policy history and the importance of cleaning up the groundwater. The panel speakers on regulator and community response briefed the forum attendees on federal, state, local government, and the stakeholders' experience on this subject.

On groundwater cleanup deposit technologies panelists spoke on conventional cleanup methods such as bioremediation,

1 monitoring technologies, and stakeholders' 2 views. Chart 6. 3 The panelists presented state-of-the-art 4 research on the technologies of natural attenuation. Also, they clarified national 5 policy issues on the use of natural attenuation 6 as a remedy. And thirdly, they offered 7 8 stakeholders from all contingencies an 9 opportunity to comment and ask questions about 10 the growing reliance of natural remedies for 11 treatment of contaminants. Chart 7, please. 12 This is a sampling of the questions from 13 the stakeholders' break out sessions. They are 14 as follows: 15 Who will pay and monitor for the long-term monitoring of natural attenuation? 16 17 Who -- Will natural attenuation replace remediation standards? 18 19 What is the reasonable time frame for 20 cleaning groundwater by natural attenuation? 21 How will natural attenuation protect the human health and the environment of the 22 23 public? 24 Will the Record of Decision, the ROS or 25 DE, specify the amount of time, the level of

The

1 remediation, and residual contamination on natural attenuation sites? 2 3 Now, no clear definite answers were The Senate for Public Environment 4 given. 5 Oversight will include all questions asked in 6 their report to EPA, to the regulatory 7 agencies, and also to the responsible parties, 8 and to the stakeholders. Chart 8, please. 9 This is a sampling of some of the comments 10 from the stakeholders' break out sessions. 11 two most often repeated comments were as 12 follows: 13 One, natural attenuation is another DOD 14 do-nothing cleanup remedy. And natural attenuation does not enhance 15 16 DOD's credibility of cleaning the 17 contamination. 18 These and other comments will be made a 19 20 21

part of the final report that is being compiled by the Senate for Public Environment. Chart 9, please.

In my research on natural attenuation, before I left for San Francisco, I learned that Cecil Field Naval Air Station is using natural attenuation to remediate groundwater

25

22

23

2.4

contamination. The installation has been in 1 2 operation since the 1940s and operation closure 3 is scheduled for 1999. Upon transfer the community will continue to use the site as an 5 This 17,000-acre installation has airfield. 6 nine sites that contain five major plumes and 7 thirty-two smaller plumes. The heating and storage tanks have been removed to prevent 8 9 additional contamination from seeping into the 10 soil and groundwater. The soil has been 11 treated using low temperature thermal 12 desorptions to prevent the further addition of 13 contaminants to the groundwater. groundwater is being treated by natural 14 15 attenuation. This cleanup process will require 16 25 years to complete. Because of the nature of 17 the future use of the property time was not a 18 major consideration in using this method of 19 cleanup. According to the DERTF report to 20 Congress by Ms. Sherry Goodman, natural 21 attenuation has helped to reduce the cleanup It is also providing 22 costs for Cecil Field. 23 adequate protection for human health and the 24 environment. Chart 10. 25

Ted McFall, Deputy Assistant Secretary for

the Air Force for Environmental Safety and Occupational Health stated in his talk, the stakeholder involvement, the RABs, are making America better.

He said that the involvement of citizen-based cleanups, RABs, were increasing public awareness and protecting health and the environment.

He stated that his goals were to continue public awareness, maintain community dialogue, be a good neighbor, and continue to seek regulator concurrence on cleanup actions.

On continuing community awareness, he said, that this would be accomplished by holding public briefings, notices, comment periods, document reviews, fact sheets, and good recordkeeping.

On being a good neighbor, Secretary McFall said, that it is being committed to cleaning up the on-base and off-base sites in a manner that protects human health and the environment.

On long-term monitoring, he said, that it would be very costly.

In closing, he said that if DOD caused it DOD would correct it, and that he wanted to

finish the cleanup as a good neighbor by ensuring that cleanups were operating properly and successfully before land was transferred to the community.

The answers to questions concerning the raising of TCE standards from 5 parts per billion to 50 parts per billion in the affirmative. Now, this is the same as Canada's standard, and it was met as another do-nothing cleanup remedy by the attendees. I personally did not do view the DOD action as making America better. Chart 11, please.

As to what is next, the Senate for Public Environment Oversight will compile a report of citizens' concerns and comments for EPA, the regulatory agencies, the responsible parties, and the stakeholders. The report will help to ensure that the use of natural attenuation and cleanup programs will meet the needs of affected communities. The report will address natural attenuation in the following context:

When is natural attenuation appropriate as part of the remedy?

How will we know if natural attenuation is working?

And thirdly, what will be done if natural attenuation does not work?

I believe, that my time is up, and this concludes my trip report. Muchisimas gracias for your attention. I would also like to say muchisimas gracias for Mr. Walters and to Mr. Ron Charmers for their help in preparing this report. Are there any questions?

(Indicating.)

MR. QUINTANILLA: Yes, Mr. Rice?

MR. RICE: Yes, Armando, I would like to make a comment. You know, for sometime many of us have been asking the Air Force for the plans to cleanup the neighborhoods. And asking when are you going to cleanup the neighborhoods, but the Air Force has always refused to give us those plans. So our -- my confusion has been that the Air Force intends to in effect walk away from the contamination in the neighborhood.

Now, with all this (inaudible) we here lately on natural attenuation, I believe that more than ever. And I think that Phillip Doyle was right when he made his comments earlier, that the Air Force is laying the groundwork to

essentially walk away from the neighborhoods. 1 And I'm also very disappointed that all of 2 3 our local government elected officials don't 4 seem to care about this. 5 MR. QUINTANILLA: George, I had the opportunity to speak to Mr. Tadd McCall after 6 7 he spoke, and I asked him about natural attenuation on off-base sites. He said that in 8 9 most -- He didn't comment that it wouldn't be 10 done, but he said, most -- more than likely 11 that it would not be done. Okay. My -- My 12 answer to him was that it was all right if they did it, you know, inside the bases but, you 13 know, not in the communities. 14 15 MR. SANDOVAL: Tanya, did you have a 16 question. 17 MS. HUERTA: Yes. When is the 18 transfer of property supposed to occur from 19 Kelly? Isn't there a date, an appointment of 20 decision? 21 BGEN. MURDOCK: Paul, do you want to 22 address that? Kelly will 23 GEN. ROBERSON: Yeah. 24 close effective 13 July 2001. And as I 25 understand, all of the remediation measures

have to be in place, approved, and operating by that point in time.

MS. HUERTA: Has that essentially happened? Are they on time lines for -- Will everything be in place, and approved, and --

MR. SANDOVAL: I think -- I think, they're moving towards that. And I don't know with some of the changes that have come up for some of the zones. I think, the global perspective is they're probably are on schedule, but there's a some sites, some zones that may not be on target. The Air Force would be best to talk about that.

BGEN. MURDOCK: I'll turn over to Mike McGhee and ask him to provide the answer.

MR. McGHEE: Okay. It's very hard to predict schedules at five, ten years in advance, what's going to happen. We have been required to put together a what-is-your-goal, what-are-you-trying-to-achieve schedule. Since we don't know what alternatives will be considered for some sights, and we certainly don't know what remedy will ultimately be selected for some sites, it's very difficult to make a prediction as to where the schedule will

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 However, what I would propose is -end. instead of me speaking off the top of my head 2 3 is, if you all would like to hear a presentation on what the present schedule looks like for completion of the cleanup program, 5 6 we'd be happy to do that for you. 7 But, Mike, isn't it GEN. ROBERSON: 8 true that -- that the Air Force has got to

GEN. ROBERSON: But, Mike, isn't it true that -- that the Air Force has got to select the remediation actions by the time the base closes?

No, sir. I do not MR. McGHEE: believe that is true. The -- the -- That is the goal of the Air Force certainly. I will add that I've seen some of the closure record for transferring properties in closure bases and it does not coincide with the date of the closure. The actual transfer of property by deed takes in some cases much longer and in some cases not that much longer, but it takes longer than the actual closure date. So while Kelly Air Force Base may close, the final remedy may not be (A) selected (B) designed (C) installed, and (D) approved by the regulatory agencies that is operating successfully. have to -- We have to face all those hurdles

and get over them before we can say, okay, this
property is now ready to be transferred by
deed.

In the interim, however, as you know, there will be lease in effect where the City of San Antonio, the Greater Kelly Development Corporation will be leasing property from the Air Force if that -- if that actual transfer by deed has not yet occurred. I will state that our goal is to have remedy systems in place and operating successfully at the end of calendar year 2000. Will we meet that goal? I can't say for certain that we will. But again after we install the systems, it is up to the regulatory agency, who -- who accepts community input certainly to that, to approve those systems and state, yes, that are in fact doing what you said they would do, and, yes, we will allow you to transfer this property by deed.

Again, going back and looking at the base closure agencies' history on their ability to successfully transfer property it does not coincide with the actual closure dates of the bases. It is beyond that date.

MR. SANDOVAL: Let me add one thing,

25

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

July 13th the Air Force is not just going to close up their doors. There's going to be an Air Force entity on base, I believe, it's called the Air Force Base Closure Agency.

GEN. ROBERSON: That's correct.

MS. SOLIS: I was under the impression that no deed could be signed over before decontamination was complete. What's the status of that?

MR. McGHEE: No, sir. I believe -- I believe, the way -- if -- If I understand your question, I believe, the way that the process works for property transfer is that the regulatory agencies have to agree that the remedy is in place and is operating successfully. It may take, in fact, "X" number of weeks, months, years, probably years, for those systems to actually, ultimately finish completing the job. But it -- the process is such, that if you have a system in place, it's doing the job it was designed to do, it looks like it will clean up the site by a certain given period, the regulatory agencies have the ability to say, okay, that's good enough. We

will allow you to transfer the property by deed 1 2 at this point. You have proven that you have a 3 system that's in place and is operating, and we 4 will allow transfer by deed to occur. Otherwise, it could that -- if you wait until 5 6 the actual cleanup is ultimately complete, in 7 some cases, that could be many years away. 8 MR. QUINTANILLA: General, I believe, 9 it's time for break. 10 MR. SANDOVAL: Thank you, 11 Mr. Quintanilla. One more quick thing as an 12 Action Item, though, Mike, if we could take you 13 up on your suggestion and have a program time 14 line presentation at the next RAB meeting, and, maybe, in addition to that or with that, a 15 16 presentation on property transfer and lease 17 requirements that was mentioned tonight. 18 Mr. Roberson, you -- or General Roberson, you may want to help in that lease transition. 19 20 GEN. ROBERSON: Sure. MR. SANDOVAL: Mr. Quintanilla, if 21 22 you could do a couple of things, please, sir. 23 Make sure -- or have someone ensure that the 24 RAB members get a copy of the slides, that was

a very good presentation.

1 MR. QUINTANILLA: I think, Mr. Walters will take care of that. 2 3 MR. SANDOVAL: Okay. And a second 4 thing is, are you on the distribution list for the meeting minutes of this meeting? 5 MR. QUINTANILLA: On the distribution 6 7 list for what, sir? 8 MR. SANDOVAL: For the meeting 9 minutes that you're going to get once they --10 they can get compiled. Are you on that 11 distribution list to receive minutes? 12 MR. QUINTANILLA: Yes, I am. MR. SANDOVAL: Okay. If you'll, when 13 14 you get those, forward those on, those will be 15 good minutes? I think, we are a little bit behind, so if we could just take a short break 16 17 and be back in about ten minutes, we'd like to 18 start back at 8:10. Thank you. 19 (Short ten-minute recess taken.) 20 BGEN. MURDOCK: At this point, I'd like to introduce William Ryan from Kelly Air 21 22 Force Base who will make a presentation 23 providing information on how the public can be involved and the opportunities for it in the 24 25 RAB process. Mr. William Ryan.

MR. RYAN: Good evening. My name is 1 William Ryan; I'm with the Kelly Air Force Base 2 Environmental Restoration Program. And at this 3 time, I'd like to present some opportunity --5 upcoming events and opportunities for public 6 involvement in the cleanup program. 7 purpose of the tonight's briefing is to provide 8 advance notice to the RAB and also to the 9 members of the audience of some upcoming documents which will be available for review in 10 11 the next three or four months, the time frame for release of these documents, where these 12 13 documents can be reviewed, and also the process 14 for sub -- for submitting comments. Thank you, 15 The -- The RCRA, the Resource sir. 16 Conservation Recovery Act, is pretty much the 17 way Kelly Air Force Base is having to follow 18 its terms and conditions. And it requires us 19 to submit closure plans for four units. 20 site map located in the upper right corner of 21 the -- this slide indicates the locations, in 22 general, of these sites. There are three sites in Zone 2 which is 23 24 shaded in yellow, a site at E-3, which is a 25 waste and evaporation unit, SA-2 has already

been (inaudible) SD-1, the sludge drying beds, and all three of these sites are inactive. And in Zone 3 there's one site, S-8, which is a former parts cleaning and storage tank located in Zone 3. It's on the eastern border of (inaudible) which is stated in (inaudible) before we planned for these sites (inaudible) the actions necessary and plans to achieve site closures with TNRCC regulations. Next slide.

involvement requirements. First, public notice of -- public notice of the beginning of the 30-day public comment period will be published in the local newspaper, including the Express-News, La Prensa, and the South Side Reporter, in the first week of November. The closure plans will be made available in the -- in the San Antonio Main Public Library at 600 Soledad, and also at the TNRCC regional and Austin offices.

Under -- Under this process it's a state requirement for this public participation, and the state will actually be the recipient of the public comments. So all comments should be addressed to the TNRCC -- to the -- to the

appropriate action officer at the TNRCC. And this information, the address, the names will be provided in the newspaper ads, and also in the letters that we will be sending out to the public.

Also, at -- at -- during the 30-day notice for public comment the public is invited to submit a request for a public hearing, and that also should go to the TNRCC. Next slide.

Also, issued with the hazardous waste permit were the groundwater compliance plan. And this compliance plan requires Kelly Air Force Base to conduct public participation in the Zone 2 soils remedial action work plan and corrective management implementation work plan in regulatories. This work plan will address soil contamination at four sites located in -- within Zone 2.

This document will describe several technologies, including excavation, removal, capping, and soil vapor extraction, which will be used to remediate soils contaminated by fuels and solvents and metals as the result of past practices at Kelly Air Force Base.

This is also a public participation

requirement of the TNRCC compliance plan with Kelly Air Force Base. The -- The process will -- will be that we will submit a draft work plan to the TNRCC, EPA, and also to the RAB for review and comment in December of 1998. We will then receive comments back from the TNRCC, and EPA, and also from the RAB, and incorporate those comments into a revised work plan. We will then submit that work plan for public process -- public comment and involvement.

The notice -- The public participation process is similar to what I just described. We will place notices in the newspapers and have mailings that will go out the public. This notice period is 60 days in contrast to 30 days of the previous plans. And also, comments should be forwarded to -- to the TNRCC for -- for a response.

Another requirement of the groundwater compliance plan is to -- to -- includes public participation in Site S-4, which is located in Zone 3, the soil removal work plan or remedial action work plan. This work plan will -- will outline clean up for Site S-4, which is the

site that has -- which has fuel and solvent contamination in the soils. It's located along the east boundary of Zone 3 of Kelly. The work plan will -- will address and describe the remedial -- will address and describe the remedial actions necessary, including bioventing, which is a primary action at this site.

The public participation process will be the same as previously discussed. There will be notices published in the San Antonio Express-News, La Prensa, and the South Side Reporter. There will be a 60-day public comment period with written comments going to the TNRCC. Next slide, please.

During this public comment period also there's a 60-day comment period where we're responsible to the TNRCC, and during this time period if there are requests for public hearings or meetings, that should be forwarded to the TNRCC.

Also, in accordance with the groundwater compliance plan at Kelly Air Force Base, we will conduct public comment and hold a public comment period on the Zone 3 Groundwater

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Remedial Action. This work plan will outline the -- the remedial actions that we plan to use in the Zone 3 groundwater, both on base and off base, and -- and addresses the existing system's containment at the base boundary and off base contamination. Next slide, please.

The public involvement process in Zone 3 is, we will submit a document to the state EPA and -- and the RAB for comment prior to the public -- the official public comment period. We will receive comments back from the state EPA and -- and the RAB, address those comments in a new document which will then be put out for the official public comment period. The notice of public comment period will be published in the newspapers, the La Prensa, Express-News, and the South San Reporter, and there will be a 60 day public comment period for -- for these reports. Any requests for public meetings or hearings and all written comments should be forwarded to the TNRCC for this document.

The last site that we have coming up in the next three or four months is Site S-1, which is located in -- in Zone 5. And you'll

4

5

7

8

9

1.0

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

see that's up in the northern portion of main 1 Kelly adjacent to the large fuel tank which was 2 recently removed. This is an interim action and it will be -- the public notice requirements for this interim action are 6 actually governed under the CERCLA or the Air Force IRP, Installation Restoration Program. This is actually an Air Force requirement for the public participation at this site. The Air Force will publish a notice in 11 the -- in the local newspapers. There will

be -- In December of 1998. There will be a 30 day public comment period at which time a proposed plan for this action will be open for public comments. Public comments on -- Written public comments on this document should be forwarded to -- to the -- to the Air Force, not to the TNRCC. Any questions? Mr. Rice?

MR. RICE: Yes. William, you mentioned off base groundwater cleanup in Zone 3. Could you expand on that a little bit, and tell us what it involves?

MR. RYAN: The compliance plan -- The work plan, the -- for -- for Zone 3 groundwater addresses both the on-base and off-base

contamination from Sites MTS-4 and -S-8. We have existing recovery systems, containment systems, on the base boundary. There's also a barrier wall planned to be installed, and we're also looking at collecting data to evaluate whether there is a potential for natural attenuation to be used.

MR. RICE: Just a follow up. I guess, when you -- when I said that you have not developed any plans to clean up any of your off-base contamination, that's -- I'm wrong then. You are, in fact, developing a plan to clean up off-base groundwater contamination in Zone 3; is that correct?

MS. BROWN: Excuse me. I'm Leslie
Brown with the Kelly Legal Office. And,
George, I think, you're kind of going into that
area where before -- discussing off-base
contamination in Zone 3 where I stood up, and I
have said, "Due to litigation, we've been
advised not to answer those questions."

And if -- if you want to ask those questions, what we're doing is taking the questions that you've asked in the past, formulating an answer, and sending those to the

Department of Justice. And having them review 1 our answers, and get basically their permission 2 3 to give those answers to you. But they need to 4 see those answers. MS. HUERTA: Well, what's the time 5 6 line? 7 MR. RICE: Well, see, I don't 8 think -- I don't think I'm asking anything involved with the lawsuit. You know, I've been 9 saying for a long time that y'all have never 10 11 developed any plans to clean up the off-base 12 contamination. Now, it appears like I'm 13 I think, William said that you are 14 developing plans to clean up off-base 15 groundwater contamination, and -- in Zone 3. 16 So I'm just asking; is that correct? 17 MS. BROWN: Well, I think it's okay 18 to answer that question, William. MR. RYAN: Yes. That's correct. 19 MS. HUERTA: What's the time line 20 before you expect the Department of Justice to 21 22 give you the answers? Are we looking at years, weeks, months? 23 MS. BROWN: I have -- What I'm doing 24 25 is going to have draft answers to any of the

questions that have gone on regarding Zone 3.

And I'm putting the answers together, and then
I will send them to the Department of Justice.

And I plan on doing that within the next two
weeks. They'll have to have time to read our
answers; hopefully, it won't take that long,
and then we will be able to get back to you.

MS. HUERTA: Maybe, by the next meeting? I mean, as far as the -- you know, it's real hard to hear the public concern about the contaminants that are off the base that are living, you know, in our homes, and then to hear we're not allowed to discuss it from the very people that should be discussing it under Open Law.

MS. BROWN: Right. We understand, and that's why we're giving the answers to the Department of Justice, and asking them to review them. Now, I would say by the next RAB meeting, I'm sure we will have Department of Justice review those answers, and I hope by the next TRS.

MS. HUERTA: Is there anything that we as citizens can do to express our concerns to somebody about this situation of needing to

wait to have the answers?

MR. SANDOVAL: There was a couple of discussions about going and seeing our -- our local representatives. And Mr. Quintanilla and I were talking about that, and I don't know if -- Mr. Quintanilla, did you have a chance to speak with anybody about that issue, about trying to push that to get that answer?

MR. QUINTANILLA: You know, I think
Kelly is trying to -- to hide something. The
lawsuit only involves a small portion of
property, 50 x 75 feet, 50 x 100 feet. There's
20,000 families that are involved, and we can't
answer the questions on Zone 3 because of this
small plot of land.

MS. BROWN: Well, we -- the

Department of Justice are our attorneys in this

litigation, and they've advised us not to

answer.

MR. QUINTANILLA: Did the Department of Justice say you cannot answer these other questions of the 20,000 people that are affected, because we have one lawsuit on one small plot.

MS. BROWN: Well, it's the off-base

1	contamination in Zone 3. But that's what we're
2	try But we're trying to remedy this.
3	MR. QUINTANILLA: And that is all
4	is that Where is the environmental justice
5	in all of this?
6	MS. BROWN: I hope to have the
7	answers
8	MR. QUINTANILLA: Because of my my
9	lawsuit The other people have not filed a
10	lawsuit, they deserve answers on this.
11	MS. BROWN: Well, hopefully, we'll be
12	able to give them some.
13	MR. SANDOVAL: The The last time
14	there was there were doing an exit meeting
15	with a couple of folks, about three months ago,
16	we provided a map and Mr. Quinta Mr. Rice
17	provided a map and circled an area, has that
18	have you have you had a response back from
19	DOJ on that?
20	MS. BROWN: Sir, I'm sending that
21	with them. I've discussed it with them,
22	they've asked me to send them the map, send
23	them the questions.
24	MR. SANDOVAL: So in the last two
25	months nothing we have not sent anything up

1	to them to get clarification on that?
2	MS. BROWN: I've discussed it with
3	them and described the map, described the
4	circle.
5	MR. SANDOVAL: Do they understand
6	how how folks are starting to feel down here
7	about this issue?
8	MS. BROWN: Yes, they do.
9	MR. SANDOVAL: Is there Is there a
10	contact that you can give us to so that some
11	of us can start making calls.
12	MS. BROWN: If you'd like, yes, I
13	can. I don't have a phone number here. His
14	name is Adam Bain, if you want to get with me
15	tomorrow.
16	MR. SANDOVAL: I I sense the
17	frustration. If I was living next to
18	Mr. Quintanilla I would be totally upset myself
19	right now.
20	(Laughter.)
21	MR. SANDOVAL: Not because of my
22	neighbor, because of the situation.
23	(Laughter.)
24	MS. KELLY: That didn't come out just
25	right, Damian.

1	MR. SANDOVAL: I was concentrating.
2	I'm sorry. Yeah. If you could provide that to
3	me tonight or first thing tomorrow morning,
4	that would be great.
5	MS. BROWN: First thing tomorrow
6	morning.
7	MS. HUERTA: I would like that
8	information, too, and I could give you my
9	E-Mail address if that would be easier.
10	MR. SANDOVAL: Can you make that
11	Action Item, also?
12	MR. McGHEE: Sure.
13	MR. RICE: Thank you. William, could
14	we get a document or a map showing the area
15	that you plan to address with this plume in
16	Zone 3; are those available?
17	MR. RYAN: They will be available in
18	the document in that which is published in
19	December.
20	MR. RICE: In December '98.
21	MR. RYAN: In December '98 the work
22	plan will be available.
23	MR. RICE: All right.
24	MR. SANDOVAL: Let he add one more
25	thing, too, William, before you before you

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

depart. We've had an attempt over the last six or seven months in the TRS meetings to bring these issues to the table. Specifically, which documents are going to come out, which -- what's the time frame, so that the TRS can review those documents and then have written comments submitted to the appropriate agencies.

I was going to save this to very end, but let me announce this now. As everybody knows I've been working on the TAPP process, the Technical Assistance for Public Participation. And one of those issues is we actually designated two experts, one in restoration and one in the health -- health risk assessment They're on board, they're contracted, area. they're funded. What we're waiting for now, the community and public, are the documents to come out so they can actually view these documents. And the two documents that we're -the three documents that we're waiting for is the ATSDR report, which there's been a three or four month delay on; the second document is the Base Wide Remedial Assessment, the groundwater issue, the 1998, which, I believe, is scheduled

1	for December time frame to be released; and the
2	work plan for Zone 4, the off-base work plan
3	for Zone 4, the 082.
4	As soon was we get these documents on-line
5	into our hands, we've got contractors to look
6	at these. So whatever Kelly Air Force Base can
7	do to meet or to advance this schedule in time
8	lines, we'd appreciate that, because we'd like
9	to get to get those issues working already.
10	Thanks, William.
11	MR. RYAN: Thank you.
12	MR. SANDOVAL: Any other questions
13	for Mr. Ryan?
14	(Indicating.)
15	MR. SANDOVAL: No. Thank you,
16	William.
17	BGEN. MURDOCK: The next item of
18	business, I'd like to turn to Paul Roberson for
19	an update on the Greater Kelly Development
20	Corporation. Paul.
21	GEN. ROBERSON: Thank you. By the
22	way, is everybody having as much trouble
23	hearing as I am?
24	(Indicating.)
25	GEN. ROBERSON: All right. Because
ı	I and the second se

I -- I was beginning to worry that my old age
was starting to show here. But maybe, does
this -- is this better if I talk directly into
the mic like that?

(Indicating.)

GEN. ROBERSON: All right. Well, good. I thank the RAB for an opportunity to give you just a quick update on what's going on with the redevelopment of Kelly. This going to be a little shift in gears. I'm not going to -- I'm not going to focus on environmental issues; although, I will allude to them during the course of the briefing, but it's more just to give you a general update on Kelly's redevelopment.

If you kind of refer to this chart up
here, which is obviously a graphic of Kelly,
just to get you oriented. What they -- Well,
when they decided to close Kelly back in '95,
what they actually said was that the runway and
everything to the west of the runway, in other
words, everything in yellow, gets realigned to
Lackland Air Force Base. And I think most of
you know Lackland is right adjacent to Kelly on
the west side there. In fact, for those of you

true.

who don't know, and it's kind of interesting,
there actually is a ten-foot-high Cyclone fence
with barbed wire on the top between Kelly and
Lackland. I've often wondered why that's

That's supposed to be a joke.

At any rate, so everything in yellow becomes part of Lackland Air Force Base. So when we talk about the redevelopment of Kelly, I'm focusing on what's to the east of the runway, the things that are in the various colors there. The only exception to that is that little green area down at the bottom where the engine test cells are and some of the environmental industrial waste treatment facilities are that will be part of the redevelopment also.

Just to give you the broad overview, we were talking about time lines here before, but Kelly is a six-year closure, I think most of you know that. The Air Force will shut down its missions here on 13 July 2001. But the point was made earlier, and it's absolutely true, there will continue to be an Air Force Agency here, the Air Force Base Conversion Agency responsible for the ongoing

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

environmental programs that are in place.

I -- I don't necessarily share the view that was expressed earlier, the fear that the Air Force is just going to pack up and walk out And they're -- Probably, the reason I of here. don't share that view is, I have some confidence in people like General Murdock and In addition to that, I also know that others. there are some laws that require the Air Force to complete this clean up, and I can guarantee you that we, the Greater Kelly Development Corporation, along with a lot of other community people here, are going to make sure this Air Force, you know, complies with all of those laws. So I -- I personally have a high level of confidence that -- that they're not going to just walk away. But -- Because of all of us are going to be watching that very closely.

But while -- So the Air Force base closes in 2001, and all the property will have been conveyed to the Greater Kelly Development Corporation by that point in time. But the point was made earlier, that we can't actually transfer any deeds until, either the

contamination is remediated or remediation mechanisms have been set in place that the regulators, EPA and TNRCC, have gone off and said, "That's going to do the job" and we -- you know, only then can the deeds be transferred, and that could happen after 2001.

In the interim, we have actually signed a master lease with the Air Force for all of the property that's east of the runway, and all the terms and conditions, so --

Now, we don't actually have access to all of that yet, but we're drawing it down in parcels. Now, we actually have drawn down a good part of it already under these lease provisions. The federal government still owns it, but we've leased it so we can begin the redevelopment.

And probably, what's unique about Kelly from other base closures is that we are in the process of redeveloping the base right in the middle of the base being closed down. It's just really unique. In most cases, a base is literally closed by the Air Force, the missions moved out, and then all of the empty buildings and vacant land are turned over to the

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

community for redevelopment. That, for closure list as Kelly. process of closing. Next slide. Well, let me quickly run through these slides with that quick overview, and I'll cover these items very quickly. Next slide.

example, is what's happened at Reese Air Force Base up in Lubbock, which was on the same The -- The mission was totally gone last year, and they turned over all the empty buildings to the City of Lubbock. We're doing that differently. trying to redevelop it as the base is in the

This is the same graphic of Kelly, but just to give you a little status report on what we've done. With the companies that we've brought on to Kelly as a part of our redevelopment effort already, we have already recreated over 2500 commercial jobs, which is, I think, pretty spectacular in view of the fact that there are still about 15000 Air Force people, military and civilians, located on Kelly.

We have also taken down, under this master lease, just over 50 percent of the property, and actually have that under lease to various

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

represents almost five and a half million square feet of property; there's about eleven million square feet of -- of leasable property on the base. And we have in contract with the contract with the Air Force called a Cooperative Agreement, we are already doing, the Greater Kelly Development Corporation, some of the operations and maintenance on the base in terms of maintenance of facilities and that sort of thing. So the redevelopment of Kelly is moving along very rapidly.

These -- This is a list of some of the commercial tenants that we have on the base now. Obviously, the big one is Boeing with the property that they've leased. They've leased over a million and a half square feet of hangar and shop space as well as about four million square feet of rent space. And they're out there; they're operating. The big hangar on Kelly, which many of you are familiar with, when -- you know, all C-5s are now gone is starting to fill back up, again, with the aircraft that Boeing is in the process of maintaining.

 14
 comme

 15
 now.

 16
 prope

 17
 over

 18
 and s

 19
 squar

 20
 there

 21
 Kelly

 22
 when

 23
 start

 24
 aircr

 25
 maint

Pratt & Whitney has a big operation on the base. We've leased them two hangars where they're doing an engine upgrade project.

General Electric has just signed a lease to operate the Precision Measurement Equipment Laboratory, which has got great potential for an electronics repair center for commercial work. And that's where we're headed for with that.

EG&G is a contractor that has taken over the operation of the entire warehousing area under a contract with the Defense Logistics Agency.

Ryder Corporation. You may recognize them as the -- the -- you know, the -- the -- the little yellow truck company, but they're actually a very large logistics distribution management company. And we've leased them a very sizable amount of warehousing space and they're starting to use that for logistics distribution purposes.

And Rail Car America, Frost Bank, Sacque (phonetic) are also there. We're also negotiating with a company called MQS to take over the science and engineering lab.

2 5

And some of you may be interested to know that the community is not getting all of this property free. We actually had to negotiate a purchase of it under what's called an Economic Development Conveyance. And we, in fact, are going to pay the Air Force \$108,000,000 for all the land, buildings, and equipment that are located out there. Next slide.

It's -- It's interesting that one of the great challenges we've had is, as you start up this redevelopment, it's like starting a new business. You've got a tremendous demand for capital to meet expenses to accomplish all the things you want to do. We actually are operating on a line of credit with a bank consortium right now.

We have been able to put together a fairly sizable package of financing up to between \$40,000,000 and \$50,000,000 over this last year of financing to invest back into Kelly.

Now, what's really interesting about this is as nice as all the facilities are out there, what we're learning is that many of them are going to take some investment to put them in absolutely first class condition.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

For example, with Boeing we are going to have to make, or we are in the process of making about a \$30,000,000 investment in the hangar and shop facilities to put them in first class condition, to upgrade electricity and that sort of thing -- you know, we've put together a \$30,000,000 financing package to do that.

The big -- The largest portion of that is, in fact, a loan from the Department of Housing & Urban Development which is incorporated back into the rent payments that Boeing is paying. So they're actually paying for that loan. we had to put that financing together in order to close the deal with Boeing. Which I think is a lesson that I'll point out a little later, that there's a significant amount of capital investment that is going to have to be made in Kelly to make it the first rate industrial park that we want it to be.

One of the goals we have as we are both bringing companies onto Kelly and -- and contracting for services to perform work at Kelly is, that we want to -- to use small

23 24 25 minority and women-owned businesses. We in the

Greater Kelly Development Corporation have adopted the cities based SMWB goals. The goals are listed there; you can see how we're doing with the dollars that we have -- have already let out in the way of contracts to businesses. And quite frankly, we're doing very good on attracting small businesses to do some of this work for us. Next slide.

Things we're working directly with the community. We recently -- The City Council expanded to Board of the GKDC from 7 to 11 members to get a broader representation, and that's working very, very well.

We are actively working on the on the environmental side. I'll just allude to that because, obviously, the RAB is one of vehicles for that. But on a day-to-day basis, we work very closely with the Air Force to ensure that the -- the community's interests are being represented. And I think many of you are aware that the decision to remove those fuel tanks at the north end of the base was actually a Greater Kelly Development Corporation decision that -- that was in the best interest of the community to remove those tanks. One of them

is gone; the rest will be gone before closure in 2001.

If any of you have nothing to do on a Wednesday evening, and it's clear that you don't have a lot of do on a Wednesday evening or you wouldn't be here, but at 7:00 o'clock every Wednesday we have a TV program on Channel 20, the Public Access Channel, Keep Kelly Working, is an update to the community about -- about what's going on. Next slide.

You know, I've got to put this in perspective. From the redevelopment perspective, this has been a tough three years. You know, the worst news of all came in '95 when they announced Kelly's closing, and I know many of us didn't believe it. How can they -- I mean, we just couldn't imagine the government closing Kelly Air Force Base. And the reality of it is, it's really been an uphill journey since that time.

You know, when we started off we had kind of a pledge from the Administration that they were going to privatize all the work in place. Well, then, we found out, shortly later, that -- that they couldn't do that legally,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

that they had to go through a process called Public/Private Competition. And then we got into that, and we ran the first one of those with the C-5, and low and behold we lost the C-5 work. That ended up going to Warner Robbins Air Force Base. And a lot of other work loads that we thought were going to be privatized, in fact, were going to be moved to Air Force bases. So it's been kind of an uphill battle. But even with all of this, we're continuing to make good progress. Next slide.

A lot of people are involved in this. When I re -- I'm going remake this slide, General Murdock and Damian. I'm going to add the RAB to this, because I really see the RAB as playing a very important role in the long-term development of Kelly. But the point of this slide is, there's just a lot of people involved. Next slide.

The -- The redevelopment of Kelly is -- is all about creating jobs and economic opportunity for the community of San Antonio, and we really believe that. Our goal is to create 21,000 good paying jobs by the year of

2006, and we really believe in the process of doing that we can have a very positive impact on the whole economic development on the south side of San Antonio.

But the point of this slide is, in doing that, there's just a whole myriad of things that we work on on a day-to-day basis that are listed there. I'm not going to go into all of those, but everyone of those issues takes a great deal of -- of time and effort on our part in order to reach our overall goal of creating jobs. Next slide.

One of the great challenges we have, that's going to face us, is, this need for financing to invest in the facilities and the infrastructure so we can modernize them. I've alluded to the Boeing situation already, the fact that we had to put together \$30,000,000 financing package in order to close that deal. And I think that we're going to face that with other -- in other situations with other companies coming in also. Big companies, first-class companies, want Class A facilities. They want modern, up-to-date facilities. And we are in competition, by the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

way. This is not an easy deal. There are communities all over this country that are complete competing for the same companies we'd like to bring in and locate at Kelly.

Probably, the best example that I've had of that recently, we were one of the final three sites that Bell Helicopter was considering to locate the manufacturing plant for the tilt-rotor aircraft, the B-22, which is going to be a big-- a lot of jobs, it's a big It was us, it was Alliance Airport up in deal. Fort Worth, and the City of Amarillo. thought it was really between Kelly and Alliance Airport. I mean, looking at the facilities and the infrastructure and everything, but Bell decided to go to Amarillo. And the reason they decided to go to Amarillo was that Amarillo, the community, laid \$40,000,000 on the table. They're going to build a brand new facility for Bell Helicopter at no cost to Bell, and that was a deal, the stockholders at Bell just couldn't turn down. That's just an example of the kind -- how competitive this business is of attracting big companies with good paying jobs into your

community.

We've got a good incentive package with tax incentives via the Defense Enterprise Zones. I'm hopeful that we're going to get approved for the Empowerment Zone, which will introduce additional incentives. The financial realities, though, are that we need to create a pipeline of investment into Kelly to have a first-class facility to attract these first-class companies. Next slide.

This is our calculation of the investment we've got to make over the next ten to fifteen years, about \$300,000,000. It's sounds -- probably sounds like a staggering number, but it's -- I think it's not an unrealistic number of what we're going to have to invest.

That number down at the bottom -- There's a whole plan for improving the transportation infrastructure on the north side and on the east side of the Kelly, and that totals \$40,000,000 to \$60,000,000. The first at highest priority is 36th Street, to improve 36th Street at the interchange of Highway 90, and then to improve the highway -- the -- the Hudnell Drive intersection with 90, and the

connections there with Cupples, and with Frio Road, and Quintana, etcetera. But those -- those investments are going to be necessary over the long hall. Next slide.

This is a slide attempting to give you a feel for how the property transfer is going.

On the vertical axis just as represented that -- the 11,000,000 square feet of leasable space, and then the horizontal axis is the time frame.

And you can see we've already leased a good portion to Boeing. The commercial, the -the warehouse area is being operated by EG&G
under contract to DLA, Defense Logistics
Agency, right now. But over the next two and a half years, all of that DOD inventory will be moved out; it will be converted to commercial use, and then that will all be leased out to create our integral logistics distribution center.

The jet engine contract should represent another half to three-quarters of a million square feet. That contract should be let in 1999.

And then you can see there will be

additional space in '99, about another half million square feet in the year 2000, and then a good chunk of space coming available in 2001. That's basically when we'll have access to it to lease it and market it for commercial purposes. Next slide.

The next big contract that's going to be left for the work at Kelly is the engine contract. Now, this is a big deal. This represents, you know, two to three thousand jobs. It's -- You know, it's \$600,000,000 of work annually. This is, again, going through a Public/Private Competition, just like the C-5 did. On the private side it's a team headed by Pratt & Whitney; on the public side it's a team headed by the Oklahoma Air Logistics Center, that's that OC-ALC.

Interestingly enough, the Oklahoma Air
Logistics Center has teamed with a private
company, Lockheed. And the way it works out,
if Pratt & Whitney wins, they're going to keep
all the work here. We've already got a letter
of intent to sign a lease with them to do all
the work here. If Oklahoma wins, some of the
work will move to Oklahoma to Tinker Air Force

Base, but the part that Lockheed is going to do is going to stay here. And we have a letter of intent from Lockheed to do that work here at Kelly. So you can see that we're in a very interesting position. When they let that contract we could win it all or we could win a good portion of it, so it's a very positive story in terms of jobs. Next slide. Yeah. The 30th of September has come and gone obviously, and the Air Force announced a short time ago that this award's going to slip into the early part of 1999.

Environmental issues, I might say that the Greater Kelly Development Corporation Board of Directors has adopted an environmental policy. And I brought copies of it with me, it's all just a one-page front and back, for the Board, and I've got extra copies, if anybody in the audience would like them. This is the policy statement that I'm handing out to you on the -- the environmental policy of the GKDC.

It basically addresses what the GKDC will do, what we will expect of our tenants that we bring on to Kelly, what we will expect of the Air Force as they are continuing to clean up,

and then what we expect of ourselves in our responsibility to deal with the community and keep the community informed. Next slide.

This is just a quick look at the job picture. The IBASC refers to the original -- Initial Base Assessment Strategy Committee that set the goal of 21,000 jobs by the year 2006. And what that slide depicts, the green are the jobs in the Air Logistics Center, or at the DLA Depot, so you can see by 2001 they all go away.

That blue line down at the bottom are some Air Force and DOD jobs that will remain. A lot of them are on the part that's being realigned to Lackland: Like, Security Hill, and the C-5 reserve wing, and the F-16 guard wing.

The red represents our initial goals on what jobs will be privatized and kept here. We're going to fall short of that.

And then the yellow represents the commercial jobs, the new jobs, the commercial tenants that we need to bring in to reach the goal of 21,000. So you can see we've got a heck of a challenge ahead of us to reach those goals.

what's on the right side is our successes to date. The Boeing with the most recent contract that they won are now up to 2000 jobs, which is pretty dramatic. And then down at bottom you can see the jobs that we have in the pipeline. Right now with in the pipeline, we have between 4 -- another 4,000 to 5,000 jobs. So that's basically kind of a report card of where we're going.

What this slide is depicting is -- if you take a look at that Air Force draw down, what typically happens is, that that line goes down all the way, and then the base is turned over, and then the community has got to start creating jobs, that kind of pink line.

What we're really trying to do at Kelly is to not follow that model, but to create the jobs so we avoid that big bathtub, that big dip, as we're trying to redevelop the base even before the Air Force has departed. And the thing that's going to make the difference is the -- our capability to invest in the facilities, upgrade, and modernize, to do some new construction, which we have plans to do this coming year, and with aggressive marketing

programs to bring in companies that are going to bring in the good paying jobs.

And that's summary. And I'd be more than happy to answer any questions anybody may have.

MS. HUERTA: Yeah. I have a question.

GEN. ROBERSON: Sure.

MS. HUERTA: Did you address that slide at the bottom where it talked about the homeless?

GEN. ROBERSON: There is a -- There is a requirement in the law that in a closing base you must advertise the property that's becoming surplus to federal needs to a certain number of activities. One of them being organizations that provide services to the homeless. Those organizations are then allowed to apply for that property, and then the local redevelopment authority, in this case the Greater Kelly Development Corporation, goes through a process of reviewing those applications and trying to find the right balance of what properties should be given to homeless organizations and what is going to be

done for -- used for other purposes.

We have -- We have gone through that process. In fact, if you look at the graphic over here, we've got some family housing units that we're making available for homeless purposes as well as a very large 180,000 square foot warehouse on east Kelly that's being made available. There's a lot of these agencies who wanted storage space, warehousing space, that sort thing, that's being made available.

That -- We went through that whole process. One of the entities to whom we did not provide property challenged that -- that process in court. You probably read it in the paper, it's a company called -- it's a little nonprofit called Cedar Resources. And the result of the court case is requiring us to go back and do this process again, because of what was judged to be a technical flaw in the way we did it. And we -- That's what this refers to.

We're now in the process of redoing that -- you know, that submission for the homeless. Does that answer your question?

MS. HUERTA: I have another one.

GEN. ROBERSON: Pardon me?

1	MS. HUERTA: Can I ask another one?
2	GEN. ROBERSON: Sure.
3	MS. HUERTA: In that zone that's over
4	there that you said was the so many feet
5	you're talking about warehousing and storage of
6	not people there?
7	GEN. ROBERSON: Oh, no, no. This is
8	for material goods and that sort of thing.
9	MS. HUERTA: Okay.
10	GEN. ROBERSON: No. The only place
11	that people would actually the 12 units of
12	military family housing or can be used for
13	transitional housing for homeless people, and
14	that's in an area where there is no
15	contamination. Yeah, George?
16	MR. RICE: Are Those 12 units, are
17	they like for the families or are they like
18	barracks.
19	GEN. ROBERSON: That's That's a
20	decision that will be made by the homeless
21	organization. We're going to turn them over.
22	It's actually going to be managed through the
23	City of San Antonio, Department Community
24	Initiatives, and they'll work with
25	organizations like SAMM and others to determine

what the best utilization is.

MR. QUINTANILLA: General, just one question. On your environmental policy, you said here that the Greater Kelly Development Corporation will defend Kelly property from external environment encroachment. What does that mean?

GEN. ROBERSON: Well, for example, if we had someone proposed to put a large chemical plant right next to us in your neighborhood, Armando, I would be right there alongside of you making sure that they're following proper environmental procedures so that they don't contaminate our land either.

MR. QUINTANILLA: General, I want to commend you on the job you're doing with the Greater Kelly Development Corporation. If the same thing could be done for our neighborhood, which has been contaminated by Kelly, we would be in damn good shape.

GEN. ROBERSON: You know, the only thing I -- I -- Let me make this response to that. I -- I really take seriously, and I know my Board does, that we have got an obligation to represent the communities' interest on this

environmental issue, and we're going to continue to work with you. I mean, I -- I know there's a lot of issues on the table here that we've got to sort our way through, but I -- I want you to feel that the GKDC is a place you can come and -- and discuss these issues with too.

MR. QUINTANILLA: We have been -- We know that we have been contaminated by jet fuel underneath our homes since 1988, yet there is not one plan available right now to clean up that jet fuel and those contaminants from underneath our homes, our schools, and our streets. And yet we have not received one dime from DOD for the contamination that they have caused.

GEN. ROBERSON: Any other questions? Thank you.

MR. SANDOVAL: Let me add something,
too. I think we need to thank General
Roberson, and even more so the Air Force.
Typically, the Restoration Advisory Board,
these -- these meetings are specifically for
restoration issues and hardly ever are used for
redevelopment time. And again, this was

something we talked about three or four months 1 ago, and so we should be very appreciative of 2 3 the fact that General Roberson made the presentation. 4 Thank you. 5 (Applause.) MR. SANDOVAL: General Roberson, I 6 7 had two questions, though, sir. One of them was, do you feel -- I know sometimes from the 8 9 Board's perspective we feel that we're not 10 getting the support from the local community 11 representatives, i.e. City Council, and state, 12 and maybe federal representatives -- I guess, the question is, do you think you have adequate 13 14 support, and is there anything else we can do 15 for you in that aspect? 16 GEN. ROBERSON: That's a good 17 question, Damian. I -- I guess, the first 18 thing is, my name's Paul.

MR. SANDOVAL: Okay.

GEN. ROBERSON: There -- There's no question, I -- I've talked to a lot -- and many of you many people on this RAB probably have --I've talked to a number of City Council people and Commissioners on the -- on the Commissioners Court, and they are very

25

24

19

20

21

22

concerned and interested in the environmental issues out here. And I -- I personally have every confidence that if we've got a specific issue where we need their assistance, if go to them with the facts, that we will get their support. So I -- You know, the fact that we don't have any elected officials here, I don't take as a -- particularly as an indication of not interest. I think, if we had something we wanted them to do that -- that we could go to them and they would -- that they would respond.

MR. SANDOVAL: Okay. Good. Thank
you. The next quick question is about the
community outreach. You mentioned that
community members can go to GKDC and provide
or -- or give their advice or make statements.
But is there an outreach program that goes out
to the community from the other side?

GEN. ROBERSON: The -- there is -- We hold our Board meetings every fourth Wednesday at 3:00 o'clock in the afternoon downtown at the City Council Chambers, and there is an opportunity there, we have a citizens' comment period if anybody wants to come and say anything to the Board. And some of these

topics would certainly be relevant to that.

I tell you what I will do, let me -- let me get to this. Periodically, in fact, fairly frequently we have environmental topics on our Agenda for our Board meetings. I will make a point of getting the Agenda for the GKDC Board meetings out to the RAB. So if you see something on there you're interested in it will alert you to plan to attend that meeting.

MR. SANDOVAL: Great. Thank you.

Okay. The next one, moving right along. Item

Number 7, the Edwards Well Contamination. This

was a request that we had at the TRS meeting.

We had a discussion at the TRS meeting which we thought we would be appropriate to be discussed here at the RAB meeting.

Mr. Rice, a hydrogeologist within the local City of San Antonio area, is going to make a presentation, and then an individual, Major -- I'm sorry, I can't pronounce your name --

MJR. GARGIULO: Gargiulo.

MR. SANDOVAL: -- Gargiulo will make a presentation right after Mr. Rice on the same issue.

MR. RICE: Thank you, Damian. Like Damian said, I'm going to be talking about the contamination of the Edwards Aquifer found in wells on Kelly Air Force Base.

First of all, I'd like to thank the RAB for allowing me to speak on this topic. As -- As many of you know the Air Force vociferously opposed my making this presentation, but the RAB thought that it was important enough that I go ahead and give it.

The Air Force asked me to make an announcement before I begin. They would like me to say that I'm a candidate for the Edwards Aquifer Authority District 3, and that the election will be held on November 3rd in the general election.

Now, I'd really like to do two things
here. First of all, I'd like to do something
that the Air Force should have done years ago,
and that is present information concerning
contaminants in Edwards Aquifer wells on Kelly
Air Force Base. But second, and I think more
important, I'd like to use this topic as a
vehicle to show a fundamental dishonesty on the
part of the Air Force. And I believe, if you

listen to what I say, you will agree with me at the end, that the Air Force has intentionally misled this community concerning contamination of Edwards wells on Kelly Air Force Base.

Now, to begin this is also something I've done at the request of the Air Force. They've asked that I show how contaminants found in the Edwards Aquifer around Kelly fit into the rest of the county. What this map shows is our public supply wells, those are our drinking water wells, where man-made contaminants, in this case chlorinated solvents, have been discovered between 1982 and 1986. There are certainly many more wells where the source of contaminants have been found in the Edwards; however, these are only our public water supply wells. Let me point out a couple of things here.

First, the majority of the wells are up in this upper tier here, and that's on and near the recharge zone. And that's where you would expect to find contamination in the Edwards; that's the most vulnerable portion of the Aquifer. If any of you have been out there lately, you see how rapidly it's being

developed, and unfortunately I think that in a few years, if I were to make a similar presentation, you would see a lot more dots up in that northern area than we see now.

The second area here right here is down around the Kelly Air Force Base. And a legitimate question is, how do contaminants get into the Edwards Aquifer down here. In the northern part of the county the Edwards limestone is exposed to ground surface; however, down here, I imagine right where we're standing is probably more than a thousand feet below ground surface. And the units that are between us and the Edwards are very low permeability units, so it's highly unlikely that any contaminants are going to flow down through those low permeability units and into the Edwards.

Now, the way it happens is that the area around Kelly has been farmed for hundreds of years -- excuse me -- over a hundred years.

And around the turn of the century a lot of deep irrigation wells were put in around here. They went through the shallow aquifer, which wasn't contaminated then but is currently

contaminated, and down a thousand or so feet into the Edwards to water the fields that were all over this area.

Now, the casings on these wells are steel, and as you can imagine, after 80, 90 or 100 years these casings have rusted, holes have formed. So what -- what we know happens is, that these contaminants that are now present in the shallow aquifer can enter the wells through these corroded casings and get down into the Edwards.

By the way, for those of you who have packets, these slides I'm showing are in this pack here, part of it says, Kelly AFB Safe Drinking Water Program, that's Air Force presentation that's going to follow this one, and my slides are on the back of that.

What I'm going to do is -- is go through this chronology, and I will -- I will pick off a topic on there, talk about it, and go to another slide. But I'll keep coming back to this; I've found that this is the easiest way to explain what's going on.

So the first date there is in -- in January/March of 1986 contaminants were found

in eight of the Edwards Aquifer drinking water wells here on Kelly Air Force Base.

This map shows the locations of those wells. These are -- were most of Kelly Air Force Bases drinking water wells. Let me say right now, that most of these wells have been closed, sealed off, and replaced with other wells. So they're -- they are no longer a problem. Although, they were in the past.

This table is the data that I got from the Air Force. And along this column here you see that the well ID number, the date the sample was taken, the type of contaminant that was found, concentrations, and some remarks. I'd like to make a few points about this -- this table here.

First of all, it was very difficult to get this information. This is part of a very large amount of information that the Air Force will not release to the public. They refuse to release it to the public; and the way I got it was that I went through the Freedom of Information Act.

Second, in three of the wells the contaminant concentrations that were found by

ESQUIRE DEPOSITION SERVICES

the Air Force exceeded present day MCLs, that's present day health standards. However, back when most of those samples were taken, those health standards didn't exist for most of the contaminants. I think the only health standard that we had, at that time, that was exceeded was the one for Mercury. Another point is, that although the Air Force collected these samples and this water was being drank by the workers on Kelly Air Force Base, and by residents who lived on the base, the Air Force never informed those people that any contaminants had been found in their drinking water.

Now, I'll return to the chronology. In 1989, the Air Force discovered that contaminated water in the shallow aquifer on Kelly was flowing into one of its drinking water wells, the well that they call 313. This is a very interesting case. It's an old well -- This is a cross section of it taken from the Kelly documents. It's an old well that was drilled, I think, in about 1910 or 1912, and it had been used as an irrigation well, but then when Kelly came along they

converted it to a supply well. This horizontal pipe, at one time, had been part of the water supply system. Because when the well was first dug, there was enough pressure in the aquifer to naturally by artesian pressure force water out through that pipe and then put into an irrigation system. However, as this area developed a lot of pumpage occurred, and water levels dropped so that they could -- water levels dropped below the level of that pipe, and then they had to put a pump in because of the natural pressure which was normally (inaudible) amount.

Well, back in 1980 -- '89, I believe it
was, they had some trouble with this pump. So
they investigated this well, and they found
that when they pulled the pump they heard water
running into this well. And they couldn't
figure where it was coming from, so they put a
TV camera down there. They discovered this
horizontal pipe, and water was actually running
from this horizontal pipe down into the well,
and down into the Edwards Aquifer.

They later did a chemical analysis of that water running into the well and found that it

contained more than ten times the current drinking water standard of PCE, one of the chlorinated solvents.

So what -- what the Air Force did shortly after they discovered this -- within a year after they discovered this, they shut the well down, sealed it off, and replaced it with another well so it could no longer be a source of contamination to the Edwards Aquifer.

Now, back to my chronology. In 1990, that was the last time that chlorinated solvents or, to my knowledge, any contaminants had been found in any of the Edwards wells on Kelly Air Force Base. So the contamination problem itself, I think, is a problem of the past. What our problem today is -- is the Air Force's credibility and the way they treat this community.

Now, in 1991 the Air Force published a document, and that's where this figure that we just looked at came from, explaining exactly how contaminants from the shallow aquifer on Kelly entered this well and got down into -- into the Edwards. By the way, that document hasn't been released to the public either; it's

not public information; I got it under the Freedom of Information Act. So to go -- fast forward a bit to 1994 and the beginning of the RAB.

At the first RAB meeting that we held, the Air Force made a very big point of telling us that all the contamination we were talking about had to do with the shallow aquifer.

There was no contamination in the Edwards and -- and the implication was it was really impossible for any contamination to get down into the Edwards. Now, this is what they said at the first RAB meeting when they knew that all those statements were false. At the time the -- when the Air Force told us that, they knew that those statements were false.

And in -- the false statements just keep on coming. There was a public hearing back in July of 1995, and the Air Force issued a response of this summary to the questions that the people had brought up during that hearing. And a lot of the questions had to do with contamination in the Edwards Aquifer. And their written response to that, and I quote it here, says, "Edwards wells used for Kelly Air

Force Base drinking water are routinely tested. Nothing in these tests or in any of our environmental studies indicates that activities at Kelly Air Force Base have had an impact on the Edwards Aguifer."

Once again, clearly a false statement.

The Air Force clearly knew it was false and that's what they told the people of San Antonio.

And now we have present day situation.

You know, at our last RAB meeting the Air Force handed out this little pamphlet, a very nice little booklet, that they distributed to the neighborhood folks talking about the contamination of Kelly. And they have a little section there about the Edwards Aquifer. And not once in there do they mention that, by the way, some years ago we found some contaminants in the Edwards Aquifer. They no longer tell people that it never happened, but they're not honest enough to -- to say that, yes, at one time we did find contaminants in the Edwards Aquifer.

Look at all of the displays you've got back here talking about all these zones and

ESQUIRE DEPOSITION SERVICES
7800 IH-10 WEST, SUITE 100, SAN ANTONIO, TX 78230
(210)377-3027 (800)969-3027 FAX (210)344-6016

everything. Nothing in there mentions anything 1 about a very important fact that, yeah, back in 2 3 the '80s and early '90s we did find contaminants in the Edwards Aquifer. 4 So let me summarize by saying, I think, 5 the fact that Kelly contaminants entered 6 Edwards is -- is important, but that's pretty 7 much a problem in the past. The problem that 8 we still have, though, is the Air Force's 9 dishonesty, their refusal to tell us the truth 10 11 when we ask them direct questions about this -about contamination in the Edwards. 12 I'll be happy to answer any 13 14 questions that you might have. Yes, sir? 15 MR. DOYLE: (Inaudible.) 16 MR. SANDOVAL: Excuse me. Can you 17 speak louder or speak into the mike. 18 MR. DOYLE: George, you -- you said that this is a problem in the past. But we've 19 20 got wells that are still out there and they're 21 still active, correct? MR. RICE: Edwards wells? 22 23 MR. DOYLE: Yeah. 24 MR. RICE: Yes. MR. DOYLE: How do we know that --25

2.5

How do we ensure the integrity of those wells to ensure that as time passes they won't erode and allow contaminants back into the drinking water supply or -- or -- or around the casings down into the Edwards from the shallow water aguifer.

MR. RICE: That -- that's a good -- a good point. And probably the Air Force would be able to address it better than I will, Phillip. But let me make two points.

First of all, most of the wells are fairly new and made of -- the construction specs are pretty good. I think, it would be a long time before there would be problems there.

Rut the second point is, is that, you know, there are many old Edwards wells in this area. For all we know, this school could be built on one of them. And their casings are corroded, and as long as these contaminants remain in the shallow aquifer they are potential pathways for contaminants in the shallow aquifer to get down into the Edwards. And that's another reason I think it's so important that we clean up this shallow aquifer as quickly as we can.

I thank you all for your attention. 1 Thanks, George. Ιt 2 MR. SANDOVAL: was a good presentation. 3 MJR. GARGIULO: Well, I am Major 4 5 Robert Gargiulo. I work in the bioenvironmental engineering flight, and we 6 7 control or manage the safe drinking water program for Kelly Air Force Base. Next slide. 8 What I'd like to do is just overview the 9 purpose of this presentation. Just a brief 10 11 background on the safe drinking water program 12 at Kelly Air Force Base. Discuss some of 1986 Discuss the incident with Well 313, 13 well data. and then conclusions summary. Next slide, 14 15 please. The first presentation is to address some 16 of the issues that were raised at the -- the 17 18 last Technical Review Subcommittee concerning 19 the 1986 data as well as Well 313. Next slide. 20 Background is backwards, but again, the 21 background for it. Next slide. This is just an overview of the safe 22 23 drinking water program at Kelly Air Force 24 Essentially, there are two different Base.

types of wells.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

We have monitoring wells, and these are the wells that are used to study and monitor the shallow groundwater. They're used to support the installation restoration program, our clean up program, and they're located both on Kelly Air Force Base and off Kelly Air Force base.

The other wells that they have are production or drinking water wells. And these are the Kelly Air Force Base drinking water system or distribution system, and they are located on the base only. So there's these two different types of wells that we have.

The Kelly Air Force Base drinking water wells are not part of SAWS or the Bexar Met Water District. These are all -- only apply to Kelly Air Force Base. Next slide.

We had nine active and inactive wells in the '86 time frame. And since 1986 we have closed six those wells and drilled three new Now, the wells were closed because of poor production capacity. Some wells were dug, as Mr. Rice had mentioned, in the 1910s, 1920s, and also taking into consideration some of the facility realignment considerations, those

ESQUIRE DEPOSITION SERVICES 7800 IH-10 WEST, SUITE 100, SAN ANTONIO, TX FAX (210)344-6016 (800)969-3027

wells were closed.

In the '89 and '90 time frame Kelly Air
Force Base did a TV surveillance on all the
wells on the -- on Kelly Air Force Base and
took a look at the integrity of those wells.
And that was part of this decision on closing
some of the wells that we had in the '86 time
frame that existed back then. We currently
have six active wells at Kelly Air Force Base.

These wells draw from the Edwards Aquifer, not from the shallow aquifer. They are for the exclusive use of Kelly Air Force Base for human consumption as well as to support the industrial operations on the base. And they are regulated by the federal and state drinking water program.

Now, the Safe Drinking Water Act is based upon compliance with Maximum Contaminant
Levels, and those were discussed a little bit earlier. The EPA definition for that is a highest level of contaminant that EPA allows in drinking water. And these MCLs are established to ensure the drinking water does not pose a short-term or long-term health hazard or health risk. They're based upon a person drinking the

water for their lifetime, and they are set to ensure the short-term and long-term health of those individuals.

Back in 1986 when the Safe Drinking Water
Act was in effect there was roughly 18
chemicals or MCLs that were being monitored.
The Safe Drinking Water Act updated and they
had a phased approach to add more Maximum
Contaminant Levels, they were under
consideration in the '86 time frame for
implementation over the following years. And
they were roughly going to quadruple number of
MCLs we have. Next slide, please.

This shows you what MCLs were in effect in the '86 time frame, and then the phased upgrade when they were going to implement the other MCLs. One of the things we just want to identify is that Perchloroethylene or Tetrachloroethylene (inaudible) right here was not put into effect until July of '92. Next slide, please.

What I'm going to get into now is the 1986 well sampling data that we have. In January of '86 we hired a contractor to study the monitoring wells that we have at Kelly Air

ESQUIRE DEPOSITION SERVICES

Force Base. And that is, to study those wells for the shallow groundwater contamination.

As an added effort to that contract, the contractor also sampled the production and drinking water wells that we have. And we assumed that this is in preparation for the proposed new Maximum Contaminant Levels that were coming out.

Now, the contractor took a sample, and split that sample. Half of the sample went to government lab for analysis, and half of the sample went to the contractor's lab. And that was done in the January '86 time frame.

When we got the results back on the sampling, both the contractor's and the Air Force's sampling results indicated that we did have volatile organic compounds as well as metals in those drinking water samples.

Now, you're going to get contaminant levels for three separate reasons in samples that you may take -- or three possible reasons.

One could be sampling error. When go out there and actually sample and collect your sampling you can introduce contamination into a

sample.

Another possible explanation for contamination in a sample is, analytical error when it's in the laboratory. Either poor quality methods that they're doing or carry over from other samples that they have.

And then the third possibility is that you actually have a contamination in that well sample.

So what the Air Force and the contractor did was follow-up sampling to (1) verify and confirm the results that we had in January '86 time frame, and then (2) to assess the disconnect that we had between the exact same samples that was sent to a contractor's lab and the government lab.

When we did the follow-up sampling, both the contractor and the government used specific collection equipment for volatile organic compounds, and dedicated sampling equipment.

Now, in March of '86 Kelly Air Force Base took samples, and then split those samples and sent them to our lab. So we drew a sample, split it in half, and sent it to the exact same lab to see if we could get consistent results

from our lab.

In April of '86 the contractors sent samples to their lab, and then Kelly Air Force Base followed that up, again, in May of '86 to analyze that drinking water. So in the following three or four months with sampled those wells several times. None of the samples were able to replicate the contaminant levels that we found in the January of '86 time frame.

Now, there are possible explanations for that. The contractor was -- was hired to collect water from the IRP sites, the monitoring wells, and he had been collecting IRP wells for the three weeks prior to collecting the drinking water samples.

In addition to that, he was collecting samples from the IRP wells, the shallow groundwater wells, the day prior to collecting the water for the drinking water samples. He was using the same collection equipment that he was using for the monitoring wells as he was using for the drinking water wells. So he went to a monitoring well the day prior, collected the sample in this collection mechanism or

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

equipment, he did a decontamination, cleared it out, and then the next day was actually collecting from a drinking water sample.

Identified in the report that he generated that the decontamination, the cleaning, of the sampling equipment was inadequate to be collecting drinking batter samples. Also, to analyze the data from the March, April, and May time frame we found that some of the IRP samples that were collected may have been switched with some of the drinking water samples that was sent to the labs. Okay.

The sampling results that we have for the last ten years or so indicate that we have complied and continue to comply with the Safe Drinking Water Act requirements for organics and inorganic compounds. All of our results have been below federal and state limits, the -- the MCLs, and the detections that we have had have all been trace amounts or nondetects for all the state collected samples over the last ten years. The State of Texas collects those samples for our compliance with 各部發水廠已以上始點監護考達時發發於法權包日報人 the Safe Drinking Water Act, not Kelly Air 1948年前開發起24 Force Base. The state comes in and collects

those samples.

MR. QUINTANILLA: That's 1988 to

MJR. GARGIULO: 1988 to 1998, the last ten years.

The next ten slides were presented Okav. at the TRS, very detailed slides on the sampling results that we had in the '86 time They're all pretty relative -- pretty frame. much the same for each one of the slides. were presented at the -- the TRS. I can present them to the RAB, if you like. You have a copy in your -- your folders. John, can you throw up the first one.

Like I mentioned, we had nine active and inactive wells and the MCLs that we had for this time frame were not in effect. And this is because as of 1998, the MCLs that we had for this well in Building 1044, we did sampling --OEHL is a lab for the Air Force -- There was sampling done in the '83 time frame, you can see we had nondetects.

The contractor took samples on Radian: the 22nd of January of '86, and split that sample and sent it to their lab and sent it to

24 25

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

our lab. So this is the exact same water sample here. They grabbed it out of the well and sent it to two separate labs. These are not the same samples. What we believe happened was that they took the sample and mixed it up with an IRP site and sent it to the Air Force lab. This is not the same sample as this. As you can see on the follow-up sampling in the March, April and May time frame we got essentially nondetects. Next slide, please.

Suspect that there was a switch in the IRP sample and the drinking water sample. We did get a trace hit in the '83 time frame for a contaminant which there was no MCL even currently. And as you can see, follow-up sampling all the way into the '95 time frame have been nondetects. Next slide.

Another well, Well I-78, similar story.

Nondetects. Follow-up sampling with

consistency, you can see some things in the Air

Force lab, but '88-'94 time frame, nondetects.

And the well was plugged in the '97 time

frame.

Building 310, similar story. Nondetects. And nondetects the last ten years.

ESQUIRE DEPOSITION SERVICES
7800 IH-10 WEST, SUITE 100, SAN ANTONIO, TX 78230
(210)377-3027 (800)969-3027 FAX (210)344-6016

24

25

This is Well 96. This well was not in use 1 as of '84 two years prior, and has never been 2 3 used since 1984. For some reason when they did that study in '86 they decided to sample this 4 well also. Take a look at the split sample 5 that they did on the 31st of January '86. 6 There is some disconnects between that same 7 sample that was sent to the two different labs. 8 Essentially, the Air Force sample came out 9 roughly three times higher than the -- the 10 11 radian sample. And this is a separate sample 12 bin for the volatile organic compounds that we Essentially, nondetects across the 13 have here. Did not do a follow-up sample for the 14 military. Again, the well was not being used 15 16 for drinking water sample. Suspect that because it was three times higher that it could 17 be carry-over contamination from sampling from 18 an IRP site or a mixed sample. Next slide, 19 20 please. Just to summarize what I said. 21 was not in use as of '84 to the current date. 22

It was plugged in the '91 time frame.

This is Well 313. Now, we'll discuss this a little bit further in the presentation. You

1	can see the splits that we had. There were
2	nondetects. This is the 5.5 PCE. The base
3	followed up and the state did follow-up
4	samplings for that well and another well right
5	next to it and got nondetects. The well was
6	closed in the January of '89 time frame and
7	actually plugged in the June of '91 time frame.
8	GEN. ROBERSON: Is this the well that
9	George was referring to?
10	MJR. GARGIULO: This is This is
11	the well that George was referring to.
12	GEN. ROBERSON: Which specific items,
13	the PCE?
14	MJR. GARGIULO: The PCE right here.
15	I will get into details on that later.
16	This is the well that's roughly 30 to 50
17	feet away from Well 313, it's right next door
18	to it. You can see the indications that we got
19	for here. Nondetects for the most part. Did
20	get some trace amounts of these in the '83 time
21	frame. Nondetects in the '88 to '98 time
22	frame. We did get some trace amounts got
23	4.7 parts per billion of PCA, which is not
24	regulated even today, and then also the TCA
25	.6 5.5 parts per billion. The well was

plugged in June of '98. Next slide.

Another well here, similar information.

The contractor got a hit of -- Well, all the contractor samples came up with a hit of (inaudible) and the Air Force did not. That's one of the disconnects. We could not replicate that at all. Once again, all nondetects from '88 to '98 for the inorganics and organics.

Another well, similar story. As you can see in the '86 time frame the MCL for led was 50, that was the action level. It currently is down to 15, that's the action level for it.

Contractor got 13 parts per billion; we got nondetect, less than 20 parts per billion. But essentially, since '85 to '98 there have been nondetects with the exception of these. John.

Okay. What I like to get into now is specifically Well 313. This is a bird's-eye view of Well 313 and 314. As I mentioned earlier, they're roughly 30 to 50 feet apart from each other. If you could take a look at these two fine lines here, that would be the wells. They go down through the shallow aquifer roughly about 40 feet to 50 down is when you hit the solid rock -- excuse me the

**** rock and clay layer separating the shallow aquifer from the Edwards. You get down to roughly, 1,500 feet and that's when you step into the Edwards Aquifer, and then it extends roughly another -- Excuse me. This layer right here is roughly 1,000 feet -- 1,055, and it extends down into the Edwards Aquifer another 500 feet. There's a blow up of this on the next slide.

As Mr. Rice had mentioned, prior to the 1970s this was an irrigation well. The two wells were fed by artesian pressure was filled with horizontal pipe. There's a distribution pump here in this distribution pit, and then that was -- that entered into the distribution system across the base. Next slide.

Sometime between the 1970s and '80s what they did, because of the -- the growth in the San Antonio area, it was pulling down the Edwards Aquifer, we could no longer fill the horizontal pipe here through artesian pressure. Our records indicate, what they did is, they capped off the horizontal pipe, filled in this distribution pit, and then dropped a pump into both Wells 313 and 314. Next slide.

二十年 日本日本 平 年 1 表,效

This is a chronology of events from the '83 time frame. The Texas Department of Health is collecting the samples for the TNRCC back then. In July of '88 they took the samples, we got the results in August of '88, and we got the hit of 5.5 parts per billion.

The well which is 30 feet away from that, 30 to 50 feet away, got a nondetect. When we got the sample on the 9th of August, we resampled on the 11th, got the results back on the 12th, and got nondetects for both wells.

The Texas Department of Health came back in in the September time frame and their results came back nondetect. Once again, there was no standard at the time for PCE. It did not become effective until the '92 time frame. Well 313 was in compliance, and there was no need to notify the public. And if anybody was going to notify the public it was going to be the regulators, the TNRCC, would advise us to do such, and they did not.

MR. JACOBI: If I could make a comment at this point. In 1988 the -- the water program was at the Texas Department of Health that was combined in the Texas Water

Commission, and is now part of TNRCC. And all those records are at the TNRCC; they are not at the Texas Department of Health now.

MJR. GARGIULO: Thank you for the clarification. That is correct. Next slide, please.

There have been some questions about
the -- the health effects of the water at the
5.5 parts per billion that has been raised.
Essentially, the water comes from all of our
wells on the base, is entered into the
distribution system, is combined with all the
water from the wells, and then is distributed
to the different points on base.

For example, in July of '88 the base pumped roughly 126,000,000 gallons of water out of the Edwards Aquifer of which Well 313 contributed roughly about a fourth of that water. Next slide.

Taking the worst case analysis of what the concentrations would be in the distribution system on base. If Well 313 was at 5.5 parts per billion then the base distribution system would be at roughly 1.6 parts per billion, which is below the Safe Drinking Water MCL

requirements -- the current requirements as of today.

Taking a -- a more conservative approach.

If I were just to combine the water from Well

313 and water from Well 314, which are 30 to 50

feet apart from each other, the concentration
in that combination of water was only at 3.1

parts per billion. Again, below the Safe

Drinking Water Act, Maximum Contaminant Levels

for PCE. Kelly Air Force Base water did not
exceed MCLs. So the water that was going to
the individuals on base or to the industrial
complex did not exceed any health standard.

In the '89 time frame Well 313 was closed down for maintenance. They pulled the pump out of the well to do maintenance on it. And it was not used from that date to the present.

Roughly, in the June time frame some workers heard water running in the well or what sounded like water running in the well; dropped a TV camera down into the well and found the horizontal pipe. And this is the pipe that we alluded to earlier that was used by artesian pressure to feed the distribution system.

They saw water leaking into to the well.

What we did is we took a sample of that water that was coming out of the horizontal pipe and sent it on base for a quick analysis.

Three days later what we did is we put a plug in the well, a three-foot plug, to cover that horizontal pipe to stop anymore leaking into the well. And we got the results back on our quick analysis and it showed that the water leaking into the well was at 52 parts per billion. Next slide.

This shows what the well looked like as of 26 June of '89 when we put the plug in there. And the three-foot plug was put right in the horizontal pipe and was verified that it, in fact, was in place. Well 314 was still being used at that time. Next slide.

We sampled Well 314 in the July time frame of '89 and got nondetects for PCE. We sampled them again in September, October, and the January time frame of '90.

In March/April '90 the records indicate
that we put a patch on Well 314, so, in
essence, a hollow plug to allow us to continue
to use that well as a precautionary measure in
case it was leaking from the other horizontal

pipe.

The well was cemented and capped in the June time frame. And the report was generated and sent to the state in September of '91.

This is what Well 313 looked like after it was sealed. This is a pictorial. And then you can see a patch that was placed in here, and allowed us to continue to go into the well.

Okay. Since that date Kelly Air Force

Base has taken a look at some of the wells that

are on the base. In the recent years, we have

actually gone and looked at some of the wells

that were already plugged, and we have

redrilled those, and cemented, and plugged

those to today's standards.

Well 314 was just recently closed on June of '98, and we sealed and plugged it. And have dug a new well on the west side of the base, up by Security Hill. Next slide.

In summary for Well 313, we took appropriate actions to close that well, and using a worst case analysis it does not indicate that there is a health hazard associated with that well.

And then in summary. Our wells have

1	complied with the Safe Drinking Water Act for
2	organics and inorganics. This is inclusive of
3	the 1986 questionable data, as well as Well 313
4	incident back in the '88 time frame.
5	As I had mentioned earlier, the detections
6	that we got in the '86 time frame were most
7	likely cross contaminations in the sampling and
8	the analytical equipment as well as possibly
9	switching samples of the data indicated. And
10	then Well 313 was shut down and sealed at that
11	time. Any questions?
12	MS. HUERTA: I have question.
13	MJR. GARGIULO: Sure.
14	MS. HUERTA: You put up a slide with
15	samples in it right (inaudible) the background
16	and the 1986 well sampling data, and you had a
17	lot of stuff on it.
18	MJR. GARGIULO: Yes.
19	MS. HUERTA: Could we have a copy of
20	that?
21	MJR. GARGIULO: Sure. I don't think
22	it's in your package, but I will I will get
23	that to you.
24	MS. HUERTA: And then I have another

question. Let me figure out how to phrase it.

MR. PERSON: You need to speak up, please.

MR. SANDOVAL: John, while she's looking for that I have a question. What would have been the normal policy and procedures for the regulatory agency, at that time, if there had been an (inaudible) in any well above the regulatory limit.

MR. JACOBI: Well, obviously, I wasn't with the agency at that particular point in time, but my guess is, that the Air Force would have self-reported it, and we would have conducted a full investigation to find out the nature of the contamination.

It appears to me that the Air Force acted quite reasonably under the circumstances and did, in fact, investigate on their own the exceedences (phonetic) and found what appears, to me, to be a satisfactory explanation.

It's important to note that they did continue with the sampling well past the -- the dates when the bad samples were identified.

And the -- the ten years of nondetects or -- or below detection levels is strong evidence that there was no permanent problem created.

1	MR. SANDOVAL: Okay. Thank you.
2	MS. HUERTA: Did I understand you to
3	say that when you went down to the horizontal
4	pipe to pull a water sample in '89 that there
5	was ten times higher the limit of that PCE than
6	the state allows; is that what I heard you to
7	say?
8	MJR. GARGIULO: No. We sampled the
9	horizontal pipe, and we took a sample of that,
10	and sent it to the lab for a quick analysis
11	that the levels of PCE in that pipe were around
12	52 parts per billion.
13	MS. HUERTA: Which is ten times what
14	the EPA allows today or
15	MJR. GARGIULO: Today.
16	MS. HUERTA: And they didn't measure
17	it in '89.
18	MJR. GARGIULO: It was not a a
19	standard in the '89 time frame. That did not
20	become effective until the '92 time frame.
21	MS. HUERTA: Okay. And when was that
22	plugged?
23	MJR. GARGIULO: That was plugged
24	in
25	MS. HUERTA: Before that sample or

1 after that sample? 2 MJR. GARGIULO: Right after that 3 sample. Three days after. We took that 4 sample, sent it to the lab for quick analysis, 5 plugged the well, got the results back, I 6 think, five days after that. 7 MS. HUERTA: That was my question. 8 Thank you. 9 MJR. GARGIULO: So we plugged it 10 prior to finding out exactly what the 11 contaminant levels were. 12 MR. JACOBI: One other quick The fact that another well was within 13 comment. 14 50 feet and was pumping high gallons is -- is 15 also an indication that the problem with 16 Well 313 did not cause any other difficulties 17 with the aquifer. 18 MR. QUINTANILLA: I just have two 19 questions. How many monitor -- monitoring 20 wells did you have in 1986 at Kelly? 21 MJR. GARGIULO: I don't have an answer for that. MR. QUINTANILLA: Where can we get an 24 answer? 25 MJR. GARGIULO: That's not in my

1 my area of expertise. MR. QUINTANILLA: Well, you talked 2 about some of the monitoring equipment being 3 contaminated from the monitoring wells. How 4 many monitoring wells were there in 1986? 5 MJR. GARGIULO: I don't know the 6 They did number of monitoring wells they had. sampling for, if I'm not mistaken, two, three 8 months for the monitoring wells. It's in the 9 report that's in the library. If you want to 10 11 take a look at that, we can get that information for you. 12 MR. QUINTANILLA: Well, I would like 13 that information perhaps at the next meeting. 14 15 I have doubt in my mind. MJR. GARGIULO: Sure. 16 17 MR. QUINTANILLA: The other 18 question --MR. SANDOVAL: Mr. Quintanilla, can 19 you speak into the microphone, please. 20 MJR. GARGIULO: What Mr. Quintanilla 21 asked was how many monitoring wells were there 22 in the '86 time frame that were sampled on 23 Kelly Air Force Base as well as off base. 24 not exactly sure if we had them off base at 25

1	that time. It is in the report. The Radian
2	submitted that study, and I believe, that is in
3	the library, and we can get that information
4	for you.
5	MR. QUINTANILLA: On the next
6	question that I have. You mentioned that you
7	suspect they used contaminated equipment. Was
8	that documented?
9	MJR. GARGIULO: It is documented in
10	the report that there was cross contamination.
11	MR. QUINTANILLA: All right. The
12	third question that I have and it's from the
13	MJR. GARGIULO: That they suspected
14	that.
15	MR. QUINTANILLA: And you state in
16	here that it is improbable that chemicals from
17	the shallow aquifer could enter the Edwards
18	Aquifer. Why was that statement put in there
19	when you knew that this had happened?
20	MJR. GARGIULO: I wasn't at that
21	RAB. I don't have that information, at that
22	time. I believe, what the statement said it is
23	improbable.
24	MR. QUINTANILLA: That was July the
25	17th, 1995 when that statement was made. And

1	it was made at a public hearing at Price
2	Elementary School. Somebody, you know, was not
3	up front with the people.
4	MJR. GARGIULO: At Price That
5	report was, obviously, ten years old when the
6	incident happened
7	MR. RICE: I think, my question is
8	more appropriately addressed to General
9	Murdock, and I'd like to
10	GEN. ROBERSON: George, I can't hear
11	you at all.
12	MR. RICE: Yeah. I think my question
13	is more appropriately addressed to General
14	Murdock. And it's similar to what Armando
15	asked. That quote that I put up on that
16	chronology where in this document the Air Force
17	says that nothing in any of our tests showed
18	that contaminants from Kelly got into the
19	Edwards. Could we have an Action Item? Could
20	you explain in writing why the Air Force made
21	that statement? That That's a request to
22	you, General.
23	MJR. GARGIULO: I think, if you read
24	it word for word, and if you
25	MR. RICE: No. I'm sorry. That
	II

25

1	My question was to the General. Could that be
2	an Action Item? Could the Air Force explain to
3	us in writing why that statement was made when
4	it appears that at the time you made it, you
5	knew it was false.
6	BGEN. MURDOCK: If you If that's a
7	formal request by the consensus of the RAB I
8	can be sure to take a look into it.
9	MR. RICE: Could Could we then ask
10	
	the RAB to make a formal request, at this
11	time?
12	MR. SANDOVAL: I don't know if a
13	formal request is necessary. I think that's an
14	Action Item with need to look into.
15	BGEN. MURDOCK: I'll be glad to try
16	and look into it. I would be the last to try
17	and articulate this statement a statement
18	that was made three years ago, for which I
19	wasn't present, and I don't know who else may
19 20	wasn't present, and I don't know who else may be present. But I'd be glad to take a look at
20	be present. But I'd be glad to take a look at
20	be present. But I'd be glad to take a look at it.

attempt to answer it?

1 BGEN. MURDOCK: I will attempt to 2 answer it. 3 MR. ROBERSON: If I could ask -- Let me make sure I understand this. 5 meeting -- At a RAB meeting in '95 somebody 6 from the Air Force, George, made the statement 7 that it's improbable that any contamination 8 could have gotten into the aguifer, is that --9 MR. RICE: That's not the issue, No. 10 General. The issue is that repeatedly, at RAB 11 meetings and public meetings of the press, 12 representatives from Kelly Air Force Base said 13 that no contaminants from Kelly had gotten into 14 the Edwards; that was highly unlikely. 15 just brought a couple of examples. 16 And the point is that when these 17 statements were being made the people who made 18 them either knew they were false or they should 19 have known they were false. That's the point. 20 BGEN. MURDOCK: So that we all 21 understand and are singing from the same sheet 22 of music, will you articulate exactly what you 23 believe the Action Item is? 24 MR. RICE: Yes. In this 25 Responsiveness Summary that resulted from a 京都有国际最后成为最高。董商广东党等副被蒙古巴蒙城人工其口数据的建筑的城梯

1	meeting held here in this room on July 27th of
2	1995 there's a statement, and I quote it, in
3	that chronology, you have the you have the
4	direct quote. In this copy I have, it appears
5	on Page 11, but there are several different
6	versions of the Responsiveness Summary, so it
7	may be on Page 12 in one of those versions.
8	My question to you is, why did the Air
9	Force make this statement?
10	MR. JACOBI: If I could ask, George,
11	do you recognize the voice on the tape so we'll
12	know who made the statement?
13	MR. RICE: I didn't hear you.
14	MR. JACOBI: Do you recognize the
15	voice on the tape so we might try and figure
16	out who made the statement?
17	MR. RICE: No. This is in writing in
18	this document that that was distributed to
19	the RAB members. It was distributed to the
20	entire city. This is in writing.
21	MR. JACOBI: Who signed it?
22	MR. PERSON: Who signed it, George?
23	MR. RICE: I I don't know. But
24	the document is called Responsiveness Summary.
25	This document contains responses to all public

comments received during this 30 day public comment period. You probably have a copy somewhere. Most RAB members do.

MR. QUINTANILLA: I think, it was Mr. Bailey. If you really want to get down

Mr. Bailey. If you really want to get down to it, I think it was Mr. Bailey, the Chief of the Environmental Section. He made it at Price Elementary School, and it was during a hearing for -- on -- on Zone 3.

MR. JACOBI: Okay. That's information that will help look into it, and I'm sure the General will look into it. To allay a comment that will come up, my guess is, that we -- there probably never have been any pure monitoring wells in the Edwards Aquifer on Kelly Air Force Base; is that correct?

MJR. GARGIULO: Not that I'm aware of, no.

GEN. ROBERSON: You know, if I could ask because, you know, the presentation in nature, to me, seems to be, you know, pretty -- pretty credible, and I was going to ask, George. Did it seem credible to you, George, his explanation of how the data came up like it did?

22

23

24

25

MR. RICE: Well, there are two points 1 The first is that 2 that I would like to make. the Major's argument seems to be largely based 3 4 on his contention that the Air Force -- the 5 data that Air Force collected is not any good. Well, okay, that -- that may be so. It's hard 6 7 to say. You could say that, but I -- I've 8 spent a large part of my career writing documents about how groundwater samples should 9 be taken and what all the pitfalls are. 10 you can go back at the -- virtually any sample 11 after the fact and say, well, something might 12 have happened at this time which makes this 13 sample less than reliable. But basically, I 14 will -- with all due respect, Major, I think 15 16 that that's a damn poor argument to say, "Our 17 data really isn't any good, and you shouldn't believe it." 18 19 Okay. There's a second point here. 20

Okay. There's a second point here. Even if you accept that argument, the Air Force and the Major do -- do state that, yes, some contaminants were found in Kelly Air Force wells, yes, we knew about them at the time, but we still made statements that we knew to be false. That's the second issue.

MJR. GARGIULO: Now, let me -- let me address that real quick, how the Air Force did not make statements that we knew to be false.

When the information about Well 313 surfaced, when we brought it up in the January time frame, we went and looked and found the report and, yes, the people, at that time, found, and it was news to us. It was new. So we went back to our records, and went back ten or twelve years and tried to get as much information as we could on the information.

And what you have there is the information that we found.

MR. SANDOVAL: George, my question is, at what -- at what point in time do we take the responsibility off of the Air Force for lying or for making a mistake and coming up to the table and saying, yeah, we made a mistake and we're trying to clarify it? When do we do that?

MR. RICE: That's a good question,

Damian. What I would very much like to see,

what would settle this in my mind, and you

would hear nary a peep out of me about it in

the future is if the Air Force would simply

2.0

say, "Yes, we did something that we shouldn't have; we intentionally mislead you; we apologize to the City of San Antonio for doing this." Then I'll shut my mouth about this.

MR. QUINTANILLA: I would like to just to bring up one point. I worked at Kelly Air Force Base -- I worked at Kelly Air Force Base, and there was one time where the people of Kelly Air Force Base could not drink the drinking water. Water was hauled in in trailers so that we could drink it. The water was contaminated at that time.

MR. SANDOVAL: (Inaudible) there's been -- There's been a lot of effort, a lot of discussion, and a lot of time spent on this issue. And you know, as a taxpayer, and everybody here is a taxpayer in one respect or another, is how much time do we spend on an issue where, hopefully, in my mind, it's easily resolved, and then we can move on from this point.

MR. QUINTANILLA: I think we can resolve it when we answer the -- what's in the Responsiveness Summary as not true. We can say, hey, somebody made a mistake by making

that statement; they should not have made it.
That's one way of doing it.

The other way is to find out how many monitoring wells we had, at that time, and -- and where were they located. Those are supposed to be -- The monitoring wells are supposed to be the wells that contaminated the testing equipment for the Air Force contractor. We need to know that.

MR. JACOBI: One comment, Armando. I think by -- by this presentation, you know, on its face it's obvious that somebody made a mistake when -- when that comment was made back in 1995. There's no question about that. They wouldn't be standing here telling you about it.

MR. QUINTANILLA: If that is the case we need to correct the Responsiveness Summary to -- to -- you know, to tell it like it is.

Because this Summary has gone to TNRCC and to EPA.

MR. SANDOVAL: All right. I think, there's been a lot of discussion on this tonight, and I think there is an Action Item for the Air Force to take a look at what George has requested and brought up at this meeting.

ESQUIRE DEPOSITION SERVICES
7800 IH-10 WEST, SUITE 100, SAN ANTONIO, TX 78230
(210)377-3027 (800)969-3027 FAX (210)344-6016

25

So hopefully, there's no other discussions 1 at this point. Let -- Let's give an 2 opportunity for the Air Force to take back all 3 this feedback information and go back and look at it, and then come back to the table with 5 something adequate that we'll be able to bring 6 closure to this point. Thank you for the 8 presentation. 9 Moving right along. The Summary and 10 Closing section. 11 MS. HUERTA: Sir, can I make a 12 comment? 13 MR. SANDOVAL: Sure. 14 MS. HUERTA: When I look at the 15 posters in the back of the room reviewed for 16 community knowledge and display there weren't 17 any values of what levels were out there and at 18 what points. A year ago when we had the 19 community meeting there was values attached to 20 those maps and, you know, without values it's 21 not real and relevant. And I -- I'm -- you 22 know, I -- I'm not sure why that isn't today. 23 Does that make sense what I'm saying?

MS. HUERTA: I just see boundaries

MR. SANDOVAL: Yes. The question --

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

there. I don't see any values that we can compare, or look at, or -- or know what chemicals we're discussing, or what levels those chemicals are at. And that concerns me.

MR. McGHEE: The posters were -- were meant to be a -- a means for people to talk with our staff about what has been found at these sites. So they were just, basically, saying here's where you are, here's where the site is, here's where Kelly Air Force Base is, that was the intent of these posters. If we want to -- It was a tool that community members could use to talk with our staff and say, well, tell me more about this place, what's going on here. That was the idea for these posters right here. We made them up especially for this meeting for that purpose. We'll use them, again.

If you would like to have something back here that also ventures into, you know, what type of data has been found, we can -- we can do that, we can accommodate.

MR. SANDOVAL: Tanya, as you see, we -- we worked in concert with the Air Force to get this RAB done this way. And one of the

things we wanted to do is to make something very simplistic to get RAB people's attention first, and further questions could be decided. But as you can see, there are a lot of maps out there with a lot of numbers, and it's confusing to a lot of people. So this was something that we worked together to develop. Things change, and that's just how we presented it tonight.

MS. HUERTA: I -- I just think if we're talking about chemicals that are beyond what the EPA allowable limits are, I think the EPA standards should be stated there, and what those levels are. And I -- And I don't think that we should underestimate the wisdom or the knowledge or the intent to learn of the public.

MR. PERSON: The maps are available -- We've had the maps made by the Air Force, and they will provide the copies.

MR. SANDOVAL: You know, you're very welcome to join the TRS meeting where we decide what type of agendas and information get put out. So your -- your information and participation would be valuable in those -- in that process.

MS. HUERTA: Thank you.

MR. SANDOVAL: Okay. Just to wrap everything up. I'd like to thank Dwight Middle School representatives, first of all, for allowing us to host this event once again here. Special thanks to the presenters. I think, you've seen tonight there was, at least, between four to six different members of the Restoration Advisory Board that gave presentations.

And at other RABs, it was always the Air

Force folks presenting or contracting folks.

So to me it's making us do two things. One,

it's making RAB members more individually

responsible; and Number Two, RAB members are

becoming more interested and more -- more of an

expert in these areas to make the

presentations. So I -- I would commend

everybody for participating and making

presentations.

A couple of announcements of upcoming meetings. As everyone knows, RAB meetings at this point are scheduled on a quarterly basis or as-needed basis. We've had between four to seven meetings, general meetings, like this.

We have Technical Review Subcommittee meetings

every month. And Dr. Lene, if you could review the next couple of meeting dates for us?

DR. LENE: Yes. The next meeting date for the Technical Review Subcommittee will be November 17th, and that will be at St. Mary's University at 6:30. The following meeting will be December 15th, and -- at the same time and same place. I believe, that we have decided that the January meeting will be just prior to the RAB, when it is -- I believe, that's the 12th of January.

MR. SANDOVAL: Right. Not to take all of the closing thunder, I'd just like to, again, thank everybody for participating in the RAB meetings.

A lot of issues ahead of us. We're, again, just around the corner from making some major moves and major participations from what the RAB was created for. So I commend everybody and let's stay with it and charge forward.

I -- I would just ask everybody, again, and after you leave this meeting tonight our job, as RAB members, is to communicate what we've learned tonight with others in our

community. And also, to act as a conduit for those issues out there and bring them back to the RAB Board. So, please, take heed of that. Good night, and thank you.

BGEN. MURDOCK: Before we -- Before we leave, if I can, let me mention one item, and -- two items, actually. We will attempt to have the next RAB meeting on Tuesday night, the 19th of January, presupposing this location is available, and we'll certainly get that information out to you. For tentative planning purposes we'll plan on the 19th of January; if that changes, we'll advise you.

The other is, one of the Agenda Items for the January meeting will be the election of the community co-Chair. That -- Damian's tenure will have expired at the end of the year as the Charter so states, and it is incumbent upon us to elect the new Chair.

Let me just take a quick second to paraphrase from the -- the Charter. It says, The base -- the Board community co-Chair will serve a twelve-month term commencing with the second Board meeting in each calendar year. The co-Chair may serve two or more terms. So

if, in fact, Damian is nominated, and he so 1 2 elects, he may serve another -- another term. 3 I would encourage you to think about 4 nominees for the co-Chair. We will solicit verbal nominees at the meeting, and vote on 5 those nominees on that same meeting. 6 7 MR. BANNER: General, it's come to my attention that some of the RAB members didn't 8 9 get this packet, this pamphlet in their RAB 10 packets. I've got some extras. If you folks want to take a look and see whether or not you 11 12 got this. And if you haven't, I'll give you a 13 copy. 14 BGEN. MURDOCK: Great. Thank you all for your attentiveness and participation. 15 16 appreciate it. Have a good evening. 17 (End of Proceedings.) 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

1	STATE OF TEXAS *
2	COUNTY OF BEXAR *
3	I, DICIE LEE EYTCHESON, a
4	Certified Shorthand Reporter and Notary Public
5	in and for the State of Texas, do hereby
6	certify that the above and foregoing contain a
7	true and correct transcription of all
8	proceedings, all of which occurred and were
9	reported by me.
10	WITNESS MY HAND, this the Zuc
11	day of November, A.D. 1998.
12	1
13	Cert No. 5392
14	DICIE LEE EYTOHESON
15	Expires: Dec.'98 Certified Shorthand Reporter and Notary Public in and for (210) 377-3027 the State of Texas
16	(210) 377-3027 the State of Texas
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

FINAL PAGE

ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD

FINAL PAGE