



KELLY AFB
TEXAS

ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD
COVER SHEET

AR File Number 3363.10

AKL

RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD

DECEMBER 11, 1995

ORIGINAL



KIM TINDALL & ASSOCIATES

7800 W. IH-10 - STE. 100

San Antonio, TX 78230

(210) 377-3027 FAX (210) 344-6016 (800) 969-3027

Dallas, TX (214) 720-4567	Austin, TX (512) 452-0011	Houston, TX (713) 681-9800	Midland, TX (915) 683-3032	San Antonio, TX (210) 377-3027
Pecos, TX (915) 683-3032	Odessa, TX (915) 683-3032	Laredo, TX (915) 683-3032	Amarillo, TX (806) 359-8734	San Angelo, TX (915) 658-4143
Lafayette, LA (318) 988-0962	Baton Rouge, LA (504) 343-2020	New Orleans, LA (504) 529-3355	Corpus Christi, TX (512) 949-9555	

1 APPEARANCES:

2 MR. LARRY BAILEY
3 Kelly Air Force Base Co-chair;

4 MR. JUAN F. SOLIS, SR.
5 Brady Garden Association/Community
6 Co-chair;

7 MR. ALLAN HAGELTHORN
8 Community Member;

9 MR. GARY BEYER
10 Texas Natural Resource Conservation
11 Commission, Austin;

12 MR. GEORGE RICE
13 Groundwater Hydrologist;

14 MR. ARMANDO C. QUINTANILLA
15 Community Member;

16 MS. DEBORAH ROBINSON
17 Alternate for Bill Sain,
18 Bexar Audubon Society;

19 PROF. GENE W. LENE
20 St. Mary's University;

21 MR. EDWARD WEINSTEIN
22 San Antonio Water System;

23 MR. KIRK LOFTIN
24 Alternate for Sam Sanchez,
25 San Antonio Metropolitan Health
District;

MR. TOM CULBERTSON
Community Member;

MR. THOMAS SMITH
Union Pacific Railroad;

MR. DESI RAYGOSA
Alternate for Nicolas Rodriguez,
Bexar Metro Water District;

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

MR. MICHAEL ESTRADA
Kelly Air Force Base Chief,
Environmental Issues, Office of Public
Affairs;

MR. DANIEL MEDINA
Acting Branch Chief,
Restoration Operations Branch,
Kelly Air Force Base;

CAPT. EDWARD VON DRAN
Team Leader, Restoration Operations
Branch, Kelly Air Force Base Employee;

MR. RONALD CATCHINGS
Zone 3 Project Manager,
Kelly Air Force Base;

MR. JODY WIREMAN
Armstrong Laboratory,
Brooks Air Force Base;

MR. MICHAEL OVERBAY
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency,
Region IV;

JULIE A. SEAL
Certified Shorthand Reporter and
Notary Public.

* * * * *

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

On the 11th day of December, A.D.
1995, between the hours of 6:11 o'clock p.m. and
8:28 o'clock p.m., the above entitled meeting
came on for discussion before said
JUAN SOLIS, SR., and the following proceedings
were had:

MR. BAILEY: If I could have
everybody's attention, we'll call the RAB
meeting to order.

MR. SOLIS: We're calling the
meeting to order at 6:10 in the evening and we
have a quorum. With that, let us to go to the
agenda for today that -- each one of you should
have one.

The Charter Revision -- the first title on
the agenda, if you will recall was a discussion
regarding articles as to conflict of interest.
That area had not been completed, so it will be
placed on the minutes for the next meeting. Any
questions on that?

MR. RICE: Yes.

MR. SOLIS: Yes?

MR. RICE: I attended that
meeting. I understood that what we were going
to do -- or what we agreed to do at that meeting

1 was adopt the charter now without the conflict
2 of interest provision and -- and then work on
3 those -- and once we complete them, we will
4 incorporate them into the charter.

5 MR. QUINTANILLA: I also attended
6 that meeting along with Mr. Rice -- and also
7 attending that meeting -- I chaired the
8 committee -- was Adrienne Williams from the
9 Judge Advocate's staff, Mr. Mike Estrada and
10 Mr. Walters, and in your package is the minutes
11 of that particular meeting. It starts out with
12 informal meetings, minutes of meeting on RAB
13 charter. That is wrong. I have been assured by
14 Ms. Adrienne Williams and Mr. Mike Estrada that
15 the words "informal minutes" will -- the word
16 "informal" will be taken out -- completely out
17 of the -- out of this minutes -- and made
18 informally -- and then a new set of minutes of
19 the Charter Revision Committee will be mailed to
20 each and every one of you no later than Friday
21 of this week.

22 Now, what we -- we were so far apart in
23 the -- in the charter revision of the conflict
24 of interest that -- that we decided -- it was
25 decided by the committee, formally, that we

1 would take out Sections G and H -- out of the
2 charter for the present time and we will operate
3 without that conflict of interest.

4 The main thing that keeps us apart is that
5 the staff wants the staff to say who can be a
6 charter board member in case -- and who cannot
7 in case there is a conflict of interest. We say
8 it should be the board itself -- the members of
9 the RAB should determine -- in the event there
10 is a conflict of interest, then the RAB, by --
11 by majority vote, should keep that member or
12 expel that member, not the staff. And that is
13 where we are far and -- and very wide apart.

14 MR. SOLIS: What is your
15 recommendation at this time?

16 MR. QUINTANILLA: My
17 recommendation is that we accept the charter
18 without Sections G and H and that we operate
19 with a new charter -- and that was part of
20 the -- the charge that was given to me at that
21 charter revision meeting.

22 MR. SOLIS: I put it into a
23 motion. Do I hear a second?

24 MR. RICE: Second.

25 MR. SOLIS: Second -- Made and

1 seconded? All in favor say "aye."

2 (Vote by the RAB members.)

3 MR. SOLIS: The motion carries.

4 Then the charter is accepted minus G and H?

5 MR. QUINTANILLA: Minus G and
6 H -- and you have a new charter in package
7 without Sections G and H which is the conflict
8 of interest part.

9 MR. SOLIS: Thank you.

10 MR. QUINTANILLA: And we will
11 operate that way until we can come up with a way
12 to -- Ms. Williams says Section I also should
13 be -- not -- has been knocked out.

14 MR. SOLIS: G, H and I, right?

15 MR. QUINTANILLA: G, H and I,
16 yes -- G, H and I.

17 (Discussion off the record.)

18 MR. SOLIS: Let the minutes
19 reflect that Section G, H and I will be omitted
20 from the current charter pending approval.

21 Thank you.

22 MR. QUINTANILLA: The charter has
23 now been approved. This is our charter and it
24 will become effective at the next meeting. Is
25 that correct, Mr. Estrada?

1 MR. ESTRADA: Under the existing
2 charter, what you're supposed to do is introduce
3 the change tonight and at the next meeting you
4 vote on accepting or rejecting it.

5 MR. QUINTANILLA: We voted
6 tonight to -- to accept the charter without
7 Sections G, H and I.

8 MR. ESTRADA: May I suggest then
9 that maybe somebody entertain a motion to waive
10 the provision of the existing charter so that
11 you can accept it tonight.

12 MR. RICE: What does that mean --
13 what he just said? I don't understand.

14 MR. BAILEY: That means -- if I
15 can try to qualify it -- it means that if we
16 make a motion to waive what the existing charter
17 says, then the motion that was just first made
18 and seconded and voted on us -- by us -- will be
19 considered to be legitimate. Otherwise, we have
20 to waive that.

21 MR. RICE: Okay. Well, I make
22 the motion that we waive it.

23 MR. QUINTANILLA: I'll second
24 that.

25 MR. SOLIS: Okay.

1 MR. QUINTANILLA: All those in
2 favor?

3 MR. SOLIS: Why don't you go
4 through that motion again. Read it for -- for
5 the minutes.

6 MR. QUINTANILLA: The motion that
7 has been made is that we waive the existing
8 charter requirements, that it -- that we would,
9 in effect, put the charter in effect at the next
10 meeting -- we want to put it in effect
11 tonight -- and that's the motion.

12 MR. RICE: And that's been made
13 and seconded.

14 MR. SOLIS: Any discussion?

15 MR. BEYER: Which section of the
16 charter are we waiving?

17 MR. QUINTANILLA: The conflict of
18 interest, G, H and I.

19 DR. LENE: Is that under
20 membership?

21 MR. QUINTANILLA: It's under
22 membership, yes, sir.

23 DR. LENE: Yeah, that's where it
24 was.

25 MR. QUINTANILLA: Now, it has

1 been taken out of the packet that you have with
2 you tonight -- that has been given you tonight.

3 MR. SOLIS: The motion has been
4 made, then, to waive G, H and I and to adopt the
5 balance of the charter effective immediately.

6 MR. QUINTANILLA: Exactly.

7 MR. SOLIS: Is that right,
8 Mr. Quintanilla?

9 MR. QUINTANILLA: That's correct.

10 MR. SOLIS: All in favor say
11 "aye."

12 (Vote by the RAB members.)

13 MR. SOLIS: Motion carries.

14 MR. QUINTANILLA: One more thing
15 that I was charged with -- that I was supposed
16 to bring up at this meeting tonight, is the --
17 that anyone has a conflict of interest, working
18 for a contractor or -- or has a claim against
19 the government, that it be brought up at every
20 meeting until we get the conflict of interest
21 squared away -- and this is in the last two
22 paragraphs of the minutes of the RAB Charter
23 Revision Committee. And, at this time, I would
24 like to state out loud that I have a claim on my
25 home at 710 Price Avenue concerning damages --

1 environmental damages -- done by Kelly Air
2 Force Base. I believe I'm the only RAB member
3 that has those. I'm the only RAB member from
4 the Quintana Road area.

5 Now, any time that you're going to talk
6 about 710 Price Avenue, whether it be subsidence
7 or property damage or property values, then I
8 will have to excuse myself from all discussions
9 on it and voting on that particular matter.

10 MR. SOLIS: Anyone else here have
11 a conflict of interest? If not, then proceed.

12 MR. QUINTANILLA: Okay.

13 MR. SOLIS: The second item was
14 approval of the minutes of the meeting. Now,
15 how many of you got the minutes in time to read
16 them and -- since some of you got the minutes
17 late, I would like to recommend that we -- we
18 address approval of the minutes later on during
19 the meeting. How many had time to read them and
20 become acquainted with them? How many have not
21 read them?

22 MR. QUINTANILLA: Mr. Chairman,
23 if I may, I have something to say about the
24 meetings -- the minutes of the -- of the
25 meetings. We have had 11 meetings since we

1 started the RAB. At every one of those -- these
2 meetings something has been wrong with -- with
3 the minutes. They have had errors and the
4 misspelling of names, incorrect data in -- in
5 it -- or whatever.

6 Further, I believe that the contract calls
7 that these minutes should be delivered by the
8 contractor to the staff within 72 hours. I
9 don't know whether this is being done or not --
10 within 72 hours -- but I do know that for the
11 last 11 meetings the minutes have been redone by
12 the staff.

13 For instance, the minutes -- the reason you
14 received the minutes so late is because the
15 staff worked until almost midnight -- from
16 what -- from what I understand -- Thursday
17 night -- in order to have the minutes that are
18 presented to you here today.

19 MR. SOLIS: Thank you,
20 Mr. Quintanilla.

21 MR. QUINTANILLA: I'm not -- Wait
22 a minute. I'm not through -- on it. I honestly
23 believe that something is wrong with our
24 contract. We are paying for something that is
25 unacceptable. We're doing the work for the

1 contractor and then presenting it to us.

2 So, Mr. Chairman, I strongly suggest that
3 you appoint a committee to look into this
4 particular item.

5 MR. SOLIS: I think that's a
6 matter for management to address and that's
7 where we're going to go. I will not appoint a
8 committee to do that.

9 MR. QUINTANILLA: That will be
10 fine. But I will not be part -- in case there
11 is a appearance of fraud, waste and abuse by the
12 staff redoing the minutes, I will not stand for
13 that and I want to go on record as stating that.

14 MR. SOLIS: So stated. On
15 Membership Actions -- Larry, do you want to
16 address that?

17 MR. BAILEY: Yes, sir. There are
18 at least three different items that are up for
19 us -- for consideration -- not for --
20 necessarily, votes -- but just to make sure
21 that we all know about it.

22 First of all, Mr. Tom Smith, who is back
23 with us, who represents Union Pacific Railroad,
24 had been absent three times. This is -- He is
25 now coming back for the fourth time. We had

1 voted after the second time to let him know
2 that. It has been a recommendation in the past
3 by the San Antonio Restoration Advisory Board
4 that when this happens, that the applicant so
5 wanting to come back to the board would have to
6 resubmit an application. And, as such,
7 Mr. Smith, tonight, would not be able to vote on
8 anything, if there was a required vote, but
9 would be needing to submit an application. So,
10 if you would, put that together. I think you
11 had indicated there was an interest on your
12 part --

13 MR. SMITH: There is.

14 MR. BAILEY: -- to continue and
15 I'm just making sure that the Board knows that
16 that's the procedure that we followed -- and, if
17 you would, continue with that, please.

18 MR. SMITH: Yes.

19 MR. BAILEY: We had forwarded a
20 letter signed by Mr. Solis and myself to the
21 Defense Transition office, City of San Antonio.
22 We addressed the letter to Mr. Paul Roberson,
23 who was a member of the IBASC group -- that's
24 the organization that was initially put together
25 to review the privatization of Kelly Air Force

1 Base and the realignment of Kelly Air Force
2 Base. That letter has been received by that
3 office. It was a letter requesting that they
4 consider joining the Restoration Advisory Board
5 as a voting member.

6 There are two reasons for that. Number
7 one, they and the LRA -- this Local
8 Redevelopment Authority that will eventually be
9 formed -- are going to determine in many ways
10 what happens to the land use over at Kelly Air
11 Force Base. So, for that purpose, we believe
12 that they have direct involvement on what
13 happens. And, then, secondly, there is
14 information that has come down through various
15 Air Force channels that encourages the RABs to
16 invite people on the LRA to join as a member.

17 So, that letter has been forward by
18 Mr. Solis and myself. Before we meet again --
19 whenever that next time is -- you will have
20 that application along with Mr. Smith's in your
21 package for review.

22 MR. RICE: A question on that,
23 Larry.

24 MR. BAILEY: Yes, sir?

25 MR. RICE: The application for

1 the LRA, will that be for an individual or for
2 the organization?

3 MR. BAILEY: We are submitting it
4 like we do for all the applications for all of
5 us where they designate a primary and an
6 alternate.

7 And the last item in this area -- or there
8 are -- pardon me -- two other items -- one is
9 that Mr. Solis has identified an alternate
10 should he not be able to make it -- and I
11 believe that's his lovely wife, Mrs. Solis --
12 in the back -- and she will be the designee, or
13 alternate, should he not be present.

14 The other and last item is regarding one of
15 our RAB members, Ms. Thurlow, who had been
16 absent who indicated that she did not want to
17 become -- or continue to be a member. We have
18 verbally heard that. We will be, once again,
19 trying to get a formal letter. If not and she
20 verbally concurs she does not want to be on,
21 then also in your packet before the next RAB we
22 will take her name off as a -- as a voting
23 member, per her wishes.

24 Mr. Chairman, that's all that I have.

25 MR. SOLIS: Thank you.

1 Mr. Beyer?

2 MR. BEYER: I'm Gary Beyer with
3 the TNRCC. I'm the representative of the TNRCC
4 for the RAB and I've been asked tonight to give
5 a presentation on the risk reduction -- or
6 program at the TNRCC. This is just a -- Can
7 everybody see this okay? Can everybody hear me
8 okay?

9 We're authorized -- TNRCC is authorized by
10 the EPA for certain waste programs -- primarily
11 the RCRA and HSWA amendments to the RCRA -- and
12 regulate nonhazardous industrial solid waste
13 sites, permit authorization for storing,
14 regulate cleanup and treatment options.

15 Risk reduction rules were passed about two
16 years ago and it offers a different alternative
17 to -- in the past, everything was cleanup to
18 background or PQL's or organic substances -- and
19 now they've instituted three standards for the
20 cleanup of hazardous waste sites. There are --
21 to achieve these goals -- must be protective of
22 human health and the environment, continuing
23 responsibility dependent on the effectiveness of
24 the remedial alternative selected and agency has
25 a preference for remedies that provide a

1 permanent solution.

2 MR. RICE: A question, Gary.

3 MR. BEYER: Yes?

4 MR. BEYER: You may get this
5 later and so I can wait -- Who decides which
6 cleanup standards will be applied at a
7 particular site, as a concrete example,
8 Quintana Road neighborhood? Who has decided
9 that that would be Cleanup Standard 3 rather
10 than 1 or 2?

11 MR. BEYER: The facility decides.

12 MR. RICE: Who is the individual
13 that makes that decision?

14 MR. BEYER: There -- I don't
15 think -- I don't know if there's an individual.
16 I think there is a -- I mean, the organization.
17 We view it as the Air Force -- decides.

18 MR. RICE: So, would EM decide
19 you're going to clean up to Standard 3 rather
20 than Standard 1 -- or who -- who for the
21 Air Force makes that decision?

22 MR. BEYER: They evaluate various
23 remedial alternatives and then pick the remedial
24 alternative that they feel best suits the
25 situation.

1 QUINTANILLA: Mr. Beyer, do they
2 always get the minimum standards, like, for
3 instance, 3 being the minimum? Is that the one
4 that is submitted to you?

5 MR. BEYER: I don't know if it's
6 minimum. It's -- It's -- Usually, Standard 3
7 requires much more work in the long-term of
8 maintenance, in terms of post-closure care --

9 MR. QUINTANILLA: What I'm
10 referring to -- a minimum 3 was decided with the
11 groundwater in South San Antonio in the Quintana
12 Road area and that's barely going to bring up
13 the water -- the groundwater -- to drinking
14 standards on it, and it's going to take 30 years
15 to do that. And, you know, do you you-all
16 automatically approve that -- that low standard
17 there or do you-all look at different
18 standards?

19 MR. BEYER: We don't
20 automatically approve it. We evaluate the
21 selected alternative to see if it meets the
22 standards required under the regulation.

23 MR. QUINTANILLA: Yeah. The
24 standards required under the regulation, again,
25 is the minimum standard and it meets that

1 minimum standard. But shouldn't there be --
2 because of the long period of time -- a higher
3 standard other than the minimum standard?
4 Thirty years -- In 30 years, you know, the whole
5 life of that community will be gone because of
6 the contaminated groundwater and how long it's
7 going to take to clean it up.

8 MR. BEYER: Right. Well -- Well,
9 we -- the Standard 3 that was selected for the
10 Quintana Road neighborhood is looking at the use
11 of the groundwater in the neighborhood.
12 Depending on how it's being used, the TNRCC
13 makes a decision as to whether or not that
14 remedial alternative is adequate.

15 MR. RICE: Gary, when this was
16 brought up at our technical committee meeting in
17 October -- you know, when we decided that this
18 would be something that would be addressed
19 during one of these meetings -- something that I
20 understood would be emphasized -- first of all,
21 how are these decisions made as to cleanup and,
22 second, who makes the decision?

23 So, that's what I'm asking. Who is it that
24 decides that a certain number of cleanup will be
25 instituted? I mean, this is the EM staff or is

1 this the --

2 MR. SOLIS: Mr. Rice, if the
3 installation -- this is Kelly -- comes up with
4 a proposal and it meets the protective of human
5 health and environment and so approved by TNRCC,
6 what is the problem?

7 MR. RICE: I'm asking who makes
8 that decision.

9 MR. BEYER: The facility makes
10 the decision and then we evaluate that decision.

11 MR. RICE: Yeah. And when you
12 say "facility," who does that mean? Does that
13 mean that's Mr. Bailey?

14 Is that your staff, Larry? Or is that the
15 general in charge? Who makes it?

16 MR. BAILEY: Could I interject?

17 MR. BEYER: Certainly.

18 MR. BAILEY: As we stated
19 previously, the decision and recommendation is
20 by -- made through us. It is a facility
21 decision that is recommended and submitted then
22 to the regulatory agencies for -- for review and
23 concurrence.

24 In the case of what's been selected here
25 and in the area surrounding Kelly Air Force Base

1 and on Kelly Air Force Base, the State is in a
2 position, as well as the Environmental
3 Protection Agency soon -- due to what's
4 happening with the BRAC closure process -- to
5 come back and tell us that should the level for
6 which we are proposing be acceptable, then it's
7 acceptable, if they so view it that way.

8 If they deem to be -- that there is a
9 higher standard for which they want us to go to
10 at this time, then they can so do that. Later,
11 four or five years -- seven to ten years down
12 the road -- should the TNRCC or the EPA so
13 choose for us to meet a higher standard, should
14 that be what their decision is, then that does
15 not meet recommendation -- that's a requirement
16 that comes back to us the Air Force to clean up
17 to that standard.

18 MR. RICE: Well, I don't want to,
19 you know, hold up Gary's presentation, but just
20 let me say it's kind of frustrating when you
21 can't even get an organization to say who it is
22 or what organization within the facility that
23 makes a particular decision. Why they don't
24 want to volunteer that information is strange to
25 me.

1 MR. BAILEY: Well, we are here.
2 It is the Environmental Management Organization
3 that make the recommendation for Kelly Air Force
4 Base that goes forward.

5 So, as we've stated before --

6 MR. RICE: So, it's Environmental
7 Management's recommendation?

8 MR. BAILEY: Initial
9 recommendation, that is correct.

10 MR. RICE: And then, must that be
11 approved or does that go straight to TNRCC?
12 Does someone else have to approve that after --

13 MR. BAILEY: The Base -- The Base
14 evaluates that and then it goes on to TNRCC and
15 to others.

16 MR. RICE: I think you've
17 answered my question. The original
18 recommendation -- it originates with the
19 Environmental Management staff.

20 MR. BAILEY: Absolutely.

21 MR. RICE: Okay. Thank you.

22 MR. QUINTANILLA: I have one more
23 question. If the citizens here in South San
24 that are impacted by this contaminated
25 groundwater -- can they request to upgrade the

1 standard? Do they have that -- Do they have a
2 say?

3 MR. BEYER: There is a say in the
4 public hearing process that Kelly has done as
5 part of their record of decision. Plus, again,
6 there will be another public hearing at such
7 time as a permit is issued -- a hearing
8 permit -- and at that time there will be
9 another public hearing.

10 MR. QUINTANILLA: Speaking as a
11 member of the community -- just as one -- I
12 think that the standard is too low and I think
13 30 years is too long and I believe the citizens
14 will speak up to that when and if you have the
15 hearing.

16 MR. BEYER: Okay.

17 MR. HAGELTHORN: Mr. Solis, let
18 me request that maybe we hold the comments and
19 the questioning of the speaker until after his
20 presentation so that he can make his
21 presentation without interruption.

22 MR. SOLIS: Yes. Go ahead.
23 Proceed with the presentation and then if there
24 are any questions we'll direct them to you at
25 the end of your presentation.

1 MR. BEYER: Here is a summary of
2 the standards. Standard 1 is removal or
3 decontaminate to background levels -- you can
4 see here. This is usually for small sites that
5 are -- such as oil-water separators, some
6 situations like petroleum storage tanks, small
7 sites where this kind of idea is economically
8 feasible or viable to operate.

9 In many cases -- in large sites -- where
10 you have impact -- several acres or tens of
11 acres -- those would be the types of
12 alternatives that become extremely expensive,
13 so -- and become economically infeasible.

14 Standard 2 is cleanup to a risk-base
15 standard where we look at the various exposures
16 of an area -- well, actually we assume the most
17 conservative risk base standard -- that the soil
18 is going to be eaten by children, the
19 groundwater is going to be drunk at a rate of
20 two liters per day for 70 years and these kinds
21 of things -- very conservative risk base.

22 Because of Standard 2, there are no
23 requirements for post-closure care afterwards.
24 We assume that even though the soil is
25 contaminated with -- with contaminants that are

1 above background, but they're less than this
2 risk standard, that they're still perfectly
3 safe.

4 And, then, Standard 3 has a goal of
5 Standard 2, but allows for a different -- a more
6 site specific examination of the area's exposure
7 alternatives. So, in the case of the
8 Quintana Road area, what we've looked at is the
9 groundwater use scenario there to determine if
10 the groundwater is -- is used for drinking water
11 purposes, is for irrigation purposes, what are
12 the -- what are the -- the realistic exposure
13 pathways? Is there someone that is out there in
14 the Quintana Road area that is drinking two
15 liters of water a day for 70 years from a water
16 well that's contaminated? And you have to look
17 at that type of exposure situation.

18 The risk standards aren't applied just
19 when -- they're applied -- you hear of a risk
20 standard applied to a site, it's actually
21 applied to different media. You can have
22 closure of the different media under different
23 standards. So, you can close the soil under
24 Standard 2, but groundwater under a Standard
25 3 -- or the soil -- the upper two feet of

1 soil -- you can close that to a different
2 standard. So, there's different standards for
3 different contaminated media.

4 Here's a flowchart for Risk Reduction
5 Standard 1. Since that's not the primary area
6 of interest here, you know, I'll go through some
7 of these very quickly. I don't want to spend a
8 lot of time on these. But this is the
9 decision-making tree on how we decide areas of
10 risk standards are passed.

11 Standard 1 is usually applied to safe soil
12 where you have an area that can be handled by
13 what we use -- the sort of jargon we use is
14 backhoe technology -- can easily be dug up and
15 either treated or properly disposed.

16 Standard 2, using risk base criteria -- the
17 facility has the option to submit a
18 notification, and then proceed with their
19 cleanup to Standard 2 and then provide the
20 agency with a final report -- and then the TNRCC
21 doesn't enter into the action until the report
22 is submitted and reviewed and then a
23 determination is made as to whether or not
24 additional work is needed.

25 In Standard 3, which is what many of the

1 sites are being cleaned up to, is a little
2 bit -- is more involved and requires a lot more
3 work in terms of exposure assessment -- prepare
4 a remedial investigation report and then a base
5 line risk assessment report, and then a
6 corrective measure study is then presented,
7 which present -- presents various alternatives.
8 And then after a preferred alternative is
9 selected, it then goes to the TNRCC for a
10 review, then the TNRCC says "yes" or "no." If
11 remedial actions is needed, then a remedial
12 action is conducted and a final report is
13 submitted. At that point, it is determined
14 whether or not there is additional work that
15 needs to be done or post-closure care is
16 needed -- and if post-closure care is needed,
17 then the facility is asked to -- or required to
18 perform post-closure care.

19 Our rules have -- are available for your
20 inspection under Section 335 and then in
21 Section .551 through 335.569 under the Texas
22 Administrative Code.

23 MR. RICE: What was that --
24 establishing the standards?

25 MR. BEYER: This is a -- These

1 are the actual risk reduction rules as they have
2 been written. And if you want more in-depth
3 discussion of that, you can go to the --

4 MR. HAGELTHORN: According to
5 your briefing now, am I to understand that the
6 Air Force is cleaning up to the most restrictive
7 standard, that is requiring the Air Force to do
8 the most cleanup as opposed to doing the least?

9 MR. BEYER: It's -- I don't -- I
10 don't really see it in terms of restrictive
11 standards.

12 MR. HAGELTHORN: Well,
13 comprehensive standards.

14 MR. BEYER: It's difficult to say
15 whether it's comprehensive or restrictive, but I
16 guess the most -- I guess the most stringent
17 standard would be Standard 1 where you clean to
18 background -- and, obviously, those -- that type
19 of goal is -- is totally economically
20 infeasible. So -- then you have to look at the
21 other risk reduction standards, because it's --
22 the whole -- you know, to achieve Standard 1,
23 you know, the entire neighborhood would have to
24 be dug up down to a level of 30 feet, you know,
25 several million cubic yards of dirt would have

1 to be hauled off and there's not enough money in
2 the world to do that type of remediation. So,
3 then, you have to look at other types of
4 exposure scenarios to see, you know, what would
5 work.

6 MR. HAGELTHORN: Based on what
7 you know, and what you have seen and what was
8 presented by the Air Force to the TNRCC, is the
9 Air Force complying -- are they doing the most
10 they can do with this type of contamination?

11 MR. BEYER: Yes. We've evaluated
12 their proposals and have determined that what
13 they have proposed is protective of human
14 health.

15 MR. HAGELTHORN: I also saw that
16 the TNRCC approved and released the -- I saw
17 that the TNRCC approved and released the study
18 or the comments from the public comment period.
19 Was there anything in there -- any concerns --
20 that were presented to TNRCC which would make
21 TNRCC reevaluate what level of cleanup they're
22 cleaning up to?

23 MR. BEYER: We're still going
24 through all those public responses. We provided
25 some feedback on that. I think a --

1 Congressman Tejeda submitted a lot of questions,
2 I think, by Mr. Quintanilla regarding certain
3 issues and we've responded to those.

4 MR. HAGELTHORN: Has the TNRCC
5 changed their position of the level of cleanup
6 as a result of these comments?

7 MR. BEYER: No.

8 MR. RICE: I believe, in the
9 past, the Air Force has asked the State to
10 change the status of the shallow aquifer from
11 a -- from a potential source of drinking water
12 to a lower status. Is that correct, to your
13 knowledge? Larry, do you know if that's
14 correct?

15 MR. BAILEY: No, we haven't
16 formally asked them to do that.

17 MR. RICE: Have you asked at
18 all? Are you making any attempts to change the
19 status of the aquifer?

20 MR. BAILEY: No. Not formally,
21 no.

22 MR. RICE: Not formally.

23 MR. BAILEY: No -- meaning, we're
24 not talking to them about that. We're looking
25 at a much broader picture with Bexar County and

1 we're working with other industries in the
2 San Antonio area and outside of this.

3 MR. RICE: But the Air Force is
4 not going to make any attempt to reduce or to
5 change the status of the shallow aquifer from a
6 potential source of drinking water as it is now;
7 is that correct?

8 MR. BAILEY: I can't answer
9 that. I don't -- Right now, no, we're not.

10 MR. RICE: Right now, no.

11 MR. BAILEY: But I don't know
12 about that a year down the road. I just can't
13 speculate.

14 MR. RICE: Okay.

15 MR. SOLIS: Mr. Beyer, does EPA
16 review your decisions?

17 MR. BEYER: EPA has authorized
18 us. They've retained an oversight role. If
19 they so choose to conduct oversight of
20 particular situations, they can. And -- But
21 since the State of Texas is authorized, then we
22 make the decision. They will -- The EPA will
23 have a more active role when it comes to base
24 closures and they will be a party that will
25 enter directly into decisions as far as --

1 MR. SOLIS: So, if, at that time,
2 they decide that the standards entered by Kelly
3 is inadequate they will direct you to
4 reconsider?

5 MR. BEYER: Yes. The EPA would
6 review our -- our process and determine if -- if
7 TNRCC reviews the Air Force's application and
8 whether or not we reviewed them, according to
9 the regulations and whether or not the
10 regulations are met.

11 MR. SOLIS: Thank you.

12 MR. QUINTANILLA: Mr. Beyer, is
13 your office State funded? How is your office
14 funded.

15 MR. BEYER: Yes.

16 MR. QUINTANILLA: 100 percent?

17 MR. BEYER: It's funded through
18 various sources. We have fees. We have -- It's
19 funded through State sources. We have funds
20 from other agencies. There's various funding
21 mechanisms depending on the program.

22 MR. QUINTANILLA: But other
23 agencies, are they federal agencies?

24 MR. BEYER: Yes. The EPA funds
25 us.

1 MR. QUINTANILLA: Department of
2 Defense --

3 MR. BEYER: Department of
4 Defense.

5 MR. QUINTANILLA: -- funds
6 you-all?

7 MR. BEYER: Yes.

8 MR. QUINTANILLA: Okay.

9 MR. RICE: Are there any sites at
10 Kelly that aren't being cleaned up to Standard
11 No. 3 or are they all Standard No. 3?

12 MR. BEYER: Yeah. Some storage
13 tanks -- well, actually, they have a
14 different -- the petroleum storage tank program
15 has a different -- although a similar risk
16 evaluation program. So, I think there are some
17 sites that are being cleaned up to those
18 standards.

19 MR. RICE: All the sites to which
20 these rules are directly applicable, then
21 they're all Standard 3, as far as you know?

22 MR. BEYER: For the big sites.

23 MR. RICE: Do you know if that's
24 correct, Larry?

25 MR. BAILEY: There are some

1 smaller sites -- possible storage -- storage
2 tank sites which we would consider to be cleaned
3 up to a higher standard while they're not put
4 into this category. But the large sites are
5 being proposed -- or the ones we've proposed to
6 date are for Category 3 standard.

7 MR. MEDINA: And there are some
8 sites that are closed out, or proposed to be
9 closed out, under Standard 2, which is under
10 risk base standards.

11 MR. SOLIS: Thank you, Mr. Beyer.

12 MR. RICE: One more question.
13 Could you -- I don't really understand the
14 difference between Standard 2 and Standard 3.
15 What's -- What really makes the difference
16 between those two standards?

17 MR. BEYER: Standard 2 assumes
18 certain exposures scenarios such as ingestion
19 of -- for soil -- ingestion of certain
20 quantities of soils daily by infants -- the
21 infant lives on the site until -- for 70
22 years -- the person lives there -- and can
23 ingest -- I forget how many grams -- two grams
24 of soil per day for 70 years -- and those kinds
25 of things -- then the groundwater is -- has two

1 liters of -- of groundwater is ingested per day
2 for 70 years and then once you, you know --

3 MR. RICE: Isn't it a risk-based
4 standard and No. 3 is not a risk-based
5 standard?

6 MR. BEYER: No. Standard 3 is
7 also a risk-based standard, but then you --
8 Standard 3 -- you can look at things such as
9 inhalation during showering and water --
10 irrigation of vegetables -- those kinds of other
11 exposure scenarios.

12 MR. RICE: Is it the difference
13 in the pathways that are considered? Is that
14 the main difference?

15 MR. BEYER: Right. There is --
16 The various mix of various pathways.

17 MR. SOLIS: Thank you, sir.

18 MR. HAGELTHORN: Mr. Solis, I
19 just want to let you know that I'm going to be
20 leaving now. My son is receiving the Star Scout
21 Code of Honor tonight and I need to leave.

22 MR. SOLIS: Mr. Medina.

23 MR. MEDINA: Thank you,
24 Mr. Solis. My name is Daniel Medina, for those
25 of you who are new to the audience. This

1 evening's EMRO update is going to be given by
2 Captain Ed von Dran. He's going to be
3 presenting the Basewide Remedial Assessment.
4 This is data that represents a data collection
5 that was done during 1994. And with that, I'll
6 go ahead and introduce Captain von Dran.

7 CAPT. VON DRAN: Good evening.
8 Tonight we're just going to talk about -- I'm
9 just here to inform you about the release of the
10 Basewide Remedial Assessment in draft final
11 format. This will give you some sort of an idea
12 of the contents of the report and the efforts
13 we've undergone to get to where we're at.

14 Basewide Remedial Assessment was
15 self-initiated. Kelly Air Force initiated the
16 project to take a holistic look at the base to
17 evaluate all of the groundwater and our recovery
18 system effectiveness and also to look at any
19 potential impacts that may have been on
20 Leon Creek.

21 The -- The '94 report is, in fact, a
22 baseline from which we are going -- from which
23 we'll use to work future years. This is just a
24 listing -- you have it there in your
25 presentation. It talks about the overall scope

1 of the report -- excuse me -- the whole
2 project -- and I'm not going to read through.
3 We're providing a lot of this data here in
4 the -- in this briefing tonight because a lot of
5 you may not see the report -- or if you do, you
6 may have some questions concerning the overall
7 project -- and we just wanted to give you an
8 idea of the type -- of the type of the things
9 that we did through this project.

10 Kelly Air Force Base has also conducted a
11 '95 assessment. We've basically built on the
12 '94 work that we've done and we're going to
13 continue in 1996 to -- with these efforts.
14 Tonight, as I've mentioned, we've got the draft
15 final report. We've got a couple of copies back
16 here on the table along with a couple of our
17 charts that were derived from our groundwater
18 capture zone modeling. We've also been doing a
19 lot of compliance monitoring with this project.
20 We've been using it to take care of our RCRA
21 monitoring that's been required on a quarterly
22 basis -- and there's a couple of other reports
23 that we do have in our libraries -- and those
24 are RCRA reports, some -- a report on Leon
25 Creek -- and also we have a -- more or less an

1 executive-summary-type report on the -- on our
2 progress with Leon Creek. It should be out in
3 the early portion of next year.

4 The -- The results of this study -- just to
5 let you know where all the money is going and
6 how we're using it -- is being used to enhance
7 and augment the remedial design effort and we're
8 also using it to -- to optimize or improve the
9 existing systems to where -- that they function
10 at a higher level. We're also using the results
11 of the Leon Creek report to augment those
12 studies and also to augment our modeling.

13 The next -- like with the -- the scope of
14 the project -- I provided you a basic outline of
15 what's contained in the report -- the executive
16 summary -- everyone has been provided -- in
17 the RAB -- has been provided a copy of the
18 executive summary that they can take home and
19 read. We've also provided -- Go ahead and take
20 a look at the outline of the report -- it may
21 pique your interest -- and we are going to be
22 placing copies in -- in both the on-base library
23 and the San Antonio Public Library. We also
24 have copies available in our technical library
25 on base -- and through Public Affairs, you

1 should be able to check out one of the two
2 copies we provided to them.

3 This is a fairly large report. We have --
4 As you see here, we've got Volumes IV through
5 XI, but we only have one copy of that because
6 it's just more or less the laboratory data
7 packages for support. If you want to look at
8 those -- that support data -- it will not be
9 provided to Kelly Air Force Base until the
10 report goes final -- and at that time you will
11 be able to come into our tech library and review
12 that.

13 We've also provided you a map -- just
14 basically the location of all our recovery
15 systems so that when you're looking at the next
16 few slides that come up here showing our plume
17 contours you'll be able to locate where we've
18 placed interim recovery systems.

19 And we've given you a copy of the flow path
20 results of another report that's coming out on
21 the Basewide Remedial Assessment which is a
22 numerical groundwater model -- and this is just
23 an overall summary of that -- of that modeling
24 effort. We thought it would be interesting to
25 show you how the water -- flow lines throughout

1 the base and --

2 MR. RICE: Ed, a quick question.
3 On that map, where would the culvert be along
4 Quintana Road?

5 CAPT. VON DRAN: The Quintana
6 Road culvert is directly -- correct me if I'm
7 wrong, Ron -- is down in this.

8 MR. CATCHINGS: A little further
9 south.

10 CAPT. VON DRAN: Yeah. It's down
11 here.

12 MR. QUINTANILLA: Is it on
13 Quintana Road or is it going to be on McLaughlin
14 and Bynum -- the culvert --

15 MR. CATCHINGS: McLaughlin and
16 Bynum.

17 MR. QUINTANILLA: So, it's not on
18 Quintana Road but it's on McLaughlin and
19 Quintana -- the culvert?

20 MR. CATCHINGS: Right.

21 CAPT. VON DRAN: Correct.

22 MR. QUINTANILLA: Okay.

23 MR. CATCHINGS: It's replacing
24 the Quintana Road culvert.

25 MR. QUINTANILLA: Okay. Thank

1 you.

2 CAPT. VON DRAN: Okay. Next --
3 before I go to the plume contours -- I'd like --
4 as I mentioned, I do have a copy of the
5 executive summary for you here in your package
6 tonight. We've also provided you a copy of the
7 stratigraphy as we know it to be here at Kelly
8 Air Force Base.

9 As a component of the report, we have
10 generated certain contour maps out to either an
11 MCL or a secondary health standard of the
12 primary contaminants -- or contaminants of
13 concern -- and -- just wanted to present these
14 to you -- you have color copies of them provided
15 to you in your -- in your packages.

16 The first chart here shows chlorobenzene
17 and benzene. We're just providing these for
18 informational purposes for you tonight. We can
19 go over them in depth at your convenience.

20 This next chart here shows our chlorinated
21 solvents. And then we have a few metals that
22 we're concerned with. The last two charts --
23 they're just here to show you the presence of
24 chromium, nickel and antimony and arsenic and
25 manganese.

1 Now, as I mentioned, these aren't just
2 simply plotted out to the MCL or secondary
3 health standard. There are detailed plume
4 contours with isoconcentration provided in the
5 reports. During a break -- if we have one this
6 evening -- or just following the meeting --
7 we'll be glad to hold more in-depth discussions
8 with you over at the display. If I can
9 entertain any questions right now --

10 MR. QUINTANILLA: Just one short
11 question. You state here that arsenic was -- in
12 your executive summary -- was detected in about
13 58 percent of the wells sampled. "Arsenic
14 appears to be localized in plumes extended over
15 all the zones. Arsenic was detected in all
16 zones, except Zone 4, at concentrations above
17 the MCL of 50 UG/L." What does that mean?

18 CAPT. VON DRAN: That's
19 micrograms per liter, sir.

20 MR. QUINTANILLA: Is that bad,
21 good, indifferent --

22 CAPT. VON DRAN: It -- It has to
23 be taken in context with -- What -- Where are
24 you reading at, sir?

25 MR. QUINTANILLA: I'm reading on

1 Page EX-6 -- and my questions are on arsenic and
2 chromium.

3 MR. MEDINA: What that will
4 require us to do, sir, is to go back and take a
5 look at the treatment systems as well. In some
6 cases, some of the chemicals that were
7 identified both in the feasibility study and in
8 other studies like this Basewide Remedial
9 Assessment identify some chemicals that require
10 some sort of cleanup. So, those are the
11 types -- that's the type of information we'll
12 take a look at and look at in incorporating
13 certain cleanup systems.

14 So, in some instances like this where it's
15 above a regulatory limit, we have to go out and
16 do a cleanup on that.

17 CAPT. VON DRAN: The purpose of
18 this report is simply to track, and identify and
19 continue to monitor any progress of any
20 potential contaminants, and to provide that data
21 to the project managers as they work in their
22 zones and to assure that we're addressing all
23 the issues.

24 MR. QUINTANILLA: Now, the only
25 danger to the people in the community is if they

1 would ingest the water or the soil; is that
2 correct?

3 MR. MEDINA: There's a
4 calculation that we go through. The risk
5 assessment is what -- is what is done and you
6 have to have -- be a certain body weight, for
7 example -- a certain body weight -- you to
8 have a certain amount that you drink every day
9 at a certain concentration over a certain amount
10 of time -- and we can apply industrial standards
11 or we can apply residential standards for those.

12 MR. QUINTANILLA: What was
13 applied to the South San area -- industrial or
14 residential?

15 MR. MEDINA: It depends on the
16 location. If it's off base, then it was
17 residential.

18 MR. QUINTANILLA: It was off
19 base.

20 MR. MEDINA: Right. And it's on
21 base, industrial.

22 CAPT. VON DRAN: This report did
23 not include risk assessment. It was merely to
24 continue gathering data for the purposes of
25 supplementing the studies and to fill a stopgap

1 between the actual termination of the study and
2 the implementation of remedial actions.

3 MR. QUINTANILLA: Thank you very
4 much.

5 MR. RICE: When you hear me, I'm
6 usually critical of the Air Force's work. I
7 mean, they've done enough to be critical of
8 certainly. In this case, you know, I -- I
9 attended a meeting about a month ago where the
10 contractor went over the modeling. And what
11 I've seen of this, I think this is -- this
12 appears to be very good work because what the
13 Air Force is doing is they're not just assuming
14 that some of their interim fixes have worked.
15 Through modeling studies, they've identified
16 potential problems and -- and now, I understand,
17 you're going back and taking a critical look at
18 some of those things to see if those problems
19 are real -- and if they're real, you'll fix
20 them, correct?

21 CAPT. VON DRAN: Well, as a
22 result of that '94 study we've already -- we've
23 already made some improvements to several of our
24 systems and we're under -- we're evaluating
25 several more improvements to the existing

1 systems, basically to enhance their performance
2 and we are going to update this model next year,
3 also.

4 MR. CULBERTSON: Would you care
5 to relate anything to do with iron and the
6 presence of some other chemicals there?

7 CAPT. VON DRAN: Well, with
8 respect -- I was talking to you earlier
9 concerning the presence of iron and sometimes
10 the presence of iron can -- can enhance -- but
11 not -- we don't know that it did in this
12 particular case -- can enhance degradation of a
13 chlorinated solvent. But that study hasn't been
14 done. In particular -- what we were speaking of
15 earlier -- has to do with theoretical studies
16 and it would be pure supposition on our part to
17 go into much more detail. I was just speaking
18 of theoretically what may be occurring -- and we
19 don't have any proof to substantiate that at
20 this time.

21 MR. SOLIS: Thank you, sir.

22 MR. MEDINA: The next person I'd
23 like to introduce is a gentleman from Armstrong
24 Labs. His name is Jody Wireman. He is stepping
25 in this evening for Doctor Porter, who cannot be

1 with us this evening.

2 Mr. Wireman will discuss a little about
3 what Armstrong Lab is going to be doing for us.
4 This goes in part with the visit by ATSDR.
5 There's a letter in your packet that you have
6 this evening regarding the evaluation that we'll
7 be doing. And at this moment I want to go ahead
8 and pass it off to Mr. Wireman -- and, again, if
9 you have questions, please feel free to bring
10 them up. We'd like to have Mr. Wireman go ahead
11 and give his presentation -- and at the end, if
12 you have any questions, bring them up at the
13 conclusion of his presentation.

14 MR. WIREMAN: My name is
15 Jody Wireman. I'm from Armstrong Laboratory
16 at -- at Brooks Air Force Base -- and the focus
17 of our evaluation at Kelly Air Force Base is a
18 public health twist to the TNRCC evaluation --
19 and the way we do that is, we use the Agency for
20 Toxic Substance and Disease Registry. They're a
21 public health service agency. We use their
22 methodologies to evaluate sites on an
23 installation -- actually, to evaluate the whole
24 installation -- and our focus is solely human
25 health -- human health from every type of media,

1 be it soil, groundwater, surface water or even
2 if it's from biota -- you know, if it's from
3 plants or fish or something like that -- that's
4 where Doctor Porter is right now. He's at a
5 Tri-Service meeting -- He's the Air Force
6 representative for ecological risks.

7 To be a human health risk group, we knew we
8 needed a variety of backgrounds -- and these are
9 some of the people that we have working in our
10 group: Cornell Long is the point of contact.
11 He couldn't be here tonight. He's an
12 environmental scientist and a chemist.
13 Major MacCabe is our branch chief. He's a
14 veterinarian and a -- he has a public health
15 degree. Captain Sassaman -- he's incognito up
16 front. He's a professional slide flipper, I
17 guess. He's a bioenvironmental engineer. So,
18 his job at the Carswell Air Force Base --
19 before he came to Brooks -- was to look at
20 surface water quality -- quality -- to see if
21 it impact -- impacts human -- you know, impacts
22 humans by contaminating drinking water or -- or
23 contaminating fish. So, that was his job at
24 Carswell Air Force Base. Now, he joins our
25 group to bring that expertise to us from the

1 base level.

2 We have three toxicologists. John Hinz is
3 the chief toxicologist, then we have
4 Doctor Porter, who I mentioned, and Doctor
5 Maull. I -- My background is environmental
6 health. I have a master's degree in public
7 health and -- and Don Hammer is a hydrologist --
8 a civil engineer. We knew we needed some people
9 like that that had the expertise -- not just
10 from the health side -- but -- but actually
11 looking at the workings of -- of, you know, the
12 hydrology and the soils, that type of thing.

13 We also have a couple of people who
14 actually go out and do sampling -- Sergeant
15 Westbrook and Jacobsen. We have -- With us
16 there is Luis Salazar who is -- who is not just
17 an environmental scientist. He also has a law
18 degree and a few other degrees as well. He's
19 pretty much involved with everything there. And
20 then we Steve Strausbauch, who is also a chemist
21 and an environmental scientist. So, we have a
22 very large group -- and our specific
23 responsibility is to look at human health risks
24 from contaminated sites.

25 We originally were formed to work with

1 installations that are on the EPA's national
2 priority list, which Kelly isn't on. There are
3 40 Air Force installations on the national
4 priority list and we've gone to each one of
5 those installations -- and we've also gone to
6 several other installations. Kelly Air Force
7 Base -- seeing that we interact with ATSDR --
8 asked us to come out and then take a look at
9 their installation, which works out pretty good
10 because what we're trying to do is kind of a --
11 getting a head start and trying to get the
12 information together for ATSDR when they come
13 here -- hopefully, next month -- that's what the
14 plan is -- for them to come next month.

15 ATSDR only has about three or four people
16 that work Air Force and Navy issues. So, it's
17 important for a group like us to gather the
18 information for them prior to them coming here.
19 And what we've done at other installations, and
20 what we're trying to do at Kelly Air Force Base,
21 is put together what's called a data gap
22 sampling and analysis plan -- and what we --
23 what we do is -- we do a site visit.

24 Typically, we're only on site for about
25 three or four days and we only take two or three

1 people. But, fortunately -- basically because
2 of the size of Kelly -- we're able to break it
3 up over a couple of different days and we're
4 able to bring different expertise out. So,
5 we're really fortunate to be located so close to
6 Kelly Air Force Base.

7 So, our objective is to visit the site and
8 to identify if there's any data gaps. Does
9 Kelly Air Force have information about human
10 exposures at all their sites? Would -- you
11 know, if it takes 30 years to clean up a site,
12 would that impact human health? Now, that's
13 what our concern is. Is the information
14 available to take a good hard look at that? And
15 if necessary, we recommend additional sampling.

16 So far, from the base, we've got a
17 historical and environmental overview of the
18 installation and we've been able to look at
19 several of the sites -- we haven't had time to
20 look at all of the sites yet -- and there are --
21 there are quite a few -- and we're taking a look
22 because we want to do a thorough job. But the
23 goal is to get a report done prior to ATSDR
24 coming in January so they can use that to build
25 upon. Because when they do come out it won't be

1 a month -- you know, it will only be for a few
2 short days. So, it's important that the type of
3 information that they're looking for is -- is
4 made available to them and that's what we're
5 going to do.

6 We also try to get a feel for base and
7 community health concerns. Typically, we just
8 go to installation personnel and say, you know,
9 "Have you had any complaints? Has anything
10 come up on the Restoration Advisory Board?" But
11 through a forum like this, we might be able to
12 get -- more precisely, get a good feel for what
13 kind of concerns are out there and see if the
14 environmental side of the house at Kelly Air
15 Force Base is actually looking at the
16 concerns -- tie in the concerns -- human health
17 concerns -- to their sampling to see if the
18 sampling does indicate whether or not there --
19 you know, whether the -- the sampling satisfies
20 the concern, basically. So, that's what we're
21 looking for.

22 Public health evaluation is an evaluation
23 of historical releases. From -- For this -- In
24 this case -- Kelly Air Force Base -- and we're
25 not just looking at current and future. We also

1 try to get a feel for past exposures that
2 occurred and try to find out what kind of an
3 impact on human health matter that would be.

4 The important thing to remember -- it's not
5 an EPA risk assessment. An EPA or a TNRCC risk
6 assessment is -- is looking at what type of
7 cleanup we're going to use and what is the final
8 value. So, we're going to use a certain
9 technology to bring the risk down to this
10 certain level. What our concern is, is what
11 impact is that going to have on human health and
12 that's what ATSDR's assessment is going to be --
13 is what impact is it going to be on human
14 health. So, one is looking at technology and
15 one is looking at -- specifically at human
16 health -- although TNRCC does incorporate human
17 health into their values. But --

18 What -- What -- What a regulatory agency
19 will do is look at environmental
20 characterization of data -- and that's primarily
21 what we're going to try to get together for
22 ATSDR. What -- ATSDR has basically three
23 pillars that they look at. They look at
24 environmental characterization of data. They
25 look at health outcome data. Is there any

1 health studies going on or is there any
2 information about illnesses in the area that
3 could be linked to Kelly Air Force Base? And
4 they also look at health concerns, which is
5 often overlooked by regulators. So, there's a
6 different -- a different twist to the evaluation
7 than a regulatory agency is going to give -- and
8 it's -- it's basically the same scenario as --
9 as the regulators -- you know, you're looking at
10 the contamination and you're looking at where it
11 goes and it's -- could it affect anyone?

12 What ATSDR typically looks at -- their
13 methodology is: Do you have some values at --
14 at where the people are? If it's groundwater
15 contamination and people are drinking that
16 contamination, have you taken tap water
17 samples? We don't care what kind of wells can
18 be drilled. If people are drinking the water,
19 you might as well take a tap water sample
20 because that's what they're actually drinking.

21 So, those are the types of things that are
22 sometimes different from the regulators and the
23 things that -- information that we try to get.
24 And then just like the regulator we will compare
25 them with health effects -- information -- to

1 find out what kind of a risk there would be.

2 So, the purpose of a data gap report -- a
3 data gap sampling analysis plan is to identify
4 whether additional information is need to look
5 at human health risk from Kelly Air Force. And
6 if necessary -- you know, those
7 recommendations -- there will be some
8 recommendations for additional sampling. And
9 if -- if there's not a good -- and also we'll
10 incorporate the community concerns into the
11 report as much as possible. As far as a time
12 line -- like I said -- we're going to try to
13 get the report finished prior to ATSDR coming
14 here in January.

15 Just from the past -- what we've learned
16 is -- is ATSDR won't stop at the fence line.
17 They're going to go wherever the plumes go or
18 wherever they might, you know, go in the
19 future -- and they want to know what the
20 exposures are at the public -- whether the
21 public is on-base workers or whether they're --
22 whether they're the off-base residents -- and,
23 again, that's kind of what the methodologies
24 are, too.

25 What we've done -- and what we continue to

1 do -- is to look at sampling plans -- future
2 sampling plans to see if they meet the needs of
3 ATSDR in addition to meeting the needs of the
4 various regulators. We can actually do some --
5 some hands-on sampling and we participate in
6 public forums.

7 Getting to the -- to the -- I guess the
8 topic on the agenda -- Restoration Advisory
9 Board training -- what we've done for just
10 the -- just the RAB group itself -- you know,
11 trying to keep it as small as possible -- is
12 offer some training -- going through the number
13 crunches -- you know, why -- why use two liters
14 of water a day and -- you know, that type of
15 thing -- as far as drinking water -- and trying
16 to go through a site specific example so that
17 you can see why Kelly Air Force Base did what
18 they did throughout the process -- and, you
19 know, we're offering that to -- to your group
20 to -- and you can work out a date -- but,
21 typically, it just takes, you know, three or
22 four hours and we can do it on a Saturday,
23 Sunday -- you know, whatever -- whatever would
24 be -- whatever would be good for the Restoration
25 Advisory Board and -- so, you can decide on that

1 and in the future -- because we're right over at
2 Brooks -- so it wouldn't involve much to get us
3 to come over. Is there any -- any comments or
4 questions?

5 MR. RICE: You mentioned talking
6 to people in the neighborhood about health
7 concerns. I'd like to give you a name of a
8 committee member who is not here tonight and I
9 suggest you talk to her. Her name is Yolanda
10 Johnson -- Yolanda Johnson -- and when the
11 ATSDR folks come over I hope that they look her
12 up. Her phone number would be available from --

13 MR. WIREMAN: I'm not exactly
14 sure what kind of time they're going to be able
15 to spend here when they come, but we'll try to
16 get them to speak to as many people as they can.

17 MR. MEDINA: There's one thing I
18 would like to mention -- There's one thing I'd
19 like to mention. There should be in your
20 package a form in which to sign up for
21 training. What you may want to do is on that
22 form put a time -- I mean, a date -- when you're
23 looking at training. This would be in the
24 January time frame. If you could, just take a
25 look at it and let us know through our Public

1 Affairs folks -- and then, that way, once we get
2 everyone's feedback, we'll have a good idea of
3 when we can schedule some training using the
4 Armstrong Laboratory folks as instructors.

5 MR. RICE: Would this be for the
6 risk assessment training that he just
7 mentioned?

8 MR. MEDINA: Yes.

9 MR. SMITH: I have one question.
10 Do you expect these results to affect -- I'm
11 assuming you were sitting back here when the
12 TNRCC went through the performance standard
13 choice. Do you expect these results to affect
14 the choice of the performance standard? If you
15 came back with some adverse results that weren't
16 found through the testing that was already done,
17 can it -- or could it possibly affect the
18 performance standard that's been applied to
19 these areas we've been discussing.

20 MR. WIREMAN: I'm not exactly
21 sure how it -- you know, it just depends on --
22 on what contaminants -- you know, if they found
23 any contaminants. If it changes, it might
24 change the type of technology that Kelly Air
25 Force Base has to use or it might change the

1 approach that they have to use.

2 MR. SMITH: Okay. Well, I'll ask
3 that same question of the Environmental
4 Management group. Is this information coming
5 from these people going to be used to enforce
6 any decisions from Environmental Management,
7 perhaps upgrading performance standard use?

8 MR. BAILEY: Possibly so, yes.
9 What we see taking place is -- the information
10 coming back now is just a step in other steps
11 that will be happening. These folks will take a
12 look at it now -- I'm trying to think of the
13 best way to describe this.

14 MR. SMITH: Well, the way I
15 understand you, is the risk assessment being
16 done by the extensiveness of this testing by
17 Armstrong exceeds a little bit than what the
18 TNRCC was requiring. Is that a valid
19 assessment?

20 MR. BAILEY: Not necessarily so.
21 I will have to defer to the State, but it's my
22 understanding that this is a part that goes into
23 the consideration for ultimately what technology
24 will be used to clean up the neighborhood.

25 MR. SMITH: Okay.

1 MR. WIREMAN: It's a slightly
2 different approach -- and -- and -- you know,
3 it could ultimately lead to where -- where there
4 is -- there is not much difference at all. But
5 it could lead to -- you know, it could affect
6 one site -- you know, then -- then --
7 basically, what Kelly Air Force wants to do is
8 just look at everything and this is just another
9 tool to look at the sites.

10 MR. SMITH: Okay.

11 MR. BEYER: The TNRCC is
12 presented with evidence that there is a
13 threat -- a potential threat -- to human
14 health, then, you know, we would definitely, at
15 that point, make recommendations to -- to take
16 whatever action is necessary to alleviate that
17 threat. So, I guess the difference -- Although
18 the differences are subtle between their
19 approach and our approach, our approach is
20 looking directly at the media, determining
21 cleanup levels -- and correct me if I'm
22 wrong -- they're looking -- and -- and --
23 we're looking at the media and the cleanup
24 levels and the potential for that to affect
25 human health. You're actually looking at

1 current uses starting at the recipient or the
2 person or the neighborhood to be exposed and
3 kind of working backwards.

4 MR. WIREMAN: Yeah. It's kind of
5 that way -- and then we're also -- we're also
6 looking at, you know, kind of backup plans
7 and -- and, you know, kind of like a fail-safe
8 system. What happens if this doesn't work --
9 you know, do you have a monitoring well located
10 so if this doesn't work it will detect it and
11 then -- it's built into it -- but it's kind of
12 a -- it's just another way to look at the sites.

13 MR. SMITH: All right.

14 MR. SOLIS: Thank you, sir.

15 MR. QUINTANILLA: Wait a minute.
16 I have a couple of questions. Do you plan to
17 give us a follow-up report later on, on the
18 results of your findings?

19 MR. WIREMAN: I think the -- the
20 report should be made available, but we can come
21 back and discuss those.

22 MR. QUINTANILLA: Yeah. A five-
23 or ten-minute briefing would be in order, I
24 believe.

25 The second question that I have is --

1 concerns releases. In February of this year, we
2 had a fire in East Kelly and approximately ten
3 thousand gallons of water spilled over into
4 Six Mile Creek. Some of that water from that
5 fire had some chemicals and one of them was
6 arsenic. The following day some children were
7 wading in that water -- swimming in that
8 water. Do you-all plan to look into this area?

9 MR. WIREMAN: We're going to try
10 to look at -- into as many things as we can,
11 yeah. There's no -- There's no separation
12 between something that the environmental section
13 here looks at -- the Restoration group -- or
14 whether it's people who are removing tanks or
15 whether it's somebody that does -- or current
16 activities. So --

17 MR. QUINTANILLA: No one has ever
18 looked at this area. TNRCC, I don't think has
19 made a survey -- or ATSDR has not made a
20 survey -- neither have you-all of the people
21 there that live right outside where this 10,000
22 gallons of water went into this creek and the
23 children were wading in it.

24 MR. WIREMAN: Our objective is to
25 look at all of these different things -- you

1 know, we're not just -- we're not just looking
2 at the sites that they're talking about here in
3 the remediation. We're trying to do a -- you
4 know, as complete of an evaluation as we can.

5 MR. QUINTANILLA: Thank you very
6 much.

7 MR. SOLIS: Let's take a
8 15-minute break. We'll adjourn at 20 until.

9 MR. QUINTANILLA: He's got two
10 questions over there. Mr. Murrah (sic) has a
11 question.

12 MR. CULBERTSON: Well, I just
13 think that some of these things are so general,
14 I just can't visualize what you're doing. Do
15 you go find out how many people have had
16 diabetes, how many people have had unusual
17 births, how many people have unusual health
18 problems? What do you do when you're talking
19 about making a public health survey? Now, let's
20 be specific.

21 MR. WIREMAN: Specifically,
22 what's -- what's typically done at an
23 installation is that they found out what data is
24 available.

25 MR. CULBERTSON: What data?

1 MR. WIREMAN: If anybody has
2 collected that data in the past, whether the
3 local health service --

4 MR. CULBERTSON: Well, you know
5 that hasn't been collected.

6 MR. WIREMAN: Right. So, the
7 next step is to see what kind of environmental
8 contaminants are located -- they look at the
9 environment --

10 MR. CULBERTSON: The chemistry is
11 being taken care of.

12 MR. WIREMAN: Right.

13 MR. CULBERTSON: And you're
14 taking care -- you're checking on the health of
15 the community.

16 MR. WIREMAN: Right.

17 MR. CULBERTSON: What type of
18 occurrences of different things -- diseases and
19 health problems -- liver and kidney problems and
20 so on have occurred?

21 MR. WIREMAN: That relates to the
22 risk. If the risk --

23 MR. CULBERTSON: It relates to
24 the risk. You bet your life it does. It's one
25 of the most important things we're talking

1 about. We want to be sure that the community is
2 healthy.

3 MR. WIREMAN: If the risk is
4 there -- If the risk was there for a long enough
5 period of time, ATSDR might say more -- more
6 information on those diseases -- on those
7 illnesses -- needs to be collected -- so that's
8 another purpose of going -- ATSDR can do that if
9 they feel -- if they feel it's necessary. They
10 can -- They can do a health study. Our group
11 doesn't do health studies.

12 MR. CULBERTSON: Your group
13 doesn't do health studies?

14 MR. WIREMAN: No. But ATSDR does
15 and they are going to be looking at our
16 information.

17 MR. CULBERTSON: Who's going to
18 be looking at it?

19 MR. WIREMAN: There's a report
20 dated December 4th from ATSDR and they're going
21 to be coming here --

22 MR. CULBERTSON: Now, ATSDR --
23 you know, we're not all privy or familiar with
24 these --

25 MR. WIREMAN: Right. They're

1 from the public health service.

2 MR. CULBERTSON: The public
3 health service?

4 MR. WIREMAN: Right.

5 MR. SMITH: That -- That person
6 was -- responded to real well in this Zone 1
7 site groundwater on Page 7. That question was
8 answered.

9 MR. CULBERTSON: Okay. Thank
10 you.

11 MR. RICE: Two quick things: You
12 mentioned a form, Dan, but the only form I have
13 has to do with AFIT training and --

14 MR. MEDINA: That's it. You can
15 indicate on there.

16 MR. RICE: -- at Wright-Patterson
17 Air Force Base. Is this the one you're
18 referring to?

19 MR. MEDINA: Yes. You can
20 indicate on -- on the bottom.

21 MR. RICE: Okay. And, finally,
22 regarding the letter that on a certain date --
23 the signatures for General Childress -- I think
24 everyone here has had a chance to see it -- but
25 if there is anyone who hasn't signed that letter

1 and would like to sign that letter, please see
2 me during the break.

3 MR. SOLIS: Thank you.

4 (Short break taken.)

5 MR. SOLIS: The next item on the
6 agenda --

7 MR. BAILEY: If we could have
8 your attention, please -- Could we have it
9 quiet, please?

10 Thank you.

11 MR. SOLIS: I'm asking Mr. Bailey
12 to address the next item.

13 MR. BAILEY: Roughly, four to
14 five RAB meetings ago, various members of the
15 RAB had asked, "How can we" -- "or what specific
16 information can we get that would allow us to be
17 better informed about Washington's policies
18 regarding funding" -- "what type of funding is
19 coming down for cleaning up bases? What types
20 of policy issues are being evaluated by the
21 people up in Washington regarding Restoration
22 Advisory Boards, cleanup programs and other
23 associated types of information?"

24 Based upon that request, what we've done is
25 reviewed various periodicals. This is a

1 periodical called The Defense Environment Alert.
 2 An annual publication for this is roughly \$500
 3 per year. There was a recommendation by some
 4 folks that this type of information be made
 5 available to RAB members. I would like to make
 6 a suggestion -- and if anybody would like to
 7 carry it further, they may be so willing to
 8 carry it forward -- is that we, the RAB,
 9 evaluate or consider ordering two subscriptions
 10 for this publication. One would be maintained
 11 at Kelly Air Force Base, whereby then it would
 12 be readily available for people to come in and
 13 take a look. It would be at the library. And
 14 the other one we would put in the community
 15 co-chair -- Mr. Juan Solis's name. He would
 16 get this particular copy -- and when the updates
 17 come through during the year -- so that should
 18 anybody need information, there would be two
 19 available sources through Mr. Solis or through
 20 Kelly Air Force Base.

21 I'd like to pass this around so people can
 22 take a look at it and -- and then, we would give
 23 some consideration for using this as an
 24 information source to keep RAB members informed
 25 as to what's happening.

1 MR. SOLIS: Thank you, Larry. We
2 have Mr. Medina. Will you do the budget
3 update?

4 MR. RICE: I have a quick
5 question regarding that. This will cost us a
6 1,000 bucks a year if we do this. How much
7 money do we have available to spend on these
8 sorts of things? Would this be our entire
9 budget or would it be just a very small part of
10 it? Can you give us --

11 MR. BAILEY: We are going to go
12 back and tell headquarters, based upon what's
13 wanted here, that this is at the request of the
14 RAB. So, as part of a general pot -- we don't
15 have a general pot that is totally set aside for
16 something that just says, "Community Outreach."
17 We have some money in there right now. This
18 could be used as part of that money, but we
19 would want to get additional monies as the
20 Community Outreach Program goes. So, I don't
21 have a specific percentage.

22 MR. RICE: So, this -- this would
23 be in addition to money that we already might
24 have available?

25 MR. BAILEY: Yes, sir. But this

1 would not stop us ordering it should the RAB so
2 choose to order it.

3 MR. CULBERTSON: Could we just
4 recommend that a committee -- we won't all be
5 able to read that -- that a committee be
6 assigned to read it -- Mr. Solis, Armando or --
7 or George, we'll say.

8 MR. QUINTANILLA: I strongly
9 recommend that Mr. Solis receive a copy and then
10 he inform the RAB of the items that are
11 pertinent, either by a little memo, a
12 newsletter, the RAB Voices, the newspaper,
13 something to that effect. But, definitely,
14 Mr. Solis should get a copy.

15 By the way, the subscription cost \$398 a
16 year. I think all we need is one. It should be
17 received by the office up there, passed on to
18 Mr. Solis and -- so the office, you know, should
19 also look at the thing and then pass it on to us
20 from whatever -- those items that are
21 pertinent.

22 There are a lot of items that are pertinent
23 to the State of Texas because the State Attorney
24 General is saying such and such things must be
25 done in the base cleanups and those types of

1 things.

2 MR. SOLIS: Thank you. We'll do
3 that.

4 Go ahead.

5 MR. MEDINA: Thank you very much,
6 sir.

7 My name is Daniel Medina and I will be
8 doing a general overview of our budget for
9 FY 96. The first slide that I'd like to present
10 is what -- what we're anticipating. This is
11 a -- What I wanted to do was just go back and
12 reiterate a couple of items that were presented
13 at the last RAB meeting and that was to address
14 some of the upcoming work that is being looked
15 at your FY 96 and FY 97.

16 Currently, as it stands, we have projected
17 to do an FY 96 -- is -- to begin the soil and
18 groundwater remedial actions for three zones,
19 which is Zones 1, 2, and 3 -- and this is,
20 again, based upon the completion of the remedial
21 designs.

22 In addition to that, we are also planning
23 on doing soil and groundwater feasibility
24 studies in Zones 4 and 5. These two feasibility
25 studies would be done upon regulatory approval

1 of the investigation -- remedial investigations
2 currently being conducted -- and for the benefit
3 of those who are just joining us this evening,
4 Zones 1, 2 and 3 are located here.

5 Zone 1 is located in what's presently the
6 golf course. Zone 2 covers the industrial area
7 south of Military Drive up to the southern base
8 boundary and Zone 3 covers the heart of the
9 industrial area and also includes the off-base
10 areas that have been impacted by sites S-4 and
11 S-8.

12 Zone 4 is currently east Kelly. That's the
13 area that also covers most of the DMRO storage
14 sites and then Zone 5 is the remaining portion
15 of base. This encompasses the flight line area
16 and the runway area as well as some of the
17 warehouses on the north side. Some of the
18 off-base areas include the residential areas on
19 the north side of the base.

20 Again, as I mentioned earlier, this is just
21 a general view of what our '96 budget is looking
22 like at this point in time. Currently, there is
23 a projected budget of approximately \$30
24 million. Most of this -- probably 80-plus
25 percent of this -- is geared towards the

1 cleanup. Now, this is just projected -- what
2 we're looking at projecting for this coming
3 year.

4 We've identified and looked at actually
5 getting somewhere in the neighborhood of around
6 \$20 million to do some of this cleanup. Most of
7 this is geared towards cleanup. There are some
8 other things that are associated with our
9 teamwork, including the Community Outreach that
10 we have here as well as Restoration Advisory
11 Boards and those sorts of the things that --
12 that we also take a look at.

13 To give a breakdown per zone of how we're
14 looking at spending, there is a percentage here
15 broken out for you for the five different
16 zones. I'd like to point out that at this point
17 in time the emphasis is on Zones 1, 2 and 3 with
18 the greatest emphasis on Zone 3. Part of this
19 is because of the impacts off base and also to
20 on base and to alleviate some of the concerns
21 that we've had with the sites that are located
22 in Zone 3.

23 As Zones 4 and 5 continue through their
24 process of going through remedial investigation
25 and into the feasibility studies, you'll see in

1 future years more and more dollars going towards
2 cleanup in those different zones. This is just
3 a snapshot of where we're at at this point in
4 time. A lot of this has also been because we
5 have received regulatory approval of Zones 1, 2
6 and 3. They're a little bit further ahead in
7 the process. So, at this point in time, we're
8 looking at doing the cleanups in Zones 1, 2 and
9 3. Zones 4 and 5 will follow up in the future
10 years, as well as any additional concerns that
11 come up with Zones 1, 2 and 3.

12 Currently, as it stands -- and I would like
13 to point this out because this is something that
14 we have to work with. This is one of the
15 constraints that we have to deal with on a
16 day-to-day basis -- is that we are operating
17 currently under the Continuing Resolution
18 Authority. This means that we don't have a --
19 we basically don't have a budget to work with
20 except funds that Congress allocates to us to
21 just basically operate -- pay salaries and pay
22 some of the -- some of the -- must-pays is what
23 we call them -- like operating and maintaining
24 systems and such. Again, this is based on
25 getting the authority from Congress to -- to

1 give us the money for this fiscal year. So, at
2 that point time, once we get a budget approved,
3 we can come back and do an update on what is
4 going to happen and how much we are going to
5 look at getting.

6 MR. SOLIS: Mr. Medina, you
7 mentioned that actual cleanup will 20 million
8 out of 30. What is the other ten million going
9 to be used on?

10 MR. MEDINA: Currently, the way
11 it stands is that we had projected -- we
12 submitted -- we proposed to -- to -- or had
13 orders -- and up through Air Force channels --
14 a budget. This is what we wanted to do. Our
15 commander -- and -- as well as our -- as well
16 as through the Air Force channels dictates,
17 "Okay. This is how much you are going to be
18 able to get," because Congress is constantly
19 reducing the amounts of money that we receive to
20 do IRP-type work. It's not just related to us.
21 It's DOD-wide. It's -- It's U.S.
22 Government-wide. So, there's a downsizing to
23 that. So, we have to take a hit to it.

24 So, what we're looking at getting is
25 actually getting somewhere in the neighborhood

1 of around \$20 million and 30 million was what we
2 had projected or had propped. Out of that,
3 they're -- they're indicating to us that we may
4 get less than, which is somewhere around 20
5 million.

6 Yes, sir?

7 MR. SOLIS: Are there funds
8 earmarked for community education and outreach
9 or what -- how is that in your budget?

10 MR. MEDINA: That's also included
11 in our budget -- and it also goes towards --
12 towards our cleanup as well. One of the
13 important things that -- that is being look at
14 as we're going through this process of
15 identifying sites and cleaning them up, is to
16 identify those areas where you can achieve
17 cleanup with the quickest and part of that is
18 going through not just the process of, "This is
19 what we have to cleanup to and this is what we
20 have to restore the soil and groundwater," part
21 of that is going out into the community. So,
22 there this is some money that's earmarked to go
23 to -- deal with community issues -- community
24 relations. That's more so -- something that --
25 that we deal with -- say, for example, have

1 Restoration Advisory Boards. It's for us to
2 operate under. It's just basically our
3 operating budget to put these together.

4 Yes?

5 MR. RICE: At the last meeting, I
6 asked for that budget -- that -- the RAB
7 budget -- itemized -- and I understand you're
8 working on that and you're going to get that to
9 us sometime in the near future; is that
10 correct?

11 MR. MEDINA: Yes. That is still
12 being worked on, yes.

13 MR. RICE: Do you have a rough
14 idea of when that should be able available?

15 MR. MEDINA: That should be --
16 shortly -- within the next couple of weeks. I'm
17 going to -- I'll get an update from Mr. Walters
18 and Mr. Estrada on that.

19 Yes, sir?

20 MR. QUINTANILLA: Just a
21 comment. For instance, out of that 30
22 million -- if you were to get that 30 million,
23 at least 60 percent of that 30 million must go
24 into the cleanup. The rest can go into other
25 cleanup -- studies of a different nature -- that

1 sort of thing. But my question was also similar
2 to George. We need a budget as to -- you know,
3 what is the budget for the RAB here? How much
4 is there going to be for training, how much for
5 meetings -- I understand that we haven't
6 publicized a single meeting date for the last
7 two or three meetings because of lack of a
8 budget. We need to know that. How much is
9 required for each one of those items?

10 We also need -- on this RAB budget --
11 the -- how much -- you know, the actual
12 breakdown that's going to go into Zone 3. You
13 say it's 54 percent. When we will know the
14 exact figure?

15 MR. MEDINA: Okay. There's two
16 things that we can do to work that issue. First
17 of all, I would, again, point out the
18 feasibility studies. Those identify by sites --
19 or more so by operable units -- which of those
20 are getting money. It's not to the exact dollar
21 because, of course, there is -- there is some
22 estimation that goes into the budgets that you
23 find in the feasibility studies. That is a very
24 good indicator to show how much we are spending
25 for each of those sites and it relates back to

1 the actions that we're doing.

2 MR. QUINTANILLA: One final
3 question: The newsletter that Mr. Bailey talked
4 about on August 23, 1995, stated that the RAB
5 would have input into the fiscal year '96 budget
6 and that the Air Force was going to send down
7 questions concerning, you know, what kind of
8 input -- this sort of thing. Have you-all
9 received anything from the Air Force on this
10 subject?

11 MR. MEDINA: Not that I'm aware
12 of at this time. We have received -- There's
13 draft guidance being worked up right now on
14 that.

15 MR. QUINTANILLA: You-all have
16 received that -- that draft guidance.

17 MR. MEDINA: That's being
18 distributed right now. I don't have a copy with
19 me, but I do know that some have been
20 distributed -- some guidance on that -- and if
21 it's being distributed as just a draft right
22 now, it's probably being asked for comments
23 throughout the Air Force.

24 MR. QUINTANILLA: Thank you very
25 much.

1 Mr. Chairman, you may consider establishing
2 a budget subcommittee at a later date.

3 MR. SOLIS: I'll do that, yeah.
4 Thank you.

5 MR. MEDINA: No further
6 questions? Thank you very much.

7 MR. QUINTANILLA: Thank you.

8 MR. SOLIS: Thank you, Dan.

9 Subcommittee reports -- George, you had
10 one.

11 MR. RICE: Yeah. Very briefly,
12 you know, I've been critical about the Air
13 Force, about their plans to clean up the
14 Quintana Road neighborhood. My complaint is
15 that it probably takes longer than necessary and
16 that it's not being cleaned up as well as it
17 could be. So, what I'm doing is I'm
18 constructing a hydrologic model and I'm
19 attempting to design an alternate cleanup. I
20 don't know whether or not I'll be successful
21 doing that, but what I hope to do is when that
22 is done take five, ten minutes to present it to
23 the RAB so that you can see, "Well, here's the
24 Air Force's plan and here's another possible
25 plan for taking care of this problem."

1 MR. SOLIS: Thank you. That is a
2 product of your committee -- not a product of
3 George Rice?

4 MR. RICE: This is -- As it
5 stands now, it's a product of George Rice. But
6 anybody who is interested in working with me is
7 certainly welcome to come on board.

8 MR. SOLIS: We're looking at you
9 directing a committee -- leading a
10 committee -- to entertain -- what it is that
11 should be addressed?

12 MR. RICE: Right now, what you
13 said first is correct, Juan. This is a product
14 of me -- not of a committee -- but certainly
15 whoever is interested in working with me on
16 this -- whether a member of the RAB, a
17 contractor or whoever -- is welcome to do so.

18 MR. SOLIS: Any question?

19 MR. BEYER: Perhaps, this should
20 be an issue at a groundwater subcommittee
21 meeting. Do we have groundwater --

22 MR. RICE: Sure.

23 MR. BEYER: We could call a
24 meeting of the groundwater subcommittee to
25 discuss the --

1 MR. RICE: Yeah. When -- Do you
2 want to do that right now then -- call a meeting
3 of the groundwater subcommittee for -- well, two
4 weeks from today is the 25th. That's probably a
5 bad day.

6 MR. SOLIS: Not on Christmas
7 day -- you don't want to do it.

8 MR. RICE: Do we want to do
9 that?

10 MR. SOLIS: Who had the --

11 MR. RICE: Let's do it.

12 MR. MEDINA: I'm just going to
13 suggest -- make a suggestion maybe in the
14 January time frame so we can get everybody
15 together. What we can do is talk to those
16 individuals that belong to the subcommittee and
17 get an idea of what their schedules are like in
18 January -- just like we're doing with the --
19 with the Armstrong Laboratory -- maybe that's
20 another possibility. Once we get that feedback,
21 go back and look at those dates and maybe tie
22 those two together.

23 MR. RICE: That would be fine.
24 I'm going to continue to work on this -- and let
25 me just extend this invitation again -- anyone

1 in the room that's interested in looking at this
2 and working with me, feel welcome to contact me
3 and we'll get together on it.

4 MR. SOLIS: Thank you, sir.

5 MR. QUINTANILLA: I would like to
6 make a comment on the RAB newsletter, if at
7 all -- Major Ayala is not here -- no --
8 Mr. Sanchez is not here. He is the one that's
9 in charge of the newsletter.

10 I went to Mr. Estrada's office and got 50
11 copies of the RAB Voices. I distributed them in
12 three different place, the Mendez Cafe -- there
13 in the barrio -- at Olmos Cafe and at the bank.
14 I also distributed some copies up and down the
15 streets of Price Avenue in the 500, 600 and 700
16 block -- and I got some comments back from my
17 neighbors -- my compadres -- on the RAB
18 newsletter.

19 Basically, they think that the RAB Voices
20 was written for -- for the members of the RAB
21 Board, not for the community. So, it's
22 something to think about. When -- If any of us
23 write for -- in the RAB newsletter to make sure
24 that we consider the 4,500 people that are out
25 there in the community that this RAB newsletter

1 is mailed to.

2 Another comment was that they had already
3 received a copy of the general's letter both in
4 English and Spanish and they thought putting it
5 in the RAB Voices here was overkill on that.

6 They asked also that we not think so much
7 as to who the RAB is, or who TNRCC is or what is
8 the RAB, but what are they doing? What are we
9 doing -- you know, when are we going to
10 accomplish this and that -- to give them, you
11 know, continuous reports -- what has been done,
12 what is going to be done. That is what the
13 people that I talked to asked that we put in
14 future copies of the newsletter.

15 Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

16 MR. RICE: I have a question
17 related to that issue.

18 MR. SOLIS: What's that?

19 MR. RICE: I would like to submit
20 an article for RAB Voices -- and what's the
21 mechanism for doing that?

22 MR. SOLIS: Submit it to the
23 chair and then if I have a question, I'll call
24 you and go from there.

25 MR. RICE: How often does this

1 this come out? Do we have a schedule here or is
2 it just every once in a while?

3 MR. BAILEY: Mr. Sam Sanchez had
4 not come up with a definite time.

5 MR. RICE: Okay.

6 MR. BAILEY: We had asked that,
7 but there was no feedback that came the last
8 time the question was raised.

9 MR. LOFTIN: I'm here for
10 Mr. Sanchez. I asked him that same question and
11 he said there hadn't been anything done on -- on
12 the -- the regular time frame, yet.

13 MR. SOLIS: I recommend we put
14 that as an item of new business for the next
15 meeting and address it. I think we should set a
16 time for publication.

17 MR. QUINTANILLA: Mr. Chairman,
18 if I may, one more thing. The people in the
19 Quintana Road wanted to know specifically when
20 would the Quintana Road project start, when
21 would it end, would all the people be
22 affected -- so it might be wise to get Mr. Vega
23 or someone to give us a briefing, put it in the
24 newsletter and send it on out to the people.

25 MR. BAILEY: At the next time we

1 meet, we have already tentatively requested the
2 City to come and do just that and then put it in
3 there because they have got to have some idea.
4 When we go out -- you know, we're all going out
5 there -- or whoever goes out there is -- all
6 finding these same questions coming back from
7 the people who live -- especially on the streets
8 where the proposed storm water culvert is going
9 to go -- and that's, "When are you going to take
10 care of my problem storm water and when is this
11 thing going to get started?" -- and they need to
12 hear from the City what that schedule is -- and
13 other questions they might have -- so that is
14 going to be the -- the next RAB meeting.

15 MR. MEDINA: At this moment, what
16 we'd like to do is -- under the new
17 business -- is -- Mr. Mike Overbay from the
18 Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6,
19 Dallas, Texas -- he's going to introduce
20 himself, as well as talk a little bit about
21 EPA's role in the BRAC -- or the base
22 realignment and closure process here at Kelly
23 Air Force Base.

24 Mr. Overbay?

25 MR. OVERBAY: Thank you, Dan.

1 I'm Mike Overbay. Surprise. I work for the
2 Environmental Protection Agency in Dallas and I
3 am a senior project manager for the base closure
4 team. The base closure team works specifically
5 with military bases that are being closed down
6 under the Base Realignment and Closure Act.

7 EPA, as Gary Beyer mentioned, has
8 authorized the State of Texas -- TNRCC -- to
9 administer the RCRA hazardous waste and HSWA --
10 which is hazardous and solid waste amendments to
11 RCRA programs. The State is authorized to run
12 the hazardous waste program in Texas, but
13 there's another law -- CERCLA -- which is
14 better known as Superfund -- which has a clause
15 in it -- 120, h, 3, which says that before the
16 government can transfer any property from itself
17 to a private industry or individual that the
18 owner -- the agency that owns that property has
19 to make a demonstration to the Environmental
20 Protection Agency that there's no hazardous
21 waste problems with that piece of property. And
22 what it actually says is that the deed to that
23 piece of property, when it's transferred, has to
24 have a covenant warranting that all remedial
25 action necessary to protect human health and the

1 environment with respect to any such substance
2 remaining on the property has been taken before
3 the date of such transfer. It also says that if
4 it's transferred and later a problem is found
5 with that piece of property, the government has
6 to come back and take care of that problem
7 later.

8 Now, the act goes a little further and it
9 says that in order to qualify for that -- that
10 covenant that not only does the -- remedial
11 action have to be taken -- it specifically says
12 it has to be constructed and in place and
13 operating successfully and fully.

14 What that means is that no property can be
15 transferred from Kelly to the community or an
16 industry before EPA concurs that all the
17 remedial action has been taken and that it is
18 safe to do so. An interesting point, though, is
19 that it does not prevent issuing a long-term
20 lease. I specifically worked with Bergstrom Air
21 Force Base in Austin and they have a 30-year
22 lease with the City to take that property even
23 though they haven't transferred it by deed. So,
24 you can lease it to somebody but the Department
25 of Defense cannot transfer it by deed to the

1 community until it's all cleaned up.

2 EPA can and will hold closing military
3 bases to the same standards for cleanup as any
4 other operating facility, be it industrial or
5 DOD or a spill site or whatever. They all have
6 to be cleaned up to the same level of
7 protectiveness and in no case should an
8 expedited schedule, because of a base closure,
9 be used to justify a less stringent cleanup.

10 Now, recognizing the workload that would be
11 associated with the rapid processes at base
12 closure facilities, DOD and EPA entered into an
13 agreement last year that provided funding from
14 DOD to EPA to hire people to work directly on
15 these closing military bases. Last year EPA
16 received 100 positions from the Department of
17 Defense on a national basis to work on closing
18 bases. This year, because new bases like Kelly
19 and Reese and some others have been added, there
20 will be 146 positions nationally at EPA. What
21 that means is that EPA in Dallas is going to get
22 five new positions to work on these closing
23 bases. Kelly is going to have one and a half
24 people working on it full-time at EPA -- and we
25 are in the process of hiring those people right

1 now. So, I am not one that is going to work at
2 Kelly -- and I don't know anything about what's
3 going on at Kelly, but I can answer questions
4 about processes when I'm done.

5 Now that Kelly is on the closure process,
6 once EPA hires their representatives to work at
7 Kelly, there will be a BCT form -- BCT is a base
8 cleanup team -- and the people on that team are
9 EPA's representative, the State's representative
10 and a representative from the base. I was
11 talking to Ray Hatch this morning and he tells
12 me that -- he is the southwest division program
13 manager for the Air Force Base conversion
14 agency -- and he told me this morning that he is
15 in the process of transferring down one of his
16 employees to be the installation management
17 officer for the Air Force Base Conversion Agency
18 and he has his going away party Wednesday and
19 should be here in time for your next RAB Board
20 meeting. I think his name is Pat McCullough.
21 So, hopefully, in January you can have somebody
22 from EPA and AFBCA to come as their permanent
23 representative.

24 Now, the BCT works closely with the
25 Restoration Advisory Board to disseminate

1 information to the public and to receive input
2 as to the public's concerns. This statement is
3 going to make some people mad here. The RAB is
4 not a decision-making body. It is a forum for
5 exchanging information and each member of the
6 RAB gives their input as an individual.

7 Majority opinions are not required. What that
8 means -- I gave that paragraph two weeks ago at
9 Reese and some people got mad. What it means is
10 that the regulators -- TNRCC and EPA -- have a
11 legal obligation to make determinations of what
12 is required for a cleanup to meet the letter of
13 the law. You-all probably received a letter
14 from Major General Lewis a couple of weeks
15 ago -- about a month ago -- saying that the Air
16 Force does not determine when the cleanup is
17 done here. The regulators -- EPA and TNRCC --
18 have the final say of when the cleanup is done.

19 The RAB provides input to the regulators
20 about the concerns of the RAB and the community,
21 and the regulators and the base will take all of
22 that information into consideration in any
23 decision-making process, but the RAB does not
24 decide what the project requirements are. The
25 law determines what is necessary to be done --

1 and when I say that majority opinions are not
2 required, that doesn't mean you can't vote on
3 anything -- it doesn't mean that a strong
4 majority opinion is discouraged or anything like
5 that. All it means is that if there's one guy
6 sitting over here in the corner who disagrees
7 with what the majority of the people have to
8 say, that we're going to consider his opinion,
9 too, and that if he has the right opinion, that
10 that is what we'll listen to.

11 So, if you have any questions now on how
12 the process works, I'll be glad to discuss them
13 with you.

14 MR. QUINTANILLA: You mentioned
15 strictly Kelly Air Force Base. You did not
16 mention the areas off the base that have been
17 contaminated --

18 MR. OVERBAY: Those will be
19 addressed, too.

20 MR. QUINTANILLA: How will they
21 be addressed? I'm talking in terms of the
22 covenants that you talked about. I cannot sell
23 my property --

24 MR. OVERBAY: On the covenant --
25 the deed covenant strictly applies to Kelly Air

1 Force Base property. It does not apply to the
2 off-site -- however, the cleanup will definitely
3 address off-site contamination. There is no
4 legal way around that. The cleanup will address
5 off-site contamination.

6 MR. QUINTANILLA: But the people
7 that live in the neighborhood are affected by
8 this. Their property values are going down.
9 They cannot sell their property because of the
10 contamination. If they do sell it, they have to
11 put a covenant in there that -- you know, that
12 the thing -- how is that being handled through
13 EPA or what is the EPA's position on that.

14 MR. OVERBAY: EPA cannot help you
15 with property values. If -- If there are
16 property value impacts, you'll have to seek
17 compensation through some other source. What
18 EPA can do and will do is work with the State
19 and the base to make sure that those
20 environmental problems are cleaned up and so
21 that it should protect the community in those
22 off-site areas -- and one of the priority things
23 that we do is try and make sure that any
24 off-site base -- or off-site impacts are
25 mitigated so that nobody's being currently

1 affected.

2 Now, I understand you have some groundwater
3 contamination problems that are off-site. But
4 as long as nobody's drinking that groundwater --
5 it still will have to be cleaned up -- but it's
6 not given the same urgency that it would be if
7 somebody was drinking that water.

8 MR. QUINTANILLA: Perhaps you
9 don't understand the extent of the problem.
10 It's going to take 30 years to clean up that
11 groundwater. We cannot sell our property for 30
12 years. That's the problem.

13 MR. OVERBAY: I understand that's
14 a problem. I also know that 30 years is not an
15 unusual time frame for groundwater cleanup. I
16 don't -- I'm not a lawyer so I can't tell you
17 what your options are for seeking compensation,
18 but the environmental mitigation will be done in
19 time.

20 Now, 30 years is part of a remedy selection
21 process and the State and EPA will have an
22 obligation to look at that time frame and that
23 technology and determine whether that's an
24 appropriate time frame. And if it's done after
25 the permit is issued -- if the remedy is

1 selected after the permit for this base is
2 issued, then there will have to be a permit
3 modification required and a public notice period
4 and the community will get an opportunity to
5 comment on it again at that time. But I
6 can't -- I can't really tell you what your
7 options are.

8 MR. QUINTANILLA: But you will
9 work with the State -- EPA will work with the
10 State?

11 MR. OVERBAY: EPA will definitely
12 work with the State on the off-site --

13 MR. QUINTANILLA: -- on the
14 off-site -- on the off-site --

15 MR. OVERBAY: -- off site and on
16 site.

17 MR. QUINTANILLA: Thank you very
18 much.

19 MR. OVERBAY: Yes, sir.

20 MR. RICE: I have two questions.
21 You said that the EPA has to approve cleanup
22 plans where a piece of property has been
23 transferred. How about property that's not
24 being transferred, do you still have control
25 over that and must you approve --

1 MR. OVERBAY: The CERCLA
2 requirement applies to property that's going to
3 be transferred. The EPA still retains its
4 authority under other programs -- such as --
5 even though the State is authorized for RCRA --
6 if there was a problem that we felt the state
7 was not cleaning up and we felt it was a very
8 serious problem we would have authority to do an
9 overfile and -- Section 3008-H of the RCRA --
10 which is not delegated to the State -- to come
11 in and make a facility clean up that problem.
12 So, we do have to concur on any property that's
13 been transferred. But if there's problems at
14 Kelly that we become aware of because of our
15 involvement here and we can't work it out
16 through the State -- which is a very unlikely
17 scenario -- EPA and the State get along very
18 well at most of these facilities -- we could
19 take an overfiling of enforcement action.

20 MR. RICE: Is there any way that
21 the companies that move to Kelly -- you know,
22 after -- might be held liable for any of the
23 contamination that exists now that the Air Force
24 has caused?

25 MR. OVERBAY: Yeah. There are

1 scenarios like that. Because if you have an
2 industrial area that has used
3 trichlorethylene -- TCE -- under its Air Force
4 operation, and we know there is Air Force
5 contamination there, and that property is leased
6 and a private company comes on and does a
7 similar operation and spills some of the same
8 chemical, then, yes, they could be held
9 potentially liable because you can't tell whose
10 TCE is in the groundwater.

11 MR. RICE: So, if you have
12 similar operations, there may be a problem.

13 MR. OVERBAY: Right -- and the
14 way that Bergstrom Air Force has gotten --
15 Bergstrom Air Force Base has gotten around that
16 is that Bergstrom is being converted in Austin
17 to the new municipal airport and the City of
18 Austin has tried, in all cases possible, to
19 operate a different type of industrial activity
20 in those areas so that they aren't managing the
21 same kinds of waste and chemicals as the
22 Air Force managed. So that if there is some
23 contamination detected in the future, it will be
24 readily evident whether that contamination is
25 from past Air Force activities or new activities

1 by the people who are leasing the base.

2 MR. CULBERTSON: I hope you
3 settle your problems at Bergstrom and come on
4 over here.

5 MR. OVERBAY: Thank you.

6 MR. SOLIS: Thank you,
7 Mr. Overbay. Appreciate it.

8 MR. OVERBAY: Thank you.

9 MR. SOLIS: We -- The next
10 meeting --

11 MR. RICE: Excuse me. I
12 thought -- I have a couple of other things under
13 new business I'd like to mention. Are we done
14 with new business?

15 MR. SOLIS: Yes. But I wanted --
16 New business, can we address that at the next
17 meeting? If not, why not?

18 MR. RICE: Okay. Well, it can be
19 handled in the next agenda item. Yeah, no
20 problem.

21 MR. SOLIS: On the -- the next
22 meeting -- six weeks from now.

23 MR. BAILEY: Five February.

24 MR. SOLIS: Five February. Let's
25 look at that. Five February is a Monday. So,

1 we can meet on Monday, the 5th of February, same
2 place, same time.

3 MR. QUINTANILLA: Before
4 adjourning, Mr. Chairman -- you know, we
5 received copies of the response summary. What
6 are we to do with these, Mr. Bailey? We had no
7 input into this response summary, but I would
8 like to know where is it going, when is it
9 going, what is it supposed to do.

10 MR. BAILEY: That is our response
11 to the comments that were raised at the public
12 meeting. It is what we consider to be the
13 Air Force's official response to the questions
14 that were raised. It is submitted to the
15 Texas Natural Resource Conservation Commission
16 as part of their evaluation to take a look at
17 issues affecting Kelly Air Force Base and the
18 off-base residents.

19 MR. QUINTANILLA: And what do
20 they do with it?

21 MR. BEYER: I think they got it
22 Friday.

23 MR. QUINTANILLA: I didn't hear
24 that.

25 MR. BEYER: Friday -- Last

1 Friday.

2 MR. QUINTANILLA: And what are
3 you going to do after you do get it? What
4 happens after you get this?

5 MR. BEYER: We look at the
6 comments and take these comments into
7 consideration -- We look at these comments and
8 use these comments in -- to evaluate decisions
9 in regards to different remedial alternatives.

10 MR. QUINTANILLA: Just one
11 question: How will you assure that --
12 yourself -- that all the comments that were
13 made were addressed in this response summary?

14 MR. BEYER: What we'll do is
15 compare -- to our -- our personal notes that
16 we took at the meeting and any other responses
17 that we -- that were received.

18 MR. QUINTANILLA: I just reviewed
19 this, you know, very fast and I did not find an
20 answer to a comment that I made that 30 years
21 was too long. It is not addressed in there, so
22 I just thought I'd relay it to you now.

23 MR. RICE: Okay.

24 MR. SOLIS: Mr. Rice?

25 MR. RICE: Something that was

1 going to be brought up at the last meeting
2 wasn't and I thought it would be brought up at
3 this meeting and it hasn't been -- is one of the
4 contracting folks was going to talk about how
5 close members of the RAB can get to contractors
6 and how soon in the process can we get involved
7 with remediation plans. So, I'd like to make a
8 request that that item be put on the agenda for
9 the next meeting.

10 MR. SOLIS: It will be done.

11 Thank you, George. With that, no more
12 comments -- we'll stand adjourned.

13 Thank you very much. See you the 5th of
14 February. Happy holidays and stay safe.

15
16 * * * * *

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

STATE OF TEXAS *

COUNTY OF BEXAR *

I, JULIE A. SEAL, a Certified Shorthand Reporter in and for the State of Texas, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing contain a true and correct transcription of all proceedings, all of which occurred and were reported by me.

WITNESS MY HAND, this the 21st day of December, A.D. 1995.

Cert. No. 5160

Expires: Dec. '95

(210) 377-3027

Julie A Seal
JULIE A. SEAL
Certified Shorthand Reporter
and Notary Public in and for
the State of Texas

FINAL PAGE

ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD

FINAL PAGE