KELLY RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD

July 15th, 2008, 6:30 p.m.
Port Authority of San Antonio
143 Billy Mitchell Blvd., Bldg. 43, Suite 6
San Antonio, Texas 78226

RAB Community Members:
Beverly Abbott, Community Co-Chair
Rodrigo Garcia, Jr.
Brian Skrobarcek
Daniel Gonzales

RAB Government Members:
Paul Carroll, Air Force Real Property Agency (AFRPA), Government Co-Chair
Gary Miller, US Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA)
Mark Weegar, Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ)
Greg Lyssy, EPA

AFRPA Staff:
Adam Antwine
Steve TerMaath
Larisa Dawkins
Luis Medina
Nick Alino (Contractor)
Eduardo Martinez (Contractor)
Elizabeth Coira (Contractor)
Jose Martinez (Facilitator)

AFRPA Partner Agencies
Kristen Bettis, SAMHD-PCEH
Jorge Salazar, Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ)

Elected Officials:
Stephanie Smith, Office of U.S. Rep. Charles A. Gonzalez

Public Participants:
Bob Goodson, CH2M Hill (Contractor)

(PROCEEDINGS BEGAN AT 6:41)

MR. MARTINEZ: My name is Jose Martinez and I am the facilitator for the RAB meeting. First of all, I'd like to welcome one and all to the July 15th RAB meeting. I would like to first of all start by asking the members of the RAB, starting with Mr. Garcia, to introduce yourselves and indicate who you represent. Mr. Garcia.

MR. GARCIA: My name is Rodrigo Garcia, Jr. I'm a community member and I live in the affected area.

MR. SKROBARCEK: My name is Brian Skrobarcek. I'm a community member and I work in the affected area.

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

MS. ABBOTT: My name is Beverly Abbott. I live and work in the affected area.

MS. BETTIS: I'm Kristen Bettis. I'm a senior management analyst for the Metro Health Department replacing Kyle Cunningham tonight.

MR. GONZALES: Daniel Gonzales. I am a community member. I work in the affected and have family that lives in the affected area.

MR. MARTINEZ: Thank you. As an explanation, we were waiting for at least one other member. We know he is in town. In fact, I saw him as I got here earlier, but -- and he is going to be making a presentation, Mr. Gary Miller from

EPA. So we will just allow him to show up fashionably late, but he definitely will be present and be making a presentation later in the evening.

I'd like to very quickly go over the agenda, which all of you should have gotten the opportunity to pick up a copy of the full packet at the -- at the desk. If you don't have it, raise your hand and we'll provide you with a full packet.

On the second page of that packet is the copy of the agenda. This is what I would very quickly like to go over with you. Immediately after my general remarks, I would like to hand the baton over to Mr. Adam Antwine who will be making few remarks about Mr. Armando Quintanilla, a former member of the Kelly Restoration Advisory Board.

You notice that the next three items are approximately -- well, twenty minutes each. There will be presentations by Mr. Paul Carroll, the BRAC environmental coordinator, on three topics. The first one is the Building 360 update; following that, Building 301 update; and then last, the Semiannual Compliance Plan.

We believe that the presentations will be approximately fifteen minutes. After that, there will be a five minute question and answer session between the RAB members and Mr. Carroll. After that, Mr. Gary Miller will then take over and give a follow-up presentation on the EPA

soil vapor intrusion study, a study that he made the initial presentation at the last RAB meeting.

As is usually the case, at 8 o'clock there is a fifteen minute opportunity for questions and answers from the members of the general public of staff or RAB members. That will be at 8 o'clock. If members of the general audience have questions on any of the four presentations by staff and Mr. Miller, we respectfully ask you to write your notes and then at 8 o'clock, we will then be able to give you the opportunity to ask those questions and get your answers.

And after that, Mr. Carroll will be asking members of the RAB if you have any topics for discussion at the subsequent meeting, which will be on October the 14th, 2007 (sic) at 6:30 at this same facility.

I would like to take this opportunity to recognize Ms. Stephanie Smith, Special Projects Manager representing Charles A. Gonzalez's office here in San Antonio.

Let's see. I would like now to ask Mr. Adam Antwine, chief administrator -- information officer, Air Force Real Property Agency, to share a few remarks about Mr. Armando Quintanilla.

MR. ANTWINE: Thank you, Jose.

Good evening, everyone. For those of you that don't know me or remember me, I think I know most of you and it's good to see all of you again. I, as Jose mentioned, was a

former environmental coordinator here for a bit and ultimately became the senior administrator here for AFRPA's office and had the honor of -- of being the RAB cochair for several years starting back in 2001. Most recently was reassigned to my new job, still here at AFRPA as the chief information officer. And my team asked me to just come in and say a few -- a few words about Armando.

I'm sure most of you remember him. Probably served here with him. Mr. Quintanilla died suddenly on June 18th. His funeral I believe was the 23rd of -- of June. And he served here in the capacity as a RAB member for twelve years. Wasn't full-time, but off and on was a member and as well we want to remember him for his service to the Armed Forces.

You can see on the chart there's a few facts there about him. Forty-seven years of dedicated service between his military service and his service as a civilian here at Kelly Air Force Base. So we just wanted to take the opportunity to say a few words about Armando and remember him.

He died suddenly last month. No one was really aware of any kind of illness that led up to it, but it's unfortunate. You know, those things are going to happen to all of us. Sometimes we have no warning though.

So I just want to say that even though Armando had his differences with the Air Force, I think he maintained respect for this forum. He expressed his views openly, but

respectfully. So a man with that kind of dedication, that kind of commitment to a cause, you surely have to -- to remember him in a way that's positive.

So I just want to, on behalf of AFRPA and the Air Force, let you guys know how much he's going to be missed. We had our differences, but as soon as the meetings were over, we could talk about his next fishing trip. Even though he -- he threatened to use me for bait a few times, he always did it in a way that you knew that he was here to speak his piece, to let us know that he was here, he was watching what we were doing and we really do appreciate folks that have the kind of dedication and commitment to a cause that Armando had.

So I just wanted to thank you guys for your service here. We know this is not something that you, you know, do for pay, but you do it for a reason and we surely do appreciate your commitment to what's going on here at Kelly Air Force Base.

So I think we wanted to have just a moment of silence in remembrance of Armando. So if you don't mind, we'll just have a moment of silence and then we can go on with the meeting.

(Moment of silence observed in remembrance Of Mr. Armando Quintanilla.)

MR. ANTWINE: Thank you. Armando is buried right here in San Fernando Cemetery, just right across the street.

So somebody reminded me, Adam, he's still watching.

Thank you, folks.

MR. MARTINEZ: Before I ask Paul to begin his presentation on the first of his three presentations, I'd like to apologize to the members of the audience because the packets that you have are not in color as are the packets that we have around the table. And it is no -- in no way disrespect. The machine literally ran out of the toner. We apologize for that.

The staff has asked me to give you this following number if you all would like to receive a colored copy. They -- you can call and they will get your name, number, address, etcetera. The Public Information Office here at the Air Force Real Property Agency, the number is 925-0956. Repeat, 925-0956, and the color copy will be mailed to you.

Yes, sir.

MR. SKROBARCEK: For the seats that are vacant, can we supply those to the audience?

MR. MARTINEZ: Do we know who will not be present?

MR. EDDIE MARTINEZ: If at the end of meeting they're still not here, yeah, those folks that want a color copy can take the extra copies there.

MR. MARTINEZ: And I'd like -- if you did not pick up a copy of this little -- three documents I believe, at the table, this one on the Air Force Real Property Agency,

Understanding the Semiannual Compliance Plan, it's a very good summation of what that document -- this will be on the third presentation by Mr. Carroll. Highly recommend that you pick up a copy of this document. Paul.

MR. CARROLL: Hello, everyone. I'm Paul Carroll, BRAC Environmental Coordinator. First up, we'll be talking about Building 360. As you know, we briefed that in the last RAB. We'll give you an update of what's transpired, what we've done and where we plan to go with that. Of course the -- the building itself is a very large building, U-shaped building.

Site history is in engine cleaning and what we found there in our investigations was PCE and surface soil -- subsurface soil as high as 90,000 micrograms per kilogram. The estimated treatment volume of the contaminated soils under that building is about 11,500 cubic yards and the contaminant mass is about a thousand pounds.

So of course that said, the soil is contaminated with PCE. What we've done, it extends six to eight feet under the slab and we've installed a soil vapor extraction system under that building. We kind of briefed that in the last RAB, too.

It's got a hundred horse power, a thousand standard cubic feet per minute blower on it. That applies a vacuum under that building and will remove those vapors.

Okay. Overall, on the remediation at Building 360, we've constructed a permeable reactive barrier wall and slurry wall to redirect and treat contaminated groundwater that goes into that building and that happened in 2003, 2004. That system will remove soil contamination and it represents the source of -- the SVE system, I'm sorry, will remove the soil contamination that represent the source of that contaminated groundwater. That will shorten the time frame that we need for remediation and cut down on the maintenance that's required in that reactive wall.

So those three horizontal SVE wells, soil vapor extraction wells, are approximately 700 feet in length each. They've been installed under that building to target that soil contamination.

The next slide shows the location of those transects, where those horizontal wells are, where they go underneath that corner of that building all the way across the building.

One thing we did as part of the start-up of that system is to try to understand what the soil vapor intrusion into that building was. We did modeling, which is an accepted EPA model to -- which indicated that there -- that we had -- probably would have soil vapor intrusion into that building. That's why we installed the SVE system.

Prior to the start-up of that system, we took a

sample, just kind of a recap of what we covered the last RAB, to verify it, and we did see those chemicals in that sample, PCE, TCE, trichloroethylene, DCE and vinyl chloride. We took two additional samples in February to -- at two different locations. Next slide.

Let's see. The original sample was -- let's see, which one was it. One of these samples. And then the other two samples were taken later. And these samples on this corner were what we expected (indicating). That's where the contamination was. The sample ending in 104 was 17.6 parts per million by volume PCE, which was something we didn't expect to see at that time.

So what we -- what we plan to do -- go ahead to the next slide.

MR. SKROBARCEK: Before we move off of that slide --

MR. CARROLL: Yes.

MR. SKROBARCEK: Could you go back to that? That's actually -- the location of those is incorrect.

MR. CARROLL: Okay.

MR. SKROBARCEK: Can I point out where they should be?

MR. CARROLL: Yeah, it's not exactly to scale. They are a little off.

MR. SKROBARCEK: This was the first sample that was taken. This was the second, and this sample actually is right

here (indicating.)

MR. CARROLL: Okay. So little bit closer.

MR. SKROBARCEK: So we need to change -- change that diagram.

MR. CARROLL: Okay.

MR. WEEGAR: Paul, do you by any chance happen to have those values converted to micrograms per cubic meters --

MR. CARROLL: We do but --

MR. WEEGAR: -- because that's typically the action level that EPA utilizes.

MR. CARROLL: Yeah. We have them, but I don't have them with me tonight. They are over the action levels that EPA recommends for long-term protection of human health. Yes. So that indicates that, yeah, we do need to do some action there. We need to figure out where the source of those vapors is coming from.

MR. GARCIA: This system that we're talking about, how many years is it going to take?

MR. CARROLL: This system -- I think we briefed this in the last RAB. I think it was planned to be -- the SVE system is planned to be in place for about two years I believe.

MR. SKROBARCEK: Yeah, I think that's what we said.

MR. CARROLL: That's typical of the time frame it takes for that.

MR. GARCIA: Two years and then you retest to make sure there's nothing under there?

MR. CARROLL: We'll test as we go and then once we try to -- once we reach the goals that we're looking for, we'll test again. We'll test the soils to be sure that we've reached the contaminant goals, the cleanup goals.

The investigation we're doing is going to be done in phases. Phase 1 is to research the historical operations and chemical uses, current chemical usage and all that in Building 360. We've got the contractor on board and they've been reviewing the data and developing a work plan. We've got them on board on June 16th. We've had a little bit of a delay getting historical records and process records from -- from these -- from these operations. So we're still working on that.

As we briefed the last time, they're under the OSHA levels for worker -- worker safety. So there's no immediate safety problem, but there is a long-term risk indicated.

MR. SKROBARCEK: So the records that you're referring to are Air Force records or current activity records?

MR. CARROLL: Both.

MR. SKROBARCEK: Okay.

MR. CARROLL: Yeah. We -- we've kind of gone back and forth with the Port to try to get the current -- the

current process records. Haven't been able to get those yet.

MR. SKROBARCEK: Okay.

MR. CARROLL: I think we should have those pretty soon.

The soil vapor extraction system that's been installed, as I said, removes the contamination in the soil. It will control the vapor intrusoin into the building from underneath. It will be about two years until the soil meets regulatory standards. Hasn't been in operation since we've got noise concerns and we've got baffles ordered and those should be in place and the system will be in operation in September of this year. Then we'll continue the performance sampling below the slab and in the indoor air and in the air that goes through the SVE system to make sure that it meets -- that it's doing its -- doing what work it was intended to do.

Okay. So on the study that we're doing, we're doing this material process survey which requires as-built and current process information. We'll be doing indoor air sampling and subslab sampling and then soil sampling if that other sampling indicates that we still have a problem underneath the slab elsewhere besides where this SVE system is working. And that SVE system will be started up in September.

Any further questions?

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

MR. SKROBARCEK: I'd just like to make a comment that as far as the current process information requesting information on, it appears as though we may have a communication breakdown or lapse that's delaying the information getting to you. So whatever we can do as far as from the business standpoint or tenant standpoint in working with Port Authority and yourselves, we'll be more than happy to do that.

MR. CARROLL: Okay.

MR. SKROBARCEK: We just want to make sure we get the information to you as quickly as possible. Because every day we delay it's one more day that we're in that area without the SVE system working on those types of things.

MR. CARROLL: Okay. I appreciate that and we'll work with you and -- and with the Port to try to -- try to keep things moving.

MR. SKROBARCEK: Okay.

MR. CARROLL: Keep moving on.

MR. SKROBARCEK: The other area that we -- the last sample that was taken which was -- actually had the highest values, I don't know if people -- members of the audience picked up on that or the board picked up on that, but it's actually outside of the existing soil contamination area that is drawn here. We suspect that it may be historical in that area and we'd like to see if that can be further investigated

in that area with a day-to-day support team.

MR. CARROLL: Yeah. That's what our investigation is going to lead us to -- to try to figure out is what went on that area, you know, what our vapor samples are going to tell us, where we need to investigate further. And I suspect that's probably the case, too. It's the most likely thing that we -- we're probably going to find.

MR. SKROBARCEK: I was speaking today actually to an individual that has actually worked in that building since 1971.

MR. CARROLL: Uh-huh.

MR. SKROBARCEK: And he indicated that there were up to like eight vapor degreasing systems in that building, which is more than I had thought. So -- and some in that area. So that may be a good information. We can talk further with those individuals as we need to.

MR. CARROLL: Okay. Good. We may get HGL, our contractor, in touch with you, too.

MR. GONZALES: Excuse me. My question is really on the noise reduction equipment, is it -- it's an order I'm assuming and it's necessary because of where the noise that this unit creates in proximity to where people are working or --

MR. CARROLL: That's correct. The system -- the machinery for this system is about halfway between Building

360 and there's a row of -- I don't know what you'd call them. They're duplexes or something --

MR. SKROBARCEK: Something like that.

MR. CARROLL: -- that are -- that people live in so we have to worry about noise concerns for both of those reasons. The people that work in Building 360 walk by that to go to their parking lot I believe so we have to worry about that and we have to be concerned about the people who are living there, too.

MR. GONZALES: I guess the noise reduction equipment is typical when it's in use elsewhere and it's pretty much assured it's going to achieve what you're expecting it to do as far as noise levels so that you can get this thing going.

MR. CARROLL: Yeah. Yeah. They -- they indicate that it's going to get it down below the acceptable decibel levels with installation of this. It will -- we'll check after they install it to make sure that it does meet those standards. And if it doesn't meet those standards, we'll have to do something additionally to make sure.

MR. GONZALES: Okay.

MR. GARCIA: Yes. Brian, I would -- I would recommend that we do for our next RAB meeting is have a preliminary study on how much more SVE systems we have to put in this building and also give us a preliminary report of other buildings that might need an SVE system.

MR. SKROBARCEK: Or other types of controls.
MR. GARCIA: Or other types of controls, yes.
MR. SKROBARCEK: We may not need an update.
MR. GARCIA: I would like to see that as an agenda item.
MR. CARROLL: So all of the systems that we are -- that we are either installing or have already installed to take care of --
MR. GARCIA: No, no. We've gotten a report on the ones we have already. I'm talking if we need anymore SVE system in this building or other systems in this building and other buildings that have not been addressed which may need an SVE system or another system --
MR. CARROLL: Okay.
MR. GARCIA: -- for our next meeting so get us a preliminary report.
MR. CARROLL: All right. I think essentially all the buildings on base have been, you know, investigated and this Building 360 is a case where it looks like there might be an additional problem under the building that we have to further investigate. So we'll keep you updated on that. We'll brief that again on -- at the next RAB.
MR. GARCIA: All right.
MR. CARROLL: Of course Gary Miller will be briefing the off-base sampling they did, the indoor air sampling, also.

MR. SKROBARCEK: But anything that we can expedite getting the sound panels in place or getting that system turned on between now and this next quarter RAB, I would ask that you do that.

MR. CARROLL: Okay.

MR. SKROBARCEK: Okay?

MR. CARROLL: Okay.

MR. MARTINEZ: Anymore questions from members? Ms. Abbott?

MS. ABBOTT: I know your first couple of samples were in that corner of the building and then that other one that's quite higher was a little bit farther.

MR. CARROLL: Uh-huh.

MS. ABBOTT: Have you taken any other samples at any other places in the building?

MR. CARROLL: No. That's what we're doing on this -- this further investigation is going to take more samples.

MS. ABBOTT: In other locations?

MR. CARROLL: Yeah. We need to -- we need to determine the source of this and if -- if it's larger than just that one area.

MS. ABBOTT: Uh-huh.

MR. CARROLL: So yes. Historically I don't -- I don't have the information with me, but there have been

samples taken under the building in various locations so we kind of know what's under the building in most of the area there. But we do need to further investigate to track it down.

MS. ABBOTT: You've already had one surprise. You don't want anymore.

MR. CARROLL: Right.

MR. SKROBARCEK: I suspect -- honestly, I suspect there may be more in that building --

MS. ABBOTT: Surprises?

MR. SKROBARCEK: -- just based on what I've heard. But may or may not be --

MR. CARROLL: Yeah, from the -- from the former processes and things that went on.

MR. SKROBARCEK: Yeah.

MR. MARTINEZ: Anymore questions?

MR. MILLER: Paul, one more thing real quick on this. There was -- when they did the study on Building 360, I believe they did a number of additional samples of the soil beneath the building.

MS. ABBOTT: But not the air.

MR. MILLER: I believe the soil plume -- the soil contamination has been defined underneath the building, but obviously we did not do a subslab soil gas concentration. That's what he's talking about maybe delineating further now

because of what we found in the first two samples or first three samples.

Just to clarify, I mean they did do some work initially to determine. That's why they put the SVE in that one corner of the building because that was the only soil contamination found of a substantial amount that indicated that we had an issue in the building. So I -- I mean I believe that's what -- it's been a while since we did Building 360, but I think that's what I remember we did is a lot of soil sampling underneath the building in different locations.

MR. CARROLL: Uh-huh. And that will be -- all of that information is being looked at by our contractor and they'll develop, you know, the sampling to figure out if there's another source that we might have missed somehow and where this -- where this vapor is coming from.

MS. ABBOTT: Does that -- that SVE that you have in place, does it have a limit, a range where it works?

MR. CARROLL: Yes.

MS. ABBOTT: You know, how far it out can extend?

MR. CARROLL: Yes. And it won't extend all the way to where that other sample is taken. We intended that sample to be a background sample, which it's supposed to represent normal conditions within the building that aren't affected by this contamination so we --

MR. SKROBARCEK: And it was the highest.

MR. CARROLL: We put it further away.
MS. ABBOTT: Hmm.
MR. CARROLL: Yeah.
MR. SKROBARCEK: What is the zone of the impact from the system as far as what kind -- how far does it reach out? I know that's kind of hard to answer that question, but --
MR. CARROLL: Yeah. I don't know. I don't remember exactly --
MR. SKROBARCEK: Yeah.
MR. CARROLL: -- what it is. It's pretty tight soils there.
MR. SKROBARCEK: Yeah.
MR. CARROLL: But it's a pretty powerful system also.
MR. SKROBARCEK: Okay.
MR. CARROLL: So I can find that -- we can find that information and have that for you at the next RAB though.
MR. MARTINEZ: Anymore questions on this one topic, first topic?
For the record, I'd like to recognize that our two government representatives, Mark Weegar, TCEQ, and Gary Miller, EPA, did -- have joined us.
We will now go to the next presentation again by Paul, Building 301.
MR. CARROLL: Okay. Building 301 is just, what,

northwest of Building 360 and that's pretty close to that area. That was a metal plating shop operation. They did those electric -- those operations from 1975 to 1999. They had a wet process. Those vats were drained and rinsed in January 2000. The process equipment was decontaminated and removed in April 2001 and the building decontamination and demolish was in February 2002. So now we have a big parking lot there in that area.

The site history includes plating operations and had waste waters that included heavy metals, acids, caustics and cyanide. The subsurface soil contamination from our investigation indicated that we had tetrachlorethylene at 4,750 parts per billion.

And then -- I don't know if we can see these areas, but those four blobs underneath that building were four areas that we found contamination at. One of them was a degreaser pit, the other is a plating area. Another was a sump or some sumps and then a container storage area where hazardous waste was stored.

Okay. This is a picture of the operations inside the building. As you can see, it's pretty industrial there. Soil -- soil and groundwater contamination below the building is a result of spills and leaks from those operations. And a newly installed treatment system we'll describe here in a minute will treat areas in both the vadose zone, that's the

soil that's not saturated with ground -- with water, and the saturated zones and will compliment the remediation of the groundwater by the installed -- already installed permeable reactive barrier that is downgradient from that building.

That PRB wall was installed in 2003 to treat organic -- volatile organic contaminated groundwater from near that plating shop. Here is kind of the -- this is the location that was installed. You can barely see where the building was. It's outlined right here (indicating). But that's downgradient as the groundwater flows and that treats that groundwater.

Electrical resistive heating is what we have installed there. Here's a picture of what it looked like on the surface and what we've done is every fifteen, thirty feet is installed -- drilled a well, installed elect -- electrical probes into the groundwater and the zones above the groundwater.

This is an in situ, which means on-site remediation technology that uses heat generated by that electrical resistance to the flow of electrical current to raise those temperatures in the subsurface. It's proven effective in saturated and unsaturated soils so in groundwater and above the groundwater and it removes volatile and semi-volatile contaminants from both soil and groundwater.

We placed 218 of those electrodes and they're eleven

to thirty-four feet in depth to target the contaminated regions. The power control unit of the system uses lots of electricity of course, but it applies voltage to the electrodes and uniformally heats the soil and groundwater between those electrodes. It's six-phase and the subsurface is heated to a certain temperature.

Contaminants are volatilized, basically turned into steam and that steam is collected by a vapor recovery system that's also installed as part of the system. It's condensed to water and VOC vapors are then treated and discharged. The estimated operating time for that is from 282 to 345 days based on the manufacturer's modeling of the location and the system that's put in.

Here are -- here's a picture of before and after. There's the metal -- the plating shop and then to the right is the current system that's installed.

MR. MARTINEZ: Again, an opportunity for members of the RAB to ask Paul questions.

MR. GONZALES: When did this operation actually begin? You indicated that it would be between 282 to 345 days. How many days are we into it already?

MR. CARROLL: They are into the start-up of the system this week. And it should be turned on either alter this week or the first part of next week.

MR. GONZALES: I just wondered, August 1 or --

MR. CARROLL: Yeah, or maybe even sooner than that.

MR. MARTINEZ: Mr. Garcia, you had a question.

MR. GARCIA: Yeah. If you're going to turn it on next week, how soon will you be able to make a preliminary assessment on how the system is working?

MR. CARROLL: We will be sampling as we go. The vapors that are extracted, they monitor the temperature of the soil and groundwater that are heated. It needs to reach a certain temperature. I think it's about ninety degrees or so, Fahrenheit, to -- to be able to volatilize the organic contaminants that are in the groundwater. So the groundwater is not going to volatilize itself. It will be the TCE and PCE that -- that will turn into vapor which we'll be treating then.

MR. GARCIA: So immediately after it starts running after so many hours, you're going to start getting results as soon as you start monitoring?

MR. CARROLL: It will be more like probably weeks because it takes a long time to heat the soil up to that certain temperature.

MR. GARCIA: Okay.

MR. MARTINEZ: Ms. Abbott.

MS. ABBOTT: Okay. I have a question. As the steam is condensed to water and VOC vapors are treated and discharged, when you -- when you treat them and discharge

them, do you have collectors or something for that and then do you discharge them into the atmosphere or how are they discharged?

MR. CARROLL: Right. The -- I believe there's a carbon -- activated carbon system that collects the volatile vapors. Is that correct, Luis?

MR. MEDINA: Yes. There's filters.

MR. CARROLL: And then those --

MS. ABBOTT: Are the filters --

THE COURT REPORTER: Excuse me. Can you speak up, sir?

MR. MEDINA: There's a GAC, gas activated --

MR. CARROLL: Granular activated carbon.

MR. MEDINA: -- carbon and that will capture all the vapors. And then when the condensation -- we have a big tank. As the condensation accumulates, then we'll ship it out to the plant, either in a truck or by line. We don't know how much condensation we're going to get.

But for right now we're just going to use a big tank we have over there. You can see it on the picture, the picture before this. That white thing there, that's where the condensation goes, that big tank (indicating.)

MR. MARTINEZ: Any other questions? Mr. Garcia.

MR. GARCIA: You can put on the agenda for the next board meeting to give us the preliminary sampling results and

a preliminary report on how this is working.

MR. CARROLL: Okay.

MR. SKROBARCEK: I realize these are pretty extensive engineering projects that go on to install, but it just seems as though it takes quite a while to get them up and running. Is there anything that can be done to expedite these in the future? I mean I realize it's in everybody's best interest that this gets cleaned up as quickly as possible.

MR. CARROLL: Yes.

MR. SKROBARCEK: Since the clock doesn't start like on this particular system until -- obviously it turns on next week, is there anything that can be done to expedite these any quicker or...

MR. CARROLL: Yeah. There's -- there's probably a lot of things that can be done. A lot of things also cost extra money and we try to balance those between our schedules to -- to have to be at a certain point to be able to transfer property and, you know, trying to make sure that we are good stewards of the government's money.

You know, the -- we will expedite -- this Building 360 thing that's going on, we do need to -- we understand the need to expedite that and to keep that thing moving. 301, you know, that's -- that's a cleanup that needs to be done, but it's probably not as critical as Building 360 is.

So yeah, that's -- we try to weigh a lot of those

factors in and a lot of this environmental work takes a lot longer than we want it to.

MR. SKROBARCEK: I understand. It's just the people that I represent obviously want action as quickly as possible to make sure it's been taken care of as soon as possible.

MR. CARROLL: Yeah. That's a -- that's a critical concern, yes.

MR. MARTINEZ: Any other questions from this second report?

Then let's go on to the third report and, again, remind everybody that there's this one small flier that you can pick up if you haven't. It pertains to the next topic, the Semiannual Compliance Plan.

MR. CARROLL: If my voice will hold out. This -- this handout that you have is something you can take with you for when -- if you look on the website and look at the Semiannual Compliance Plan document or if you go to the library and take a look at it, it's a real good handy roadmap to show you what it's all about, how to navigate through there, and to understand what we report and where that can be found and the things that are of interest to you depending on, you know, who you are, whether you work here, whether you have homes in the area, whether you're interested in the groundwater situation and the remediation that's ongoing. You can find -- you can figure out that hopefully from this fact

sheet.

If you -- if you in the future have difficulties, by all means call our help -- help desk, our PA help desk number, and we'll be able to help you navigate through that. But this -- this briefing pretty much reflects what's in this -- what's in this fact sheet.

The Semiannual Compliance Plan Report is something that's required by TCEQ. We're regulated by them under the requirements of this Compliance Plan and permit as most of -- most of you have been briefed before. This requires us to conduct corrective action, groundwater monitoring programs to address contamination of shallow groundwater zone, and as I already briefed the fact sheet that y'all have.

We have two of them a year that are due. The first one is due in July of each year and it covers data from the prior six months. We report water level measurements, and sampling performed in January of the groundwater monitoring wells for the two open RCRA, Resource Conservation and Recovery Act -- that's the regulatory regime we're under -- regulated units.

We also do an assessment of Leon Creek, which I'll describe in a little bit more detail later, report base-wide gauging activities that are performed in March, water level and water flow directions and thing like that, and then we determine that the cleanup systems are working.

The second report is due in January of each year and it covers the data from July, August through December. That also has gauging and sampling of base-wide groundwater monitoring wells, monitoring and sampling of those two RCRA-regulated units and then an assessment of Leon Creek with an analysis of fish tissue sampling. It also assesses whether the cleanup systems are working, too.

Now the groundwater level measurements, the gauging that we do, we -- to evaluate the current conditions of groundwater, we have to determine the depth and to -- in groundwater monitoring wells and also in active pumping wells, recovery wells across the base and adjacent areas.

Here's a profile of the shallow groundwater. Some of you have seen this before. The groundwater -- as you can see on the right side, the man standing there is standing at about the level of the shallow groundwater in a -- in a certain area of the base. In this location, the ground surface is about fifteen to forty feet above -- well, I guess it's overall, and the groundwater zone is about four feet in depth there. It's not a source of drinking water and it's separated by the Edwards Aquifer, as we described at the last RAB, by about a thousand feet of impermeable clay rock, sand and silt.

Another thing that we have to report is in the groundwater assessment, we do groundwater sampling to evaluate

groundwater conditions, contaminant levels in the shallow groundwater zone beneath the base and off-site areas that are affected.

The July report focuses on the two RCRA-regulated units, which are still open, and the January report takes a more base-wide approach.

And we've historically subdivided Kelly -- the former Kelly into five groundwater zones, 1 through 5. Submittal of modifications for those zones are further grouped -- further group these zones into eleven waste management areas. Groundwater assessment study at each site reported, evaluated the presence of various chemicals of concern, groundwater protection standards for each chemical and the effectiveness of the treatment systems that are in place at any location.

Another thing we do as part of this report is do an assessment of Leon Creek. That monitoring program was initiated to document the physical, chemical and biological conditions of the creek upstream, adjacent and downstream of the former Kelly. The activity includes surface water and sediment sampling, surface water elevation and flow measurements. And then the January report includes the collection, results of collection and analysis of fish tissue samples.

Here's a drawing of all the remedial systems that

are in place as of June 2007. And, you know, that's -- that's pretty much base-wide. The Compliance Plan Semiannual Report evaluates all of the -- all of these systems that are in place and the effectiveness of the -- whatever treatment system it is.

Next slide shows the -- as we showed during the last RAB -- I have these maps over here if you want to look at them a little bit closer. The plume reductions from 2008 -- I mean from 1998 I believe to 2007. The blue outlines show the original configuration of the plumes. And this is tetrachloroethylene, which we call PCE. As you can see, the reduction is significant, especially off-base.

So next is the TCE, tetra -- trichloroethylene. This blue line is hard to see on this map, but I think on your handouts they're better -- they're easier to see. Blue line shows the original outline, the extent of the original plume in 1998 and then the greens are the current -- the current configuration of those plumes.

Okay. Any questions?

MR. WEEGAR: Paul, what year did you say the blue line was related to?

MR. CARROLL: 1998.

MR. WEEGAR: The blue line?

MR. CARROLL: I believe the blue line is '98 on both of them. Yeah.

MS. ABBOTT: (Indicating).

MR. CARROLL: Can't read that?

MR. WEEGAR: I didn't bring my magnifying class.

MS. ABBOTT: Font four in the legend.

MR. CARROLL: Yeah, it's 1998. It can possibly be from 1997 data. I think it's from the '98 report.

MR. WEEGAR: Okay. In both the 2008 and 2000 -- the 2008 PCE and TCE plumes, it looks like in that southern lobe you've got -- it appears that the plume is larger, not -- not larger, but it extends farther.

MR. CARROLL: Right.

MR. WEEGAR: Is that a result of having more monitoring wells in between '98 and 2008?

MR. CARROLL: That's right. There were additional monitoring wells installed downgradient that further delineated that plume after that -- after that date, yes. Thanks for that clarification.

Anything else? Yes, sir.

MR. GARCIA: Ever since we started this back when Patrick McCullough was here, that's a long long time ago, in the middle '90s when the first Semi Compliance Plan came out, I requested first to Patrick McCullough and then to Antwine that we need to have the community as well as the RAB members be given more specific reports. So I suggested that they do an executive summary of each report and all the major issues,

reports that concern the community.

Back then we were concerned about the people -- minority people living in Valley High from the radiation -- radioactive materials from the carcasses of those gauges that were across from Medina Base Road and Military and a lot of the community was concerned about Leon Creek and what is the status on Leon Creek and where does all that contamination come from. And I want to know why it hasn't been fully investigated.

Starting upstream, EPA or somebody, TCEQ or the Air Force, go up there and start finding is it over there by Highway 90, Leon Creek, where it might have been caused by Levi Jeans. Is it further down into the existing Kelly or is it down so far? Do you find the water clean? Then we say okay, this air is clean, then we examine the rest of it. Now south of this point here, where is it coming from?

You know, and that has been fighting for the past sixteen years and I still have not gotten a straight answer and we still have not gotten every -- every six months I would have a big fight with Mr. Antwine about getting executive summaries and getting more specific relative data from the commission -- from the Semiannual Compliance Report. He told me, Go buy a computer and I'll give you a disk. I said, No, you buy me the computer if you want me to use the disk. You know, so we had --

MR. MARTINEZ: We made that available close --

MR. GARCIA: But we need to find a way to put more into what you present to us and then what -- how you're going to work to present it to the community. Because this -- especially community issues.

The community can care less if you're cleaning up building such and such and such, but when it comes to Leon Creek, Hey,I live next to Leon Creek. I live next to this area here. I live next to this area here. We can make -- find a way to say, Hey, EPA is doing this, TCEQ is doing this, the Air Force is doing this. We're cleaning up this, this, this and this, to reassure all of the surrounding minority community, people that live here, Hey, we are making progress, here's our report, here's our executive summary. We must assure you.

I went to the Community Council on Restoration. They have a very bad attitude when you want to get after them and tell them, Do this, do that. And I tried to get on that board but they told me they got a very limit -- they limit their scope of participation to a very very small area that they will --

MR. CARROLL: Lackland?

MR. GARCIA: Lackland Community Council on Restoration and they did not give me any information on it. That's why I keep going to Washington to go after some of

these generals because we are not getting enough information from CCR or AFRPA, TCEQ or EPA, where is the contamination coming from and how are we going to deal with it? I want to see a plan, fifty, hundred, 200 pages long so I can say hey, rest assured, all these government agencies and the Air Force, we're working together to deal with this problem and eventually we're going to take care of it because we know where it's coming from and we know how we're going to deal with it.

Thank you.

MR. MARTINEZ: Any comments or suggestion from other members of the RAB on that issue?

MR. GONZALES: Just a couple of comments. That seems -- at some point in time there -- it seems like there is a collective -- a need of like a summary of all of the entities that are involved in this effort in particular zones or areas of contamination because we know that this RAB is restricted or focused on a specific area, then the other RAB from Lackland may have information they may be addressing that either contributes, supports or quantifies the concerns.

And I notice -- I've been off and on the RAB and I and I notice Leon Valley issues, when you -- we see the report also includes results of collection analysis and fish tissue samples. I'm sure that the results are in the report, but for us it will probably be helpful to be able to say, There's not

as much, or, There's more, and, If there's more, why is there more. And I think that where Rodrigo is going to is we need to -- you know, something to be able to convey, you know, in layman I guess terms to -- to our community -- to our community, you know, how this progresses.

MR. SKROBARCEK: I think that's a reasonable request as far as defining an executive summary that gives summary guidance for the Semiannual Compliance Plan. I mean that is a very thick document to go through so...

MR. CARROLL: Yeah, it is. And that's what -- that's what we're making an attempt to help out, to facilitate people's review of that report. It is -- it is a big report, but a lot of that report is maps and data. The body of the report, you know, I think if -- if you'll use this and take a look at the things that you need to take a look at through the index, you should be able to find what you -- what you're looking for.

You know, hopefully this -- this will be a step in the right direction. If it's not -- if it's not far enough, maybe we'll have to reassess that later.

Mark, you have a question?

MR. WEEGAR: Well, no. I just -- as far as kind of an update, you know, the -- as you know, there is a fish consumption advisory on Leon Creek. It's been in place for a while. And there is an ongoing study that's being done

jointly by TCEQ, San Antonio River Authority. I think the Metropolitan Health District is involved and I think USGS as well.

And they're -- they're looking at not only the reach of Leon Creek that flows between Kelly and Lackland but also looking at really the San Antonio River Basin as a whole and then they're trying to see whether or not chemical impacts to fish in Leon Creek are unique to that stretch of Leon Creek or is it something that is kind of systemic of the San Antonio River Basin within really, you know, the -- an urbanized area.

And I'm not really sure what the -- you know, how far that study is -- has gone forward. It might be beneficial maybe to try to get somebody at the next RAB meeting, maybe give an overview of where they are.

And also TCEQ, through our Total Maximum Daily Load program, TMDL program, whenever a consumption advisory is placed on a -- on a segment of a stream or lake or something like that that is considered to be a sustainable fishery, which I'm not sure that in its present situation or with urbanization of Leon Creek that maybe Leon Creek really fits that definition, but be that as it may, that is the definition that is placed on Leon Creek, that it's a sustainable fishery.

So whenever there is a fishing advisory placed on that body of water, TCEQ through our TMDL program looks at trying to identify sources of contamination to that body of

water with the ultimate goal trying to limit the discharges that have impaired that body of water and getting it back off of the endanger -- off the fishing advisory back into a sustainable use again.

So that program is going forward. And again, we are participating through that program with SARA and USGS and Metro Health to try to get more data to get a better handle on where -- what the potential impacts are to Leon Creek.

Because I look at these Semiannual Compliance Plan Reports semiannually and, you know, we notice contaminants in the sediment and fish and whatnot. But PCB are the source of the fishing advisory. They really seem to be limited to an area -- while they show up and down the creek in different locations, typically we see them in the southern part of the base which is near where a lot of -- there are three large City of San Antonio storm water discharge pipelines that come into that creek.

They take storm water from a large area outside of Kelly Air Force Base so we're trying to get -- I've asked the Air Force to do some additional evaluations of those storm water ditches and see if Leon Creek is showing up contamination as a result of storm water that's coming from other parts of the City of San Antonio.

So it's not a just simple because this reach of the creek has been impacted that it's from Kelly Air Force Base or

Lackland Air force Base. In fact, we have not found PCBs associated with any of the sites that we're cleaning up at Kelly Air Force Base. I suspect that part of the reason we're seeing that reach is because that's the only area they've been sampling for.

MR. GARCIA: Following his lines, who knows, we might find fifty fifty-five gallon drums inside that old Levis where they have chemicals with PCBs in the stuff where they used to treat that blue -- blue jean chemicals or something, you know.

There's a trucking company there on Old Highway 90 on the Leon Creek tributary that's got all kinds of chemicals and junk on it. You know, it has to be a little bit -- you have to find the source. We're going to have to find a way to deal with this and finally put a stop to this contamination.

If you go after the city and find out they're responsible, that's good. That will make me very happy. It's about time the city gets -- gets hung for the things that they do and things that they have control of. We have other stuff like that old Levis plant, that old Haggar sack -- slacks. There's some other chemical and industrial sites there along Ben Rodriguez Park and then that Levis and some other trucking that have junk on them. Maybe that's the source. We're just going to have to start investigating everything.

MR. CARROLL: The --

MR. GARCIA: Because I'm tough, but I'm fair. If the Air Force is not responsible for it, then TCEQ and EPA has got to find out who is and deal with them.

MR. MARTINEZ: Question.

MR. SKROBARCEK: So if we can get maybe -- I don't know what the RAB members think, but maybe we can add that to if not the next agenda, if it's appropriate to do so as far as that project that's ongoing, and maybe some of the preliminary results that are coming out of it, whether it's increasing -- the contamination is increasing or decreasing or something like that.

I don't know if there's data or anything like that available, but it makes sense to at least look at it from the stretch that it could be impacted by Kelly and what could be outside of Kelly.

MR. CARROLL: Try to get that some time in the next couple of RABs if we can -- however the timing works.

MS. ABBOTT: Maybe if we come up with a set of a few questions instead of going through the whole report to say these are thing we're looking for, you know, to try to give them target points.

MR. WEEGAR: I think you're talking about the ongoing Leon Creek study and it is ongoing. I don't -- Kyle Cunningham has kind of -- has been working along with folks from some of the other agencies and I just -- there's another

individual at TCEQ in Austin that's kind of our point on that part of the project.

I can discuss with him what the status of the project is. I just don't know that it's at a stage where they -- how much data they have and really how meaningful that data would really be at this point, but I can definitely ask.

MR. SKROBARCEK: Yeah.

MR. WEEGAR: You know, if they're at a point where they feel like it will be beneficial to make a presentation, maybe we can ask them to do that.

MR. MARTINEZ: At the end of the agenda, we were going to ask RAB members what would be items you would like to heard presented at the next couple of RAB meetings so you are suggesting that as we end each of the presentations. And I know staff and Eddie is taking notes back there.

So Mark's recommendation is a very good recommendation. Let's find out if that study is at a point that they will be able to present something of some substance. If that is the case, then staff will evaluate that and incorporate that into the next agenda if, again, they are at that stage of making a presentation. Mr. Garcia?

MR. GARCIA: One more thing. I'm going to get -- I'm going to drive that area where I told you about, all those factories at Ben Rodriguez Park and the Levis, and I'm going to itemize all those things. Then I'm going to leave you a

letter with staff about those six, seven, eight possible locations where I see that mess along Leon Creek and I'm going to give you a letter with those itemized lists of those sites and what I think is in there and I'll leave it here so you can share it with the EPA and TCEQ and then I'll bring you a letter for that effect.

MR. GONZALES: Just a follow-up. What will be interesting to me is when did that study begin so we can determine if they work. If they would bring that as well, when did they begin that study and what is -- what can we anticipate ongoing to be.

MR. WEEGAR: I -- I am not absolutely positive when the study started. It may -- might have been in the spring. There was an issue of getting the funding and getting coordination with the different agencies. Like I said, I'm not involved in the study so I really can't tell you.

MR. GONZALES: But as you approach it, maybe that will be part of what we can help on just so we can have at least a perception of what's ongoing, is going to entail. And the funding issue, maybe who knows, a lot of people can call.

MS. BETTIS: I believe Leon Creek was sampled I think starting in November. They did several samples up and down the stream from Kelly and I'm not sure how many sites there were, probably six or eight of them. And they did all different types of sediment sampling, suspended and also bed

sediment, and the state also was doing and analyzing fish tissue again.

But the study is not at a point right now where they can give a presentation on the results yet that I believe.

MR. MARTINEZ: Mr. Garcia.

MR. GARCIA: One more comment. Way back in 1996 when we started having the hearings at Kennedy High School under Patrick McCullough, there was a very hot issue. In fact, that -- dating back to late 1996, that's when they started getting a lot of public comment and back then I submitted a 34-page report with questions and comments on Leon Creek itself and that's when they started getting to put on some of these items when the RAB started. So it's been around for about ten to twelve years.

As far as reports from these guys and from AFRPA and Adam Antwine, we need to get Adam Antwine to research the files and come up with historical data if you wish to review it on this issue.

MR. MARTINEZ: Anymore comments or questions from members of the RAB on this compliance report? If not, we'd like to now turn the stage over to Mr. Gary Miller, EPA Soil Vapor Intrusion Study.

MR. MILLER: Those of you that were here back last RAB in April I believe it was, I gave just kind of a summary of what we were going to do. And basically this is just a

small update of that because I still cannot give you the data results because I have not given them to the individual homeowners. We have the study; it's been completed. I have the results at home or at the office, but our intent was to release them to the -- each homeowner first before I released them to the general public so later on I'll talk to you a little bit more about that.

But basically what we had planned to do is we were going to -- originally we were going to do one area. Public comment enticed us to expand it a little bit. We went ahead and did sampling in two areas with the highest off-base groundwater contamination. Both of these areas are around Kelly. I'll get some pictures in a minute. Was one off 34th Street, which is north of Kelly, back up -- those of you -- in this general area, in this neighborhood up north of Kelly, and the other is off of East Kelly in this general area I believe (indicating). Right, Luis?

MR. MEDINA: Yes. There's --

MR. MILLER: There's a PRB wall in this general area right off the tip of East Kelly. I think in the presentation it says southeast. It's actually northeast of East Kelly where -- where those samples were taken. That's a mistake in there.

What we were trying to do with the study initially was to determine if there was completed pathway, which from

this presentation basically would show that you would have a contamination underneath the house and it would go up through house so we were looking to see if there's a completed pathway from subslab to indoor air. We were never intended with the sampling to determine if we had a -- to delineate any contamination.

MR. SKROBARCEK: So define completed pathway.

MR. MILLER: A completed pathway is if we find it in indoor air. If we knew that we had it in the groundwater, which we knew we had a groundwater plume, both of these areas as you can see looking at this -- PCE is what we're looking at, too, tetrachloroethylene. There's a PCE plume that comes from this area right through some homes in this general area. There's a permeable reactive barrier wall right off the north part of East Kelly.

There's some concentrations here -- I believe these are only -- I think the highest concentrations up here were 40 to 50 parts per billion. In this area here off of 34th Street, there's another permeable reactive barrier wall and it's -- as you can look, it's kind of -- kind of small on this map here, but there's a plume that comes off of this. And again, it's some high groundwater concentration. So we know that there's groundwater contamination so what we looked at to determine first, based on EPA draft guidance, is we go and look and see if we can find a subslab, which is where from

this cartoon we've got here you see that we have -- we have situations similar to the third picture over here.

We would have groundwater contamination. Vapors coming off that groundwater contamination collect under the house so that's our second step. If we find it under the house, then our third step would be to go indoors and sample indoors. And that's -- that's what we did with our study.

Okay. This -- basically some of you may have seen this if you were in the neighborhood back in May. In mid May we used this particular bus, the TAGA Mobile Laboratory, the Trace Atmospheric Gas Analyzer. That really refers to a piece of equipment inside this bus which has a large amount of very sensitive analytical equipment in it. They can -- they can drive around, pick up air samples, all kinds of stuff with this thing. Go ahead.

What we did was we sampled twenty residential structures. Seventeen of them were in the 34th Street area. We added three additional in the area located northeast of East Kelly, not southeast. Out of that, what we collected were sixteen subslabs as I describe earlier. These were slab on grade homes, which many of you may have.

We did -- what we did, if you remember from our last presentation, was we installed a port where we drilled through the slab. We installed this stainless steel port and we took a sample using a vacuum box. We took a sample of the soil gas

underneath the slab.

In addition to that, we had four houses that we got access to that we took crawl spaces. They didn't -- it was a pier and beam home so we put a canister underneath that house and just took a sample underneath the house.

What -- as we intended in our original study was we were going to -- we only had funding to do five indoor air samples so what we did was we went and -- if I'm in your way over here, holler and I'll --

MR. GONZALES: You're fine.

MR. MILLER: So what we did -- we were going to do the five highest subslab samples and do an indoor air sample and that's what we did.

We went through and how this would work is we would go in -- as I said earlier, we would do the subslab sample. Then based on those, we would go back and we would do a -- if it was a high enough number, we went through with the bus you saw earlier and they had a long hose that was attached to a piece of analytical equipment where they could do a sample every minute inside the house. They could walk through room to room and pick up a sample and they could tell in that room what the concentrations were of the select chemicals we were looking at, which were only the chlorinated solvents, PCE, TCE, dichloroethylene and vinyl chloride I think is what we were looking for.

Based on those results, then we went ahead and put in a Summa canister, which was another way we took a 24-hour sample because those were just like a grab sample. Go ahead.

This just shows you -- this is the 34th Street area. The green pins are basically the houses that we did. This is 34th Street along here. If any of you have ever been over there, this is a big two-story home that's located there. and then -- yeah. Okay. Then there's a vacant spot and then there's a small one-story house over here that we did. Then we also went back along -- Valencia is the next street and this is Carnation and this is Bay Street here at the bottom, the horizontal.

Out of those, we took -- we took the subslab and pier and beam and there is one house up here at the very top left-hand corner. That was another subslab we did. It was kind of a -- just to see if we're outside. We thought the plume was -- was narrowly defined basically along the axis of Carnation and Bay Street. And -- go ahead.

This was the other area we sampled. This is off of north East Kelly. Northeast of East Kelly. In the street over here, what is it, Hues and Amarillo -- and I don't remember the actual streets we were on when we took the samples. I don't think I have the street name. Carthage. We were on -- it was on Carthage is where the two houses are. Those were both pier and beam.

The one house over here where it says 13222 -- and the doesn't mean anything. That was just an address of the house. Thirteen relates to our sample number. That was a slab on grade, a newer house that has been built within the last several years. Go ahead.

What our plan is is next week we're going to go around to each homeowner. We're going to go around, knock on doors, again using Kyle's staff also to go with us, and we're going to go to each homeowner and explain to them the results. We thought that was easier to do and much better than to send them a packet of papers where they may not understand what we're giving them so we're going to go through and talk to them about it.

Basically -- and the last part here, I'm going to touch on it now, I say July 24th, but apparently that date is not going to work. So forget about the 24th for the public meeting. We're probably going to do the public meeting on the 23rd, but we're going to have to work with that. We're working with Congressman Gonzales' office. They're going to help work with us to host that meeting and it will be in the area. And basically what we'll do then is roll out the results to any interested party.

We want to give it to the residents first because I want to give them their individual results so that I don't give the individual results -- basically what I've been told

by my attorneys is I can't give you the individual results of somebody's home. That would be an invasion of their privacy really because if I put their name attached to those results, you know, so I don't want to do that.

So basically what we tried to do was answer these three questions or -- yeah, three questions. And what we did was we went in -- you know, we knew we had subsurface gas. Based on our initial sampling results we found subsurface gas at a level that -- I won't say it concerned us, but there was a level that was a potential risk if we just looked at subsurface. And based on EPA guidance, if we found that, our next step was to do indoor air.

We had already decided we were going to indoor air samples no matter what we found because that was our promise to some of the residents was that we would do it at least on a limited number of homes.

So going to the second one, we did find subsurface gas existed so we went to -- we wanted to make sure is it a life-style which is somebody having gun cleaner in there, having waterproof spray for their boots, all these things -- there's a lot of things in your house that have the same chemicals in them and will show up in our tests that we found in the houses that we did sample.

So you have to be careful so that's why we used that TAGA bus because he can go in each individual room and he --

well, actually they went in the house and moved out plastic containers full. I don't think anybody in this room -- I know nobody in this room had their house done, but basically what they did is they went through and removed stuff out of the houses, you know, cleaning supplies, whiteout. Whiteout has chemicals in it. And these things will all leak. None of these -- even if you have them screwed down tightly, they're going to leak a little bit. So that's what we wanted to make sure of. Was it a lifestyle?

Ambient is just what's out in the air. We took ambient samples, too, in the back yard and something I -- what we found and something I'm not real clear on, but we had -- we had higher ambient samples than what he did crawlspace samples for instance. I mean we're still talking very low concentrations, much lower than any kind of a risk that we would ever consider to be a problem.

And then the last one. Basically what you want to know is did we do what we said we were going to do in number two. If we found something inside the -- in the house, are we really sure that it's from groundwater? And that was why we limited our sampling to just a few constituents.

And basically all I can tell you -- all that I really can tell you is that we had some elevated subslab samples throughout the 34th Street area. We didn't find anything in the East Kelly area of substance, anything that we

would be concerned with at all. 34th Street we found nothing in the indoor air that we would be concerned about. The values we found in the five homes we sampled are below any kind of risk level.

And that's really it. I mean that's all I can tell you right now. We want to talk to each homeowner and just explain to them their results because we did -- I mean there are values there that I want to explain to them so that they don't just see this value and think that they've got a problem in their house because we found it. We want to explain that value to them and then we want to talk further with them about the subslab values we had and we'll go from there, you know, based on what kind of information and feedback we get from homeowners and -- and the rest of the public.

So if you have any questions, you can contact me at miller.gary@epa.gov. Yes, Mark?

MR. WEEGAR: Gary, let me make sure I understood you. For the homes where you did the indoor air sampling, you did the TAGA unit and also I guess you did a Summa canister as well. You did go in and they went through the houses and they actually removed chemicals that might potentially have some --

MR. MILLER: Yes.

MR. WEEGAR: -- life-style impact on before you did any of the sampling?

MR. MILLER: That's correct. The only thing we did

not really get to do is that we -- we may not have had enough time lapse from the time we went and did that cleaning from the time we went in and took -- left our sample to do our overnight sample.

But we did it as -- you know, we were trying to do this in a tight time frame so the worst case would have been what we did, you know, we would have found something because maybe we had a house that had a leaking container of stuff.

I mean a lot of people have guns in their house; a lot of people have gun cleaner in their house. Gun cleaner is very highly -- it has a lot of TCE and I believe it's PCE also if I'm not mistaken, which were the two main constituents we were looking for in indoor air.

MR. WEEGAR: So you did this between the TAGA and the realtime or semi realtime and the Summa 24 hours?

MR. MILLER: We did it before we did the TAGA. We did it before we did the TAGA so when we went through the houses with the TAGA bus we got basically non detect.

Now the TAGA does have a higher detection limit, which I don't remember offhand, but it was higher than what we could get with the Summa canisters, which I don't have a picture of a Summa canister that has a regulated valve on it that we would open up and turn on and leave it for 24 hours inside the houses.

You know, we -- generally in the houses, we did two

samples in each house with a Summa canister. And what we would is we would go in and at the same time we did those two, we would hook another sample back up and take a second sample of the subslab just so that we make sure that we had a subslab value that we would compare to the indoor air value. So on those houses, they actually got two subslab values plus at least one indoor, maybe two indoor samples.

Again, it was a very limited sampling. It's not cheap to do the sampling. But we tried to do it biased in the areas that we felt were the highest probability of having a problem. So...

MR. SKROBARCEK: So the duration of the study in this area was how long?

MR. MILLER: It was basically a week. You know, we started on a Monday and we were finished by Friday.

MR. SKROBARCEK: How soon do you get results based on that?

MR. MILLER: Well, with the TAGA, we get them instantaneous basically. The beauty is --

MR. SKROBARCEK: So the TAGA is used for screening? Is that what it is?

MR. MILLER: It's basically used as a screening tool.

MR. SKROBARCEK: Okay.

MR. MILLER: They have the ability with the -- with

the TAGA and they use this around the country and other -- in a lot of emergency type locations where they can go through and they can take a quick sample and they get -- basically what they did -- what we did with Summa canisters is basically a comparison. We want to be able to say that we have a Summa canister here that's a certain value and we have the TAGA value and they're comparable. You know, maybe there's a little difference, you know, there's a ten percent difference or something like that. But that's an acceptable change apparently to this -- in this -- what I've learned.

So with the TAGA, what we did was we used that value. But I guess I didn't explain that real well. But when we went in and we sampled the twenty homes, we installed the ports in all twenty homes. Well, sixteen. Four were subslab.

The twenty -- the sixteen homes we did a port, we took what is known -- what is called a Tedlar bag. It's like a big baggy, but it's much thicker and it's made to collect air samples. And we did it in a vacuum box where we could draw a vacuum and we would fill that bag up through that port.

That immediately went to the TAGA and they analyzed it right then and we had a value. So we knew that house had a certain value in the subslab so we compared all those -- all sixteen of those and we picked the five highest based on that.

Like I said, again, we did a biased sampling because that's -- that was all we had as far as funding to do this.

And really that's what we were looking for. We were trying to determine, answer questions, concerns from this public, from this RAB even, that we have, you know -- plus we had not done indoor air sampling in the Kelly area.

I think it was a very good sampling and I hope that, you know, people will take the results and look at them and not dismiss them as being -- because I think we tried to do what people had asked us to do in the past. We had been told in the past that we had not followed the protocol. We tried to follow the only protocol we have right now and that's EPA's draft policy on vapor intrusion sampling and that's what we followed. And it's basically being used around the country, the same protocol.

MR. SKROBARCEK: So the mobile -- I'm sorry. So the mobile lab that's used, is that a commercially available mobile lab or is that something specifically to EPA?

MR. MILLER: It is a EPA resource. It's owned by a EPA.

MR. SKROBARCEK: Uh-huh.

MR. MILLER: It's actually the one that -- the only one that -- I think there's one in Las Vegas and one in Edison, New Jersey and that's the only two that are in the country. The bus you saw has got a million dollars worth of equipment in it basically so it's a very expensive piece of equipment.

MR. SKROBARCEK: Is that something that can be used for like screening like Building 360 or something in that nature? Do we have some type of agreement that that --

MR. CARROLL: Possibly.

MR. SKROBARCEK: -- can be done or considered?

MR. CARROLL: It's not planned for this current contract. I think with the investigation that we're doing, we're doing kind of a phased approach and with -- if we have a good understanding of the processes and chemicals that are in the building, we think that the sampling that we'll be doing will lead us to where we need to go with this investigation. If we run into problems we may consider doing the TAGA. It's very expensive.

MR. SKROBARCEK: When you say very expensive, how very expensive is it?

MR. MILLER: It's roughly $10,000 a day.

MR. SKROBARCEK: $10,000 a day?

MR. MILLER: Actually more than that, trust me. I think we spent $100,000 on the sampling we did at Kelly if I'm not mistaken. I think that's right.

I did the funding transfers and it was -- it was not cheap. I think it was roughly $100,000 we spent down here.

Well, I take that back. We spent between Kelly and England Air Force Base, but England Air Force Base we did not use the TAGA. It was totally separate so we only took

samples. As Paul was saying, we did them using Summa canisters and things like that. So we didn't take the TAGA bus there. So most of our cost went to Kelly on that particular sampling.

They give out estimates of $10,000 a day. That's their --

MR. SKROBARCEK: And it took you a week to do twenty-four homes?

MR. MILLER: To do what we were doing, yeah. Took us a week to do those twenty homes.

MR. SKROBARCEK: And in twenty homes, you did all rooms in the homes for the screen?

MR. MILLER: But not all twenty. We only did five houses where we actually used the TAGA and went inside.

With the TAGA, what we did is we took one subslab sample, one bag, --

MR. SKROBARCEK: Right.

MR. MILLER: -- and we analyzed that. So we did twenty of those bags. Then we went and we did five homes. Well, at those twenty location or sixteen locations, excuse me, we put a canister and did 24-hour sample also.

But then we went back to the five highest homes with the TAGA and that's where we walked through the houses. It's actually very quick to do that. It only takes a -- I mean if they walk into this room, they may stay a little bit longer

because it's big room, but they would walk in here, wait. I think they have to wait a minute or two for it to clear the system and then they take a one-minute sample. They say clear. You know, they're all doing this -- because the guy is in the van running the samples and analyzing it, he's telling the guy, Okay, clear, and he goes to the next room, you know, same thing. Two minutes, one minute, clear. So just walk through the house. It's very quick to do that.

And our only concern with what happened here is possibly the -- the people not keeping their houses closed up as we asked, you know, when we did the 24-hour samples with the Summa canister. You know, we know what was there when we went in and we know the house was closed when we took a TAGA sample because we walked through the house. All the windows were closed, air conditioners off, that kind of stuff.

But when it came to doing the 24-hour samples, we didn't have control over what people did, you know, if they left the back door open all day, afternoon or had the windows open or whatever. So that kind of messes with your indoor air sample if that happens so...

MR. SKROBARCEK: And I understand the cost is a driver, but the -- it seems as though that can expedite the process of screening a building fairly quickly. And right now, it appears as though -- and correct me if I'm wrong, it appears as though we're -- it's not a systematic process

that's being followed to evaluate Building 360.

MR. MILLER: Well, if I can just follow what Paul is saying. I mean basically what Paul is doing has to be done because if you don't do that, you can't use the TAGA. Because if they walked into Building 360 right now, they're going to find something. Most likely. I'm just saying it based on the stuff that Paul showed, they would find something. But you're still not going to know is that from a process you have in the back corner, --

MR. SKROBARCEK: Uh-huh.

MR. MILLER: -- you know, a drum of TCE, a parts cleaner back there that somebody only opens up for ten minutes a day --

MR. SKROBARCEK: Right.

MR. MILLER: -- or is it from the subslabThe only way they can know that is to go through the process that Paul is going through, determine what's in there today, make sure you know exactly where all the processes are, and then they can come in, go to those processes and hopefully screen those out.

The problem you run into is with anything -- EPA's guidance doesn't really apply to buildings where they're using the same constituents you're looking for because you have a problem -- well, you don't know. I mean is it coming from that process, which is an acceptable process under OSHA.

That's an OSHA requirement. That's not a EPA issue anymore. That's an OSHA issue because now it's a worker safety issue because OSHA says you can have these levels for eight hours or instantaneous. Our rates are much lower because we're looking at a 30, 40 year exposure so we have very low concentrations you can be exposed to.

But with a building like 360, it's very hard to go in there and just arbitrarily go through it with that TAGA. We did this in another location in Arkansas during the same study we did, which was a solvent packaging facility, and we basically thought we would find stuff there and we didn't find anything, which was odd. But it was -- it was the same kind of problem we had. They package solvents in the building so we basically had to exclude those results that we found in that area of the building.

MR. SKROBARCEK: False positive, right.

MR. MILLER: So if you can tie 360 down to certain areas and certain types of, you know, air handling units, you knew where the air handling unit's located, the air has been pulled from one unit into the rest of the building --

THE COURT REPORTER: Can you slow down a little bit?

MR. MILLER: Okay. Anyway, I think that's all I -- I think Rodrigo had a question; is that right?

MR. GARCIA: Yeah. I'm going to throw a curve at you. How about poor indoor air quality issues and the

relationship to vapor intrusion, did you distinguish between these two? How? By realtime monitoring or what kind of monitoring did you use to --

MR. MILLER: I didn't hear the first part of --

MR. GARCIA: -- distinguish between the two?

MR. MILLER: -- your question. What was your first part of the question? I didn't hear it.

MR. GARCIA: How about poor indoor air quality and the relationship between vapor intrusion studies? How did you distinguish between the two? Did you do realtime monitoring or other type -- other type of poor indoor air quality to establish the indoor air quality and are these houses old enough that they don't give off new material gases or any type of gases pertaining to indoor air quality --

MR. MILLER: Well, I'm going to have to --

MR. GARCIA: -- and did that come from indoor air quality or do they come from vapor intrusion?

MR. MILLER: Well, what we have to do with these is we have to know what's in the groundwater and that's all we look for in the house because that's our study. That's what limits our sturdy. If I went into anybody's house, my own house, anybody's house, and we opened it up and we analyzed everything in your house, yeah, you're going to get a huge list of contamination. That's just nature in your house, the way we live today and the chemicals we have in there and the

way -- like you said, the house materials that are off-gassing and whatnot.

So what we have to do with a study like this is you have to know what's in your groundwater. And that's what we based it on. We knew that we've got PCE, which is tetrachloroetylene; we have TCE; and we have DCE; and we have vinyl chloride. So we look for those four constituents --

MR. GARCIA: Only.

MR. MILLER: -- only because that was what was in the groundwater in each of these areas that we were looking at. That's the only way you can do this study because if we opened it up, we'd find all kinds of stuff and it wouldn't give us anything. It wouldn't tell us where the contamination is coming from. That wasn't the intent of our study.

Our intent was to find if the contamination that's going off-base from Kelly, if that is causing an indoor air issue. And based on our results of our study, we'd have to say no at this time.

MR. SKROBARCEK: So in the single area northeast of Kelly, where you said there was some elevated values there, is -- and you may or may not be able the disclose it, but is there additional -- are there engineering controls that are going to be required for those areas based on those values?

MR. MILLER: No, not at --

MR. SKROBARCEK: No.

MR. MILLER: Because we did not find it indoor air -- it in the indoor air environment.

MR. SKROBARCEK: Okay.

MR. MILLER: That's our -- our guidance basically says that if you go -- if you find it in subslabs, you go indoors first. And if you find it indoors, then you have to do some kind of mitigation.

Because we didn't find it indoors, we don't feel there's a mitigation that's required. What -- and I'll just go out on a limb, but I'd say that maybe there's going to have to be some follow-on sampling on a few of those homes just to make sure that we didn't miss the sampling because of the time frame we did it. You know, somebody had their windows open all night. We don't know.

So that -- that's the only part of it. And I'm just saying that, but that's up to other people other than me. I mean my basic results show that we met the intent of our study, was to determine if we had a complete pathway, which we did show, yes, we do have a complete pathway. But the pathway is such that we have -- we do not have an increase in risk in the indoor air environment.

MR. SKROBARCEK: So the highest level of groundwater contamination for TCE and PCE is underneath Building 360 on that map currently today?

MR. MILLER: Yes.

MR. SKROBARCEK: Okay. And we --

MR. MILLER: I mean I'm assuming. There is a lot of -- well, let me clarify that. Because if you go to Zone 3, I mean there are a number of high concentrations, but Building 360 probably has some of the highest based on what I've seen of any of the values.

MR. SKROBARCEK: Okay. So in --

MR. MILLER: Let me -- let me clarify one other thing. Somebody else asked about buildings in that area. We did look and Paul and some of his staff went with us back when we were first looking at this study. We went and looked at a lot of the buildings in that area and Building 360 is about the only one that's really occupied that has an office type environment in it. Because that's the only thing we could look at at Building 360 is the office space because, like I said, everything else fits into an operating industrial facility and our guidance really doesn't allow us to get involved in that at this time.

MR. SKROBARCEK: So my point was you have the highest level of groundwater contamination in that area. You also have known sub surface, sub soil -- contaminated soil in that area. This is the reason why I stress the point of the quickest we can expedite things, whether it be using this -- the mobile equipment that's available, whatever it takes, we've got 800 to a thousand people in that building.

MR. MILLER: I understand.

MR. SKROBARCEK: To me, it's a no-brainer that we need to expedite whatever the evaluation that needs to take place and whatever engineering controls need to go into place to try to reduce the risk in that area.

MR. MILLER: And if I can say one more thing and I will leave because I know we're trying -- we're getting late here. But when we looked initially at doing this study, what we did with this study -- and some of you may remember, we talked about it before, we did -- we were going to do four locations in the Region Six.

Kelly was one of them because of the public involvement, the public responses wanting us to do this. We looked at Building 360. We thought about it. But there is a accepted remedy that was in place that's got the SVE system, although it's not running yet, because they had some operational start-up problems. We feel that once that system has kicked in that that's going to help alleviate a lot of the problems underneath the building.

And again, Paul's samples that he talked about earlier, I haven't really looked at them carefully, but Paul did say that those -- I don't know if he said it tonight. They do not exceed OSHA standards; do they?

MR. CARROLL: Correct.

MR. MILLER: And currently we're look at Building

360 as being an industrial type structure. Now if there is office space in Building 360, with Paul's further process study he's doing, he determines that some of these offices -- and they take samples in those offices and find the same elevated values, then it may be an issue. Maybe some other engineering controls need to be put in place. Maybe some additional subslab depressurization systems or something has to be put in place to get rid of those -- the vapors in those office space.

Because those people are basically different. You know, if I'm over there cleaning parts all day, that's my job. OSHA has control over my health. They tell me -- they tell the company how much I can be exposed to. But if I'm sitting at my desk all day, that's different. There's no OSHA standard for that really.

That's -- EPA basically says we have an industrial standard that you're exposed to and that's they should be following, which is much lower concentrations. So that's kind of where we're at with Building 360. We're waiting for the rest of Paul's study before we would ever make any -- say anything else about it.

But currently we're waiting -- it's an Air Force lead and that's why we didn't get involved with doing anything on base. We decided to do off-base because the Air Force had done some studies before. EPA and TCEQ had both agreed that

they were good studies and so, because of the public outcry, we decided that maybe some additional sampling was reasonable to help satisfy the concerns that people had.

So I mean I agree with you. I mean I understand what your concern is and I -- trust me, our people have seen the numbers and they think that it's -- it's very high, subslab, and that something has to be done, but then they look at what the Air Force is doing and I think right now that might be the best course of action because we've got to figure out what the processes are that can be potentially exposing other people or causing contamination to come into the building or if it's really just what's been in the slab.

You know, if that was really used like you said, with eight process units, there may be TCE, PCE in the slab and that's going to be off-gassing for years. And that's going to have to be -- it was my understanding that the building had been sealed at one time. The floor was sealed and cracks were all sealed, but maybe -- maybe the building shifted. Maybe those crack are open again and that's opening back up so -- there's a lot of things like that that will have to be looked at. Okay?

MR. MARTINEZ: Anymore questions from members of the RAB for Mr. Miller?

MR. GARCIA: I just have one more quick comment.

Mr. Carroll, I'd like to recommend that you contact

the support staff at the Lackland RAB, the Community Council for Restoration and have that Air Force -- Air Force staff over there give you copies of their -- all of their Leon Creek reports for the past four or five years so that you and your staff can evaluate and you can find any -- see if there's any information or value that you interpret and then give us a report on. That's one of the sources of information that if they don't want to cooperate with me, maybe they will cooperate with you.

MR. CARROLL: Okay.

MR. GARCIA: But I'm not done with them yet. We're still in a war.

MR. MARTINEZ: I apologize to members of the public. We did say that we would have public comment at 8 o'clock.

The exchange between staff and Mr. Miller and the RAB was very very productive and I sincerely hope that we benefited from that, but I would like to ask now staff to please turn on the lights and maybe we can give each one of you an opportunity to address the RAB if you so desire. If you do, could use please identify yourself and then make that comment or question? Any member of the audience? No? Very good.

Then we are then at the last item on our agenda. I mentioned earlier that you had already been mentioning topics for the subsequent RAB meeting agenda and I know that Eddie

and Paul have been making notes, writing notes. I did note that all four members of the RAB community representatives did express an interest on additional, more expansive information. And with all due respect to the cochair -- community cochair, you indicated that maybe you could provide some information, documentation or listing of what it is that you want to ask staff to provide at the next meeting.

MS. ABBOTT: Maybe we can get together and just -- if we have any specific points we want to target.

MR. MARTINEZ: Okay. With all due respect, leave that up to you being the cochair. Mr. Garcia.

MR. GARCIA: Yeah. One of the most important that I want to put on record is the Semiannual Compliance Report. We covered maybe one percent of it today. I would like to see, like I mentioned for the past twelve years, some kind of executive summary so that we have something to develop questions at or comments at so we can learn more what's going on.

You know, and we might have praise for what's -- the good work that they're doing or we might have, like me, looking at the negative all the time and find more negative things that we need to deal with. But it will also be constructive.

Whether good or bad, we all need to get more familiar with the Semiannual Compliance Report, read whatever

we need to or whatever we have to and get some good executive summaries and then provide input to Mr. Carroll.

MS. ABBOTT: Maybe we can target a specific part of that report because I understand the report is pretty huge.

MR. WEEGAR: It's -- depending on which time of the year it comes, it's either two or four volumes.

MS. ABBOTT: Okay. And I think if we try to get a summary on that, that can be quite extensive. But if there's something we have a specific interest in, like, you know, you were talking about Leon Creek, that would be something that I think maybe we can target just for the October meeting, just what information you have just on Leon Creek itself.

MR. GARCIA: Well, if I'm given a hard copy of it, I'll review it and I guarantee I'll give them three or 400 questions on it. That's what I use to do to Patrick McCullough.

MR. MARTINEZ: With all due respect, I think that we -- we're trying to provide quality questions and get quality answers instead of quantity questions and quantity answers.

MR. GARCIA: No, they're all going to be quality questions.

MR. MARTINEZ: We need to prioritize. With all due respect, if you -- I think staff is ready, willing and able to provide you additional information, but from my perspective, I

would ask the members of the RAB to prioritize what it is that you're going to ask of them because we all -- I suspect the volume is this thick (indicating) and to summarize them to like that, --

MS. ABBOTT: It's difficult.

MR. MARTINEZ: -- staff would like maybe more direction from the RAB as to what it is that you're asking for.

Any additional comments from members of the RAB for additional items for subsequent RAB meetings?

MR. MILLER: Given some of the concerns that I heard also besides Leon Creek was people not understanding where you're at making progress. What about summarizing the operating property successfully, demonstrations that you're doing right now and maybe discuss that in the standpoint -- I mean it's -- we're doing the stuff through the Permit Corrective Action Order and all that and it's being reviewed constantly, but this is kind of a separate review that's done just to determine if the systems that have been installed are operating properly and successfully so that you can transfer the property to the leasing authority.

MR. CARROLL: Will that be useful for the RAB?

MS. ABBOTT: Yes.

MR. CARROLL: This is for basically Zones 4 and 5, which are the northern part of base and eastern -- East Kelly

area. We can probably do that at the next RAB.

MR. GONZALES: I just have a question for Mr. Miller. You mentioned that because people may not have kept their homes closed during that 24-hour period, is -- is that something -- and of course, you indicated that it was up to somebody else to determine whether more extensive or follow-up needed to be done. Is that -- is your -- would your suggestion to the RAB be that we may want to look at having your report reviewed or will that be automatically and then will some recommendation come to us and say, You may want to find dollars to further expand the air sampling for that community area or --

MR. MILLER: Well, you know, the report that we'll get will come from another part of EPA and it will be reviewed in our regional office. And basically what our intent always was was to do this limited study and then go to the Air Force and say, Here's what we found, and basically try and turn it over to the Air Force.

This is an Air Force cleanup. They're responsible for the cleanup. And if we felt there was an issue there that maybe it should be followed up on, then we would look to the Air Force to possibly do that.

MR. GONZALES: So you would be making that recommendation on your --

MR. MILLER: Yes. That will be something that will

be coming out once we get the report finalized and my management has a chance to get involved. There will be some recommendations coming out of it, as far as whether we think additional testing needs to be done or anything of that nature.

MR. GONZALES: But we wouldn't know -- I guess if this goes to the Air Force staff, we would know one way or the other what that recommendation was and when can we -- would this be something that we need to target to be asking some time in January since the next meeting after October is January or is this something that we would be asking because you would have results before then?

MR. MILLER: I would hope we have all the results by October, but I don't want to put too many things on the agenda.

MR. GONZALES: So when it comes in we may want to try to --

MR. MILLER: I can touch base -- I can give you by October -- if people would be interested, I can give you another fifteen minutes, and this time I'll try to keep it to fifteen minutes or five minutes even, of the actual results. We wouldn't have to give so much background. Just say this is what we found and then hopefully by then I will have my management's blessing to say, you know, that this is what we would recommend. Somebody follow up.

Probably prefer that we not do it just because of the funding issue. I mean we can spend -- we get limited funds to do this type of stuff and next year somebody wants to spend the money doing something else. So it's like we had the money this year available to do it.

MR. GONZALES: I would like that on the report. And just for a personal comment, I appreciate it the approach you took and you're taking the extra step to notify those community members that actually opened up their homes to help with this effort and I think the people and entities should work with the staff issues.

MR. MILLER: I mean it was very intrusive for them so that's why we wanted to give them the benefit of hearing us in person describe it to them.

MR. MARTINEZ: Any other comments or questions, from members of the RAB? Yes, ma'am.

MS. ABBOTT: I know you mentioned we ought to target the city and can ask them, you know, to get a little bit more involved.

MR. GARCIA: Yes.

MS. ABBOTT: Have we asked the city council to come and maybe be a part of the audience before? I know Patti Radle is no longer our representative in this area, but I don't think I've heard too much from our representative in this party -- in this area. I'd be happy to draft a letter as

a personal invitation to our council representative to come and sit in a meeting.

MR. GARCIA: We've done that before, but sometimes they don't respond. The only one that ever came before was Patty Radle.

MS. ABBOTT: Doesn't hurt to try again; right?

MR. GARCIA: Because we need to supply --

MR. EDDIE MARTINEZ: We send -- we send an advanced copy of the agenda I believe.

MS. ABBOTT: Did you? Did they ever respond?

MR. EDDIE MARTINEZ: No, it's not really a response. It's just them showing up. Just like your office also, give them a copy. We have them on our mailing list.

MR. GARCIA: One thing we mentioned was that the city -- during our discussion, we mentioned the city and their discharges and some of the problems from the city. If they're part of the problem, maybe we can find out what they're doing and who is discharging where and what and maybe that's part of our problem also.

Maybe we can do a preliminary study on that also to see how much -- you know, because the city also -- you know, I've caught city employees dumping -- cleaning out their asphalt truck with -- type A asphalt with butadine in it. I've caught them washing it down the drain and stuff like that, you know, and I advise you to take pictures and take an

action against the city.

And you know, I know they're part of the problem and they don't want to be part of the solution. That's the problem. They're part of the problem but they don't want to be told they're part of the problem even though they're causing part of the problem.

MS. ABBOTT: Well, maybe if they hear from more of us in the community and not just your agenda, maybe a few more of us that can contact them and say, We'd like to have your presence here, just like, you know, y'all honored Mr. Quintanilla in the beginning. I never got to meet him, but I understand that he had quite a passion for the community and what was good, what affected the community. And those kind of commitments need to be commended.

You know, and like the people that you went to in the housing area, I know some people that live there that saw the bus and saw that taking place and they were asking me, Hey, we saw this in the area, do you know what's going on around here? You know, and all of a sudden people are asking questions.

Well, maybe it takes more people asking questions to ask their councilman, Do you know what's going on? This -- you know, Kelly had a bus in our area, do you know what's going on? And it will take more than just the agenda being mailed. Maybe we need to send them a little note.

MR. GARCIA: That will be good if we draft -- Ms. Abbott to write a draft letter for review that will be signed by Mrs. Abbott and Mr. Carroll for us to submit to city officials asking for their participation and asking them for their comments or whatever you --

MS. ABBOTT: Just politely inviting them to come and be part of our audience.

MR. MARTINEZ: Excellent idea.

MR. EDDIE MARTINEZ: We can provide y'all with a distribution list --

MS. ABBOTT: Oh, that would help. Thank you.

MR. EDDIE MARTINEZ: -- where we send all our copies.

MR. MARTINEZ: Anymore comments?

MR. WEEGAR: This is -- the main thing is, one, I just want to be clear. I'm afraid maybe something was misunderstood when I was talking about with the -- the City of San Antonio owns -- the City of San Antonio owns storm water discharge pipelines as far as Leon Creek. They take storm water runoff from a large part of San Antonio.

But I'm not alleging that the city is dumping something down these storm waters. It's just they're -- they're owned by the city and they take, you know, storm water runoff from a large part of San Antonio and then I would remind everybody -- I don't know how many folks were on the

RAB back then, but the city council did have representatives on the RAB and I think they were actually voted off the RAB at some point in the not-too-distant past and they I think just not chose to be back on the RAB again.

MR. GARCIA: They missed too many meetings so -- at least that's what I --

MR. WEEGAR: I remember members of the RAB that are no longer on the RAB who were -- who told them their presence was no longer welcome or something to that extent.

MS. ABBOTT: Really?

MR. WEEGAR: Yeah.

MR. GARCIA: That was mainly the RAB members that didn't live in the affected area. That's why that happened.

Adam Antwine forced a lot of people off the RAB because they didn't live or work in the contaminated area, even though they had a passion for this like Mr. Quintanilla and myself. They didn't live or work in the affected area and they -- they got forced off.

MR. SKROBARCEK: But a letter is appropriate to invite them.

MR. GARCIA: Mr. Miller, one more question. On the Semiannual Compliance Report, does the EPA and the TCEQ review the entire document and then send comments to Mr. Carroll on what you think is right, what you think is wrong and everything in between?

MR. MILLER: We look at -- EPA probably looks at more selected parts of it because it's a -- it's more of a compliance type. It's required by the permit. There are parts of it that we had looked at such as the Leon Creek sampling and probably more of the groundwater data we'd kind of take a look at because that plays into what our role really is. When are the systems that are in place operating properly and successfully, like I talked about a while ago. That's our real role in this whole process is to give, you know, or comments back and, you know, our review of the documents so the Air Force obviously --

MR. GARCIA: Are you going to ask --

MR. MILLER: -- is training people properly.

MR. GARCIA: -- Mr. Weegee to provide copies to the RAB members on what you think? Wee -- what?

MR. WEEGAR: Weegar, not Weegee.

MR. GARCIA: Sorry. You and Mr. W. can send us copes of your comments so actually we can see them also.

MR. WEEGAR: Actually a copy of every letter that I write to the Air Force on all things Kelly related, there is a copy sent to the Restoration Advisory Board cochair. That has been done for ten years.

MR. GARCIA: Then Mr. Carroll, I'll go with you. Can you send us copies, Mr. Carroll, of the letters that you review and express your concerns on what needs to be corrected

or modified from the comments you receive from these two gentlemen?

MR. CARROLL: Aren't you talking about the community cochair?

MR. WEEGAR: Right. Let me -- let me be clear. Every document that I review related to Kelly, I address a comment letter or approval letter, whatever it is, a copy goes to the BRAC Environmental Coordinator, who is now Mr. Carroll. All right? Also a copy of that letter is sent to the RAB cochair. I believe there's a RAB cochair library or something like that that those letters go into.

MR. EDDIE MARTINEZ: Mark, we do actually provide copies in your packet if we do get those letters from you guys and so you'll have them there. We didn't have any this time around.

MR. SKROBARCEK: So back to the -- we started with the executive summary and findings. It was regarding the executive summary for -- for the document. Is that something that would be considered a -- you pointed out something that I didn't know exactly what you were looking at that you said it's summarized in this document. But is that something that you guys would consider so we don't have to go through the three foot of documents? We can actually read an executive summary and find out what the gist of the document is and then ask questions based on the results.

MR. WEEGAR: Well, I believe that the Semiannual Compliance Plan Report has an executive summary.

MR. SKROBARCEK: Okay.

MR. WEEGAR: But I think in the past the -- what we envision as an executive summary in a document like that and what I think Mr. Garcia has previously asked for as an executive summary are not the same thing. I think Mr. Garcia is looking for something that is much more detailed and much more involved than what one would normally consider an executive summary.

I mean executive summary is typically a page-and-a-half, two pages long, maybe three. I don't think Mr. Garcia is actually -- has that envisioned as an executive summary. But it's there. All any RAB member has to do is avail themselves of the report and there's a summary, there's recommendations and conclusions in that document.

MR. SKROBARCEK: So we will take an action to review the document or the executive summary of document and if it doesn't meet what we think is appropriate or needs additional information, we'll request that at the next RAB.

MR. CARROLL: You will? The RAB will?

MR. SKROBARCEK: I'll find the time, yes.

MR. MARTINEZ: Clarification. Does that mean that every member of the RAB that wants to review that document is requesting a document?

MR. CARROLL: It's available on the administrative record and also at the San Antonio Library at whatever address we give downtown.

MR. EDDIE MARTINEZ: Downtown, 600 North Soledad.

MS. ABBOTT: Administrator record is located where?

MR. EDDIE MARTINEZ: We can distribute the executive summary as a PDF document to you guys just to make it easier.

MR. MARTINEZ: Any questions?

MR. WEEGAR: Yes. And in response to your other question, I do go through that document volume by volume, map by map and where I find -- again, understand, this is -- this is four volumes of a lot of analytical data. Do I point out every nitpick that I can possibly find in there? No. I look at it. It is -- I view it as a snapshot in time identifying overall what is the conditions of the environmental plumes, the contamination, Leon Creek, and I look at it in that context.

And if I see a situation -- again, I have made a number of comments concerning PCBs with the fish tissue, sediment, things like that, and I make those specific comments. But I look at it as a snapshot, something I'm using just to get an overall, every six-month idea of are these systems that are out there and that are going to be working for fifteen years, twenty years, fifty years to clean up this groundwater contamination, does it appear that they're doing

generally what they're supposed to be doing or have they completely missed something, you know.

If that was the case, I can assure you I would be making very pointed comments that, you know, groundwater monitoring shows that your remediation system at site X is -- has failed.

MR. GARCIA: Okay. All right. I understand how you do that now. It's just that I am a lot harder on highway contractors and railroad and I like to crucify them all and I do a lot more extensive review of my documents.

MR. WEEGAR: Well, I didn't say I didn't do an extensive review. I just try to identify -- I choose to pick my battles when it comes to writing my comments. I mean I'm -- I understand that the -- this is a long-term remediation project and that these are snapshots and I use them for that purpose.

MR. GARCIA: Okay. Okay.

MR. MARTINEZ: We're getting close to the end. We are at the end of our agenda. I believe that Paul and Eddie have noted the items that the RAB would like to have presented to them at the next -- at least the next two RAB meetings. Not everything may be possibly presented in the next meeting, at the next meeting, but I do believe that they do have a good feeling of what it is that the community members of the RAB -- and thank you think for those requests -- have been asking

for.

Any final comments from members of the RAB? Questions? If not -- yes, sir.

MR. GARCIA: I just want to say, Mr. Carroll, I hope things change and I hope you'll work with us, especially people like me that are hardheaded, hardnosed and take this very very seriously because my dad and most of the members of my family died from cancer and I have a feeling and that was related a lot to the chemicals that they used while they worked in Hangar 375, Building 360 and the chrome plating shop and the engine shop because I had all my relatives, male, uncles and my dad die from cancer from working, I believe, at Kelly Air Force Base. That's why I take a very serious passion for all of this and I just want to let you know that.

MR. CARROLL: Thank you.

MR. GARCIA: Thank you. That was very worthwhile noting.

If there are no more additional further comments, questions, I remind you that the next RAB meeting is the 14th of October, 6:30 in this same facility.

And for the members of the audience, there are a few copy of the materials in color if you would so care to take one home.

Thank you.

(PROCEEDINGS ENDED AT 8:39)

STATE OF TEXAS)

COUNTY OF BEXAR)

I, Gina K. May, Certified Shorthand Reporter in and for the State of Texas, hereby certify that this transcript is a true and correct a record as possible, transcribed by me through computer-aided transcription.

I further certify that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties in the action in which this proceeding was taken, and further that I am not financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of the action.

WITNESS MY OFFICIAL HAND, this the _____ day of _____, _____.

_____

Gina K. May, CSR
Texas CSR 5273
Expiration: 12/31/08
FEDERAL COURT REPORTERS
Firm Registration No. 79
10100 Reunion Place , Ste. 660
San Antonio, Texas 78216
(210) 340-6464 (210) 341-5533
/s/ Gina K. May