KELLY RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD

October 14th, 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.
Daniel Gonzales
Nazarite Perez
Brian Skrobarcek

RAB Government Members:
Rafael Aviles, Port Authority
Paul Carroll, Air Force Real Property Agency (AFRPA), Government Co-Chair
Tommy Camden, San Antonio Metropolitan Health Department (SAMHD)
Kyle Cunningham, San Antonio Metropolitan Health Department (SAMHD), Alternate
Gary Miller, US Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA)
Mark Weegar, Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ)
Greg Lyssy, USEPA

AFRPA Staff:
Luis Medina
Armando Perez, Public Affairs Officer

Elizabeth Coira, Contractor
Brian Howard, Contractor
Jose Martinez, Facilitator
Larry Tyner, Contractor
Ginger Mullins, Contractor

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

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

Community Members:
Mildred Aboe
Melissa Berck
Rose Bormaid
Katia Castillo
Tuesday Cochran
Jasmine Daduya
Cammie Dobbs
Cynthia Flores
Yvette Hernandez
Andrea Johnson
Franky Kollington
Scott Lawlin
Jennifer McCam
Isa McMeasmin
Kakuta Minami
Bea Panek
Sean Prather
Taryn Shippey
Betty Yooseencio

(Proceedings began at 6:37 p.m.)

MR. MARTINEZ: Good evening. It is a little bit past 6:30. We try to start on time so that we can try to end on time. Welcome to the October 14th meeting of the former Kelly Air Force Base Restoration Advisory Board. My name is Jose Martinez. My only role is to facilitate. The -- the real purpose of the meeting here is for the members of the community to exchange information with the members of the RAB and of course for the RAB members, both citizen members and government official members, to discuss the progress of the Environmental Restoration Program at the former Kelly Air Force Base.

I'd like to -- I don't know whether all of you received packets, but you will see soon on the -- on the screen the agenda that we're going to be going through. The agenda is unique because we have the introduction of a new public affairs specialist at the Air Force Real Property Agency assigned here to the former Kelly AFB; a report by the Port San Antonio hurricane -- Hurricane Kike -- Ike update, I apologize; the usual very detailed, very interesting reports on the ongoing environmental restoration.

And then, as usual, at 8 o'clock we cease the actual discussion of the activity ongoing at the moment for a fifteen-minute citizen involvement participation process. We ask that a maximum of three minutes per individual, for a

total of fifteen, be the time allotted to that, again, because we have a very short and very tight agenda.

After that, there's going to be a brief discussion of the Restoration Advisory Board membership issues. And last, but not least, from members themselves, a discussion of what items will be, should be, discussed at the next RAB meeting.

I'd like to also state that from this point on until about 8 o'clock, at the point where we cease the actual discussion, the discussions allowed are among members of the RAB, basically the individuals seated around the table. If you, the members of the audience, have any comments, questions, we would ask that you jot them down and wait until the 8 o'clock hour for you to then have the opportunity to ask or make comments.

So the other issue we were waiting on, the quorum rules according to the RAB Rule Charter is that we must have nine members, six of which members have to be community RAB members. And as I can count, we have five. So we at the moment cannot take action of the approval of the minutes from the last meeting.

So with that said, I would like to then ask Paul Carroll to give a brief overview of the purpose of the program at the former Kelly AFB.

MR. CARROLL: This will just take a minute. Our

role in the environmental field here at Kelly is to evaluate sources of contamination that may have entered the soil or groundwater and address those issues for the former base. This is a -- what we all a BRAC base, which means Base Realignment and Closure. It was named on the BRAC list in 1995, but it closed in 2001.

But even before 1995, in about 1982, we started investigating all of these sites around Kelly and looking for environmental contamination that may have come from different sources, such as underground storage tanks where they stored gasoline, heating -- heating oil and stuff like that, and from leaks from lines, from degreasing operation, chlorinated solvents, things like that, that usually result in spills and contamination that entered the soil and groundwater.

So over these past about ten or fifteen years we've been looking for this -- these sources of contamination. And we have hundreds, if not thousands, of groundwater monitoring locations where we monitor groundwater or we tested the soil. We've evaluated -- as you can see on these boards over here, after the RAB or whatever, you can kind of walk around, take a look at the different types of sites.

We've got radiological sites; we've got petroleum storage tanks; oil water separators; we've got, you know, all kind of other environmental sites that are -- that have been closed. And well over 85 percent of the sites have been

closed. The sites in the blue are closed. The ones in the white are pending closure. So we're still working on some of those -- some of the rest of those sites.

Over here, a couple of basewide -- it actually extends a couple of miles off the base. There are plumes of chlorinated solvents that originated on -- on or by the base that have traveled off-base.

Those are the biggest areas that we have to address here at Kelly. There's TCE, trichlorethylene, which is a cleaning solvent. They used it to clean parts with. Tetrachlorethylene is another chlorinated solvent and it's a similar product. They use it quite often in dry cleaning. They also did parts cleaning for that -- with that, too.

So we've got to look at all these constituents and install remedies that will address that contamination in the groundwater and soil. So a lot of the soils, we'll do dig and haul, remedial actions to take care of the soils and the groundwater. We either do -- there's several different remedies that we can do for groundwater including iron reactive iron filing walls where the water flows through and treats the water.

We treat it also with things like vegetable oil, which gives the naturally occurring bacteria in the soil a food source in order to degrade the contaminants in the -- in the groundwater. And we do several other types of -- of

remedies that we'll be talking about tonight. That's kind of a general overview of what we're doing.

MR. MARTINEZ: Thank you, Paul. I was waiting for one last member of the community member on the RAB. That not being the case, I'd like to ask each member of the RAB to briefly state your name and your representation. And Kyle, I believe you have an introduction to make. Mr. Garcia.

MR. GARCIA: My name is Rodrigo Garcia. I live in the affected area just north of the runway.

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

MR. WEEGAR: My name is Mark Weegar. I work for the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality and I'm the Kelly Environmental Cleanup Project Manager.

MR. MILLER: I'm Gary Miller with EPA Region Six out of Dallas and the EPA Project Manger.

MS. ABBOTT: I'm Beverly Abbott. I'm the principal of St. John Berchmans School and I live and work in the affected area.

MR. AVILES: Rafael Aviles. I'm the public information officer for Port San Antonio.

MS. CUNNINGHAM: I'm Kyle Cunningham. I work for the San Antonio Metropolitan Health District. I'm the program manager for the Public Center for Environmental Health.

I'd like to introduce you to Mr. Tommy Camden. He's

our new environmental health administrator at the San Antonio Metropolitan Health District. And I am the RAB alternate and I believe Mr. Camden will be the RAB member so -- after tonight. Anyway, thank you very much.

Tom, would like to say something?

MR. CAMDEN: My pleasure to be here. I'm excited to be here in San Antonio. I'm new to San Antonio. I'm originally from Lubbock. I've been in public health for 27 years as -- prior to coming here, I was the health director in Lubbock as well as the Director for Environmental Compliance up there.

We had some of the same issues in Lubbock. We had Reese Air Force Base there that had its own share of contamination type problems and trying to get that base completely closed and opened back up for public business. So some of the same issues, but I'm excited to be here.

On the environmental health side, we'll be dealing, well, with general environmental health issues, food and sanitation, vector controls, public health preparedness, and then certainly some of the issues that -- that Kyle and Linda back here deal with here at Kelly. So I'm excited to be here.

MR. MARTINEZ: Thank you, sir.

MR. GONZALES: Daniel Gonzalez. I work in the affected area. I have lived -- I myself lived in the affected area some time back as well.

MR. PEREZ: My name is Nazarite Perez and I live in the contaminated area. And I'm very involved in this so-called contamination. I'm a San Antonio River Authority member, state official, and, well, I'm -- I'm here to do all I can to help out my fellow man. Thank you.

MR. MARTINEZ: Thank you, Mr. Perez.

The next item on the agenda is an introduction of a new public affairs officer. Paul?

MR. CARROLL: I'd like to point out Mr. Armando Perez standing back here at the back. He's our new public affairs specialist. I want y'all to welcome him aboard. He's taking over for Sonja. Welcome.

MR. ARMANDO PEREZ: Thank you. Like Mr. Carroll said, I'm taking over Sonja Coderre's position. I'm sure all of you are familiar with her for the last three years. Very new to the RAB. I've been caught up to speed about what's going on here at Kelly for the past few weeks.

I hail from Randolph Air Force Base. I spent some time there, base level, at the wing, 14 FTW, and at AETC. So I'm very familiar with how the military works and whatnot and hopefully that I can continue to do just as good a job as Sonja did when she was here.

So I'm glad to be here, glad to serve here at Kelly and look forward to meeting all of you and becoming tenured here. Thank you.

MR. MARTINEZ: Thank you. Thank you very much. The next item on the agenda, very quickly, Mr. Rafael Aviles from the Port San Antonio reporting on Hurricane Ike activities.

MR. AVILES: I need to stand up or just sit down? First time.

Well, my name is Rafael Aviles. I'm the public information officer for Port San Antonio and here to tell you a little bit about the Port's role during the hurricanes that we saw go through.

First off, I want to let everybody know that this hurricane season, although we had three hurricanes where we set up a staging area, we were ready to receive evacuees, we only received evacuees during Hurricane Ike. And just to give you some idea of how much of an impact this hurricane had on our region, a lot of people remember Hurricane Katrina a few years ago where we opened up Building 171, which is going to be occupied by the Air Force by the end of next year.

But we opened that up to the evacuees back then. And at the time we -- I think we housed 6,000. During Ike, the one that just most recently hit, we put evacuees -- we were called upon, this time, to house evacuees. That's usually not our role anymore, but we were called upon to house evacuees. And this time around we took in 6,500 evacuees. Over 9,000 did come in to San Antonio from throughout the areas on the coast, checked in, made sure that they did have a

safe haven. We're talking people who have special needs, people who just came for a place to stay.

The Port's role in this whole thing as part of the Alamo Regional Command Center is we are the staging area for all of the buses and emergency vehicles that are called upon should an evacuation take place. So many of you who work here at Port San Antonio, or if you were ever unlucky enough to wake up early in the morning and see my ugly mug on television, then you know we had 700 buses at one time and at our largest point we had over 1700 buses out here as well as 700 ambulances and emergency people ready to go and evacuate.

Of those, I think we air-lifted 200 -- approximately 200 people from the area and we also, again, as I mentioned, had 9,000 people come into San Antonio. 6500 were housed here.

Again, our role is to serve as the staging area. What we do is when the buses come in, they make sure that they have proper inspection, they are looked over again by volunteers just to make sure that we don't have a repeat of what happened during Hurricane Rita I believe where Interstate 10 was clogged and one of the buses actually caught fire enroute and killed some people on board. So the buses are inspected here before they make the trip out there.

The drivers are housed out here. And should they be called into the evacuation, then they're sent out from here.

They're also brought back in here just to make sure that everyone -- we have an accounting of every person that has evacuated. Because we learned during Katrina that there wasn't proper accounting. People were just calling their friend and family saying, Hey, this is the shelter where I'm at, come and hang out with me. And people were calling up looking for their friends and family members and nobody had any idea where they were at.

So the highways lead them to Port San Antonio. At that time, we make -- we process even, even if you -- for those people who do have friends and family members, we don't ask them to come. Just go to your friends' and family. But if you do need some sort of shelter, come here. We'll check you in, we'll make sure we've got a spot for you and that you are accounted for. If you do have pets, the city then takes them, tags them, puts them in with the population here, and when the green light is given for people to return back to the evacuated area, then they're reunited with their pets.

So again, we had at our high point 6500. Two weeks ago, we were down to 300 and I believe on Friday, two weeks ago, the last of them left and so now our Building 1536 is empty and everyone who was accounted here has returned home. It's been a pretty eventful hurricane season, as everybody knows. It ends November 29th I believe so we're crossing our fingers that we don't get hit by anymore. But should we be

called in again, the Port is ready to serve in any way possible to make sure that things go as smoothly as possible.

That's my time.

MR. MARTINEZ: Thank you. Thank you very much. On a personal note, I was in Corpus the day that I saw -- Luckily, I was ahead of a mile long trail of buses. I say lucky because I would have hated to have been caught behind those buses. But it was quite impressive, very very organized, very structured. Everybody was going the same speed and I just imagined the number of people that would actively benefit from those buses getting away from the coast. It made me proud to be a Texan that day. It was really very exciting to see that.

Now we come to the portion of the agenda where we actually make presentations and the RAB members have the ability to discuss with staff. The first item, presented by Paul Carroll, Building 360 update.

MR. CARROLL: Okay. Talk about this and afterwards we can have -- we can hear questions from the RAB.

Building 360, as a lot of you know, especially on the RAB, is a very large U-shaped building in the middle of the industrial part of Kelly. Couple of things we've done there, we've installed some horizontal wells in which we extract vapor from underneath the building where there's contamination in the soil to treat that contamination.

That system that we use there is called a soil vapor extraction system. One of the things we had to do with the SVE system as it's called is to put a big muffler on it because it was very loud. We've -- we briefed this at the previous RAB. We've done the noise abatement. We've installed the muffler on the system.

The noise from the system is significantly reduced. I think really the main thing that makes noise now is the electric engine, electric motor from that. So, you know, we have the noise survey that we have to do to ensure that it meets guidelines and that will be done within the next few weeks.

We'll continue to monitor and evaluate the performance and effectiveness of this system and the noise reduction equipment in order to minimize the -- the noise impact. All right. Next, Elizabeth. Next.

With the noise abatement complete, the operation has been restored. It's -- since we started it up very recently, we've recently done start-up sampling to determine the effectiveness of -- of the system. The system is showing that it is removing lots of contamination from the soil underneath the building. So it is working effectively as intended. We'll continue to operate the system. We'll have to make some adjustments to meet technical and regulatory goals as we go and continue to extract the most contamination that we can

from that building. And then we don't have mass removal rates yet, but we'll -- we'll compile those and get those for the next RAB meeting.

The other thing we're doing on Building 360 is there were some vapors inside the building that we measured prior to start-up of the system. And we've been looking at the potential source of those vapors, especially if they're Air Force-caused, and they may be coming from underneath the building.

We had reported that we were going to do indoor air sampling to try to track down the location of where this -- these vapors maybe be coming from underneath the building. That's probably not going to be doable since we've got to -- we've got an industrial activity going on in the building, there are some solvents being used in the building, and there's probably going to be too much interference for us to be able to pinpoint any potential sources from underneath the slab.

So what we're going to do is to go in and do some subslab sampling without doing any indoor air sampling before that. And we're going to try to pinpoint any additional sources over what we've already found underneath that building and we're developing that approach our contract -- with our contractor HGL, HydroGeoLogic.

We'll show the next slide. I think it shows a map.

I don't know if it shows it very well here. If you can -- you got really good eyes, you can probably see some cross hatches right in this area. That's where the area of contamination is. We're going to do some additional sampling over in this area to make sure that we've got it all.

Any questions about 360?

MR. GONZALES: Brian, I know you had a quite a few concerns with some of the issues going on. Have you seen some activity that suggests that we're moving along on that?

MR. SKROBARCEK: Yes. And we actually had a meeting last week and discussed follow-on action beyond what's been presented here. So I'm satisfied with the activity that's been going on.

MR. CARROLL: Okay. Anything else?

MR. GARCIA: How long is the system going to work?

MR. CARROLL: Couple of years or until we get the soil cleaned up. It's got to meet TCEQ regulatory goals, which are risk reduction standards, typical cleanup values that we go to for soils.

Of course the groundwater is being treated also by a permeable reactive barrier wall there with iron filings so that water will be -- groundwater will continue to be treated until it meets the EPA MCLs. That's our cleanup goals.

MR. GONZALES: The only thing I would like to comment is the fact that y'all were able to meet your -- your

goal of getting the SVE up and -- up and running and that hopefully the noise abatement efforts you've taken are going to be satisfactory to the people and reduce the noise from that equipment.

MR. CARROLL: We're glad to finally get it going, too.

MR. SKROBARCEK: Look forward to seeing the results at the next RAB.

MR. CARROLL: We'll get those together.

The next system that we're going to talk about is Building 301. At this Building 301, it's got a system that we have installed called electrical resistive heating. This system was brought on-line in July of 2008.

Those of you who are unfamiliar with the process, we drill holes in the ground. We install a couple of things in -- in the hole. One is a -- basically a heating unit, somewhat similar to what you'd have in a toaster oven except for a much larger scale. It actually heats the soil columns in -- in the groundwater and the goal is to heat up this groundwater that's got contamination in it and it -- the contamination, which is chlorinated solvents, will turn to vapors. These vapors are collected by a soil vapor extraction system that's part of that same system and then treated and treated down to acceptable levels. So that's kind of how that system works.

It requires moist soil conditions in order to heat the soil. And we needed -- we identified that we needed to put more moisture in about sixty of the -- sixty of the wells that we had. I think there's about 80 or 90 total. So about two-thirds of those were not heating uniformly so we added moisture to those wells by drip lines to inject the water into those wells. And then from that, we started about the middle of July.

The -- at the start-up, the temperatures were about 80 degrees Fahrenheit in the soil and then as of the end of September, they've risen to about 144 degrees average. So we've done some heating out there. We took a look at the site today and it -- think it may have been the sun that was heating us, but we were pretty warm out there, too.

We've increased about 63.6 degrees Fahrenheit average over the first two months. Projections indicate the system will reach the design temperature of about 92 degrees centigrade, which is about 197 degrees Fahrenheit, in late October or early November of this year. All right.

Next. Here's a graph that shows the subsurface temperatures. We've got, as you can see, five -- I don't know if you can read that. At different depths, we monitored the temperatures as we go and these are the average temperatures in parts of that -- part of that system.

Some of the temperatures show higher at different

levels. That's the different layers of soils and gravels and things that you -- that we are heating. As you can see, they heat at different -- different rates. But we are reaching an average of about 130 something degrees.

Okay. Next. The contamination that we're trying to remove is tetrachlorethylene, PCE, and its daughter products TCE, CIS-1, 2-DCE and vinyl chloride. Those have been in varying concentrations in the samples. We've collected samples during the -- during the process so we can tell what we're getting out. We've seen other VOCs in addition to PCE and the daughter products and they're being removed by the -- by granular activated carbon units, which is intended to capture all the VOCs that come out of the ground.

One calculation that we've done based on the volume of air and measurements of the VOCs extracted indicate that we've taken out about 120 pounds of VOCs out of the soil since -- since we started up the end of July. So the GAC, the granular activated carbon canisters, have already saturated and had to be changed out on October 9th.

So this -- this system seems to be working very well. And it looks to me like I believe we're on schedule for what we intended as the cleanup of this to be just short of a year.

Here's another graph of the cumulative contaminant removal. As you can see, it's gone up to a little bit over

400 pounds.

Any questions?

MR. GONZALES: Just one question just for my knowledge here. You have reference to 420 pounds of VOC being removed. How is that significant to us? Do we know how many pounds we're trying to remove? I know that one of you stated that we should reach cleanup by -- in a year, but...

MR. CARROLL: Right. I'm not sure if we know the numbers on that. We now know what the contaminant levels were from our measurements from our samples that we took. And I don't remember those off the top of my head. But I can get those and we can report that at the next RAB.

MR. GONZALES: I think that's -- I mean if we're going to -- that seems to be one of the few that we can see progress like probably within our tenure --

MR. CARROLL: Yeah.

MR. GONZALES: -- in some cases. And so it would be interesting to me to see how it progresses maybe quarterly.

MR. CARROLL: We'll take a look at that and I'll get the -- try to get -- I don't know if we've done -- sometime we do calculations on the estimated mass before we start and sometime we just go on what the concentrations are of the chemicals. But we'll try to find whichever of those and report that.

MR. GONZALES: And maybe we should put a target date

from the RAB stating, you know, let's go back and see where we're at in September if we reach, you know, the goal.

MR. CARROLL: Okay.

MR. SKROBARCEK: Paul, with this treatment technology, is this something we would expect to see larger mass removal in the beginning and then start to trail off?

MR. CARROLL: As -- yeah, it's pretty typical of most cleanups that it does -- the more you have, the more efficient it is and it will -- it probably will level off some as you go. Based on modeling though, it does show that somewhere -- a little bit -- 300 to 360 days, somewhere around there, is what it's going to take to clean it up.

MR. WEEGAR: Paul, what is the process you go by as far as determining when you have achieved your cleanup goals? I mean I think I understand, but you might let the RAB or maybe the community know what the process is for not just simply monitoring the pounds of contaminant removed.

MR. CARROLL: Right. We -- once we determine by monitoring that we think we are getting close or have gotten to our cleanup goal, we'll go back in and take -- actually take soil and groundwater samples to determine whether we've reached those goals or not and then we send those into TCEQ or EPA and get their concurrence on it.

MR. MARTINEZ: Okay. The next item on the agenda is a presentation by Mr. Gary Miller, EPA, on a soil vapor

intrusion study. It's a follow-up.

MR. MILLER: I just want to briefly kind of update the RAB on what -- what happened in the past. As most of you remember, last May we did some sampling in some homes around Kelly. We did 20 homes altogether.

Go to the next slide, if you would. Go the next one because I think it shows the overall plume.

You can kind of -- as some of you may remember, up in the upper -- the north area up here, the small plume at the very top, we did some sampling in that neighborhood, which is the 34th Street PRB area, and then we did some homes off of East Kelly, back up here in the northeast area of East Kelly. Those results, we did finalize them and I believe -- I think the last RAB I did present those results to the -- to the members here.

Basically we did find some indoor air -- an indoor air connection. We did find some subslab values that -- that were high enough that they potentially could have caused a problem, but we took indoor air sampling -- we did indoor air sampling in those five homes and we did not find a result in the indoor air that would cause us concern that would even be above any kind of a minimal risk level.

So but, because of concerns expressed by the community and some other members, we decided to do a -- a seasonal study. So we've decided to expand the study and go

back in January, February time frame. What our goal is is to try and go back to the five homes we did indoor air sampling in, because those had the highest subslab values, and most -- all those homes again were in the northern area, that far north plume which is off of -- I forgot the name of the street. But I have --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Growden?

MS. ABBOTT: Growden?

MR. AVILES: 34th?

MR. MILLER: 34th but I'm talking going --

MR. GARCIA: Kelly Gardens?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Growden?

MR. MILLER: Growden. Growden Road is the one that runs right along the edge of Kelly. And the neighborhood is up in here. There was five homes -- there were five homes up there that had indoor air value. Well, not indoor air values, but subslab values that were at a level that we thought should cause us to go and sample indoor air. So we're going to resample the indoor air in those homes in January, February.

In addition to that, because of other concerns expressed to us during a public forum that was held after this, back in the summertime, we have agreed to add ten homes. So kind of where we're at right now and I -- Stephanie Smith from Congressman Gonzalez' office over here and Kyle Cunningham have been helping us -- Kyle Cunningham from the

Metro Health have been helping us kind of come up with some areas to sample and maybe some possible homeowners that are interested in having their homes sampled.

What we have right now is we have a couple of areas. That's all we're going to kind of present to you tonight is we're looking at maybe a few homes in this particular area between Main Base and East Kelly and then possibly a few homes out on the far reaches of the plume that comes off of East Kelly, this darker green area.

There are a couple of areas out there that we'd like to take samples. And possibly we would do -- we're trying to get a variety of homes. We're going to do ten additional homes. We'll do a few here, a few up here. This is off of Commercial and I forgot the other street, but anyway, where the two PRBs are that Kelly has installed.

We would do a few homes there and a few homes over in this area and possibly a home or two back down in here just to kind of get a wide coverage and just see if there's any difference in those results. I mean those are very low concentrations in the plume compared to the -- to the 34th Street area. And the 34th Street area, if you remember them, had very high concentrations in one well. We were not able to duplicate those concentrations in the wells that the Air Force installed in the neighborhood.

During the summer, they took some samples out of a

few wells they installed and the concentrations were very low, but we still had high soil vapor intrusions or soil -- subslab soil gas values. So we decided to maybe expand this and take these ten additional homes.

So if any of the members of the public -- you know, don't make comments now obviously, but during the public comment period, if you want to get up and you have any particular areas you're interested in or if you want to just hand them to me on a piece of paper, I'd be happy to look at them. Or if you want to get them to Kyle Cunningham later, she's local, she's here, or Stephanie Smith, we would be -- we would like to take them. We're interested in areas the public thinks that we should look at for the soil vapor intrusion study.

We kind of just want to finalize this, to kind of get to an end point with the study and -- and we think the seasonal variation study in the 34th Street area will do that, but we're willing to take a few additional homes in other areas that are at lower concentrations obviously to groundwater. Anyway, that's all I've got. Anybody from the RAB has any comments? Yes, sir.

MR. WEEGAR: Just a question. The reason I guess to do the seasonal variation sampling as you did the additional sampling in the summertime and assume people would have -- or spring, people would have their windows or homes open, there

would be a lot of air moving through the homes so you're going do it in the wintertime, January, February, so that's typically going to be colder. Folks would have their homes closed up, the heaters or whatever, so you would expect that that would be kind of a worst-case scenario if there is potential vapor intrusion. I guess that's why you're doing it. That's why the seasonal variation study is being done?

MR. MILLER: That's correct. I mean basically that's the exact reason why. I mean because when we did the sampling, what we noticed -- I mean we -- normally in Texas, what you would notice in an area is that people would -- because we use air-conditioning so much down here, it doesn't matter. You keep your house closed as much in the summer as you do in wintertime because it's too hot outside.

But, you know, the area we were in during that time frame, it wasn't that hot. People were in and out of their house the whole time we were there. A couple of houses in particular that we sampled indoor air in, we -- we had asked that they keep the house closed and when we came back to pull up our canisters, we noticed that they had -- they had the front doors open, you know, and stuff like that. So I mean that was a typical lifestyle for them.

So we think that we possibly could have had diluted indoor air samples so we're hoping if we come back in the wintertime, we'll see what happens. I mean the values we got

in the subslab were elevated, but they were still not of a value that even if we took them in our normal attenuation factors, we would not have gotten a real high number indoor air, but because the community has expressed a concern, we're trying to follow up on it.

So again, I mean it's just -- we're looking at homes -- we're looking for homes -- mostly homes that we're looking at now, they appear to be pier and beam construction, which is a little different than last time. Last time we did basically slab on grade construction, which kind of sometimes acts as a cap and the vapors will be captured underneath that slab and then they can enter the home through cracks.

Where you have a pier and beam, you have that crawl space underneath and the vapors will just basically enter into the crawlspace and they're immediately indoor. It's in the indoor air environment. But when we have done studies in similar areas of Texas, we have not gotten very high values with pier and beam homes, mainly because in Texas we don't close those vents up on the pier and beam. And the homes that we've noticed down here, a lot of the pier and beam homes have -- I mean they're basically open-sided. You know, they're -- they have like small wood slats or whatever basically around it, but it's basically ventilated on all four sides.

So anyway, again, if you have any comments on this

proposal, if you would provide me a note after the meeting or see me after the meeting, I'll be glad to talk to you about it more. So...

MR. GONZALES: Just want to comment to you, Mr. Miller, on your efforts. I think that the proactive approach that you're taking with the study and your interest in not only seeing the study through, but also particularly yourself in saying, Well, we need to take things a step further because we might have overlooked some things, I think speaks volume to the community and shows that there is a true interest in moving this thing forward and identifying these contaminants and eliminating their sources. Thank you.

MR. MILLER: Thank you.

MR. PEREZ: So what you have in mind is to have a parallel and the affects of winter to or let's say summer to winter, the fumes in the homes that are -- you said something about air-conditioning and so on.

MR. MILLER: What we were -- as Mark was saying, what happens is if you open the doors up in a house, it -- when we took the samples in the summertime, our hope was that the people would have the house closed so that you have truly just the vapors that are coming up through cracks in the slab or through plumbing. You know, slab on grade you've got plumbing cases in the bathroom and under the tub and places like that where vapors will enter the house and then they can

be -- they'll be -- basically if you don't have the windows and doors open and you're not in and out of the house, they concentrate in the house.

MR. PEREZ: They have to circulate and then the concentrate --

MR. MILLER: But if you're in the winter -- but if you're opening and closing the doors or if you've got all the windows open in the house, then you got the cross ventilation so you're diluting any concentration of that indoor air.

MR. PEREZ: I can see that.

MR. MILLER: What we hope is that in the wintertime, maybe it will be a cold winter for San Antonio, which might be what? 70?

MR. GONZALES: 40, 50.

MR. MILLER: Maybe it will be cooler in January, February so that people will keep their houses closed up. They'll keep the window closed at least. And then when we sample inside those homes, in the same five, we'll be able to determine, Well, is there a difference between winter and summer in those five homes. Because we have summer values. And then we're going to add ten additional homes to try to get a wide variety of different styles of homes.

We started this study originally to -- as a study. Not as a Kelly specific, you know, vapor intrusion problem, but kind of an answer to what the public had expressed

concerns about. So we want to see if there's an issue in areas of Texas so we've expanded it around -- we're actually doing one in Grand Prairie, Texas, too, so... Yes.

MR. GARCIA: One more comment. You know, I'm very pleased with what you're doing with this and I just -- I know, I just want to express some concern or a suggestion.

Do you think we could do that with some of the homes around Leon Creek where we have all this contamination that don't eat the fish and all this other stuff, maybe you -- there's a bunch of homes along Leon Creek around Old Highway 90 and along that area along Leon Creek where we have not determined where all that contamination is coming from. And the Air Force seems to be dragging its feet to tell us the truth as to where all that contamination of Leon Creek is coming from.

Could we possibly consider doing that with homes next to the creek or close enough to the creek to see if they're getting contaminated from fumes and other vapors from the contamination that is in Leon Creek?

MR. MILLER: Well, what -- generally when we try and do an indoor air study like this, we like to have -- well, basically we would need to have groundwater data in that area and we don't have any notice of contamination in those neighborhoods around Highway 90. If we had groundwater data in those areas and show that there was a groundwater plume in

the area, it would make sense for us to then go to the next step, which would be doing the subslab sampling. The whole basis of the study like this, you've got to have groundwater data to prove that there's a reason for the vapors under the house.

I mean if we go and we sample your indoor air in your house or, as I said before in one these meetings, if I went to anybody's house probably in here, we -- we would find some contamination in your house.

And it wouldn't matter if you were over the plume or if you lived in north San Antonio, wherever, it would be because of lifestyle -- we call them lifestyle interferences. You pick up your dry cleaning that day. Your dry cleaning will probably set our meter off the scale most likely because your dry cleaning also contains PCE, which they clean your clothes with the same material. You've got your work boots in there. You've got your gun cleaning equipment or whatever in there. Those -- those are what cause the problems. So we -- we like to have groundwater data to start our study with because that tells -- that tells us what the samples were.

We can't go and just sample in a house for everything because of all these other interferences, which would give us results that we couldn't back up. We wouldn't know whether they were from lifestyle interferences or from the groundwater contamination.

MR. GARCIA: Have we ever done any groundwater study from Leon Creek say over there by 410 working our way down to the old Levi and working our way through Kelly and working our way south on Leon Creek?

MR. MILLER: The only areas we have looked at at Kelly are the areas that would traditionally be the groundwater contamination from Kelly, which is basically that south --

MR. GARCIA: That southeast corner.

MR. MILLER: -- kind of southeast and then that area along the northern part of Kelly so...

MR. GARCIA: Do you think we need to look further north to see if there's any contamination from the old Levi blue jean where they make --

MR. MILLER: Well, I mean that would be a separate -- that would have to be underneath some separate -- you know, it would not be related to Kelly basically is what I'm trying to say --

MR. GARCIA: Okay.

MR. MILLER: -- is because I think we've reached the limit of where it could be possibly Kelly's contamination. We're stretching the limit --

MR. GARCIA: I see. Okay.

MR. MILLER: -- of what the Air Force has caused here. We're stretching the limit at 34th Street a little bit.

MR. GARCIA: All right.

MR. MILLER: Because that is possibly not all of Kelly's contamination from there. Yes, Mark.

MR. WEEGAR: I think I need to make a clarification. Rodrigo, you asked about the Leon Creek and the contaminated fish, you know, that are in Leon Creek.

First of all, the fish consumption advisory that is on Leon Creek, that reach of the creek that is affected is between -- is within the confines of what is Lackland Air Force Base. So there -- there aren't any residential homes built on Leon Creek there. That's within the confines of the Air Force base.

And most importantly, the contamination that is the source of that fish consumption advisory is polychlorinated biphenyl, which are -- they're not a volatile organic compound like the TCE and the PCE that has been the subject of the EPA's study. This is actually something that is getting into the -- into the water shed in sediments. It's actually flowing in the creek itself.

Fish will get that into their system through, you know, the food chain and it basically is fat soluble so it stays and builds up in their fat. It is two completely different contaminants that a vapor intrusion study, like EPA has been doing at 34th Street and then east, would not show you anything because that's not that kind of a chemical.

But again, the stuff that is -- the portion of Leon Creek that is affected is within Leon -- within Lackland Air Force Base. It's not -- it's not the entire reach of Leon Creek where people have homes and things like that. It very -- it's very much concentrated within an area south of Highway 90 on the north and Military on the -- on the south.

MR. GARCIA: Now is that being -- is Lackland still contributing to that problem of contamination and those parameters you told me about? Have we investigated Lackland enough to see if they're still doing their contamination there?

MR. WEEGAR: We have -- TCEQ has no idea what the source of the PCBs in the fish in Leon Creek is. The site on Kelly Air Force Base, the sites of Lackland Air Force Base, are not sources of PCBs. We do not know whether this is something that is coming from farther north that's -- I mean Leon Creek is an urban stream. It's in a developed, you know, urban environment. The sources of those PCB that are washing off into that creek every time it rains could be, you know, who knows how many. There's also the potential that the fish that are -- that have been caught and have shown the PCBs as part of this TDH study may have actually swum upstream.

According to folks with the San Antonio -- the aquatic biologists with the San Antonio River Authority, typically in flood events where you have a lot of rain and

Leon Creek is flooding -- why they do this, I don't know, I'm a geologist, not a aquatic biologist, but fish tend to swim upstream in flood events. So it's very possible that the source could be something downstream.

We have noted that in the southern part of Kelly Air Force Base, there are like four large storm water culverts that empty into Leon Creek. Now those drain areas of San Antonio outside of Kelly Air Force Base. We have actually in the sampling that is -- that is continually done on a semiannual basis shows that there are PC -- PCE -- PCB levels in the sediment, in the area of where those storm drains are.

So we -- we really don't -- the PCBs are there. The fish have been impacted. That's why TDH says, you know, we are advised not to eat these fish out of that area of the creek.

We don't know where it's coming from. TCEQ working with Bexar Health Department, with San Antonio River Authority, are doing some additional studies to sample fish not only in Leon Creek but in other parts of the San Antonio River Basin trying to see whether this is -- you know, it -- the question is is it unique to this portion of Leon Creek or is it not unique to Leon Creek -- to just Leon Creek, but a lot of the San Antonio area.

The only reason it shows up in Leon Creek is because that's the only area that's been sampled for these chemicals.

So that's the next thing we need to do is find out how pervasive are PCBs in, you know, fish in the -- in the river basin and then, based on that, start looking at trying to identify sources and how to correct.

TCEQ has a program for trying to address contaminant impacts to surface water bodies like this to get them back to their recreational use, fish consumption, whatever their use might be, and that study is ongoing. But the first thing is to determine is this unique to Leon Creek or is this not and we don't know that at this point.

MR. GARCIA: My bottom line is we got to figure this out. This has been going on for what? Since 1996, since Patrick was here when we started all this stuff on Leon Creek and everything else. This has been going on for 12, 13 years and when are we going to solve this mystery. That's my bottom line.

MR. PEREZ: Twenty seconds, please. Just real quick.

About, I don't know, eight, nine years ago, I remember we were referring to such a thing. The city wasn't too involved at that time. I remember that they went tracing, that they -- you know, the Authority, you know, their -- they can't cover all of those areas over there, in their jurisdiction. Government has it all this area, this common place. But they have found out that they have PCE and so on

further north where the rain goes and they traced it. But they couldn't pinpoint. But they noticed that there was a storage area, a CPS I believe. I guess y'all know something about that.

I know that the River Authority is going to be supplying some money to some studies there. In fact, we spoke about it about three weeks ago. And tomorrow we'll be speaking tomorrow more concerning that. We're going to go to another county, to Floresville tomorrow. And but not -- the federal government in this area doesn't have jurisdiction to trespass.

MR. MARTINEZ: Thank you, Mr. Perez.

Ms. Cunningham?

MS. CUNNINGHAM: I just wanted to mention there are additional studies that are ongoing. USGS is still collecting sediment sampling -- sediment samples working with San Antonio River Authority and the health department. Also the TCEQ is doing their total maximum daily load project and that's all working together. They're doing additional sampling, fish sampling, with that project so all these things are happening. And then I think USGS working with Lackland is also looking at maybe trying to actually do a little bit more pinpointing of where the actual source might possibly be on some of these contaminants.

So just wanted y'all to know that it's still

working. They're definitely still looking.

MR. MARTINEZ: Great. The next item on the agenda, I believe that Paul will introduce a gentleman to talk about a metal plating facility.

MR. CARROLL: We have another big project that we just kicked off in the last couple of months. It's called the Site MP, former metal plating shop. This is out in the central portion of Kelly, and kind of in the industrial area, but it's near Building 171.

A lot of you know Building 171 is a very large office building here on the base. This office, we're eventually going to be moving into along with AFCEE, Air Force Center for Engineering and Environment, and several Air Force agencies at the end of -- once we get the building remodeled and ready for the Air Force, it will be 2500 people in that building.

And in the parking lot of that building though there is a former metal plating shop and we've got a project here with Tetra Tech. I'm going to introduce Bill Norton who is project manager for Tetra Tech who will go through the steps they're going to be going through to clean this site up. So Bill, go ahead.

MR. NORTON: First of all, on behalf of Tetra Tech, let me thank you guys for allowing us to be part of your team and we're very honored to be here at Kelly Air Force Base.

I'd like to start off with giving an overview of what we want to do, of the agenda. We'd just like to run down the line and give you an introduction of my team that I'm sending from Tetra Tech who is going to work closely with Paul Carroll's team from the Air Force here at Kelly and doing just a brief overview of the site history of the metal plating shop itself so you can kind of see how we got to where we're at today. And then I'd like to walk you through just an overview of what our scope of work will be to meet our clean-up objectives here at Kelly Air Force Base for this site. Next slide, please.

As Paul Carroll, said my name is Bill Norton. I will be the project manager for Tetra Tech. We have a contract manager, Keith Bratten, who couldn't make this visit. But I have my technical leads here, Larry Tyner and Brian Howard. Brian is with our San Antonio office as well. And also I have my deputy GM Ginger Mullins here, too, who has actually played a key role in developing the project plans and documents to get us going on this job.

The key Air Force personnel are Mark Davis with AFCEE, of course Mr. Paul Carroll here with AFRPA and Luis Medina who is the project manager I believe. Luis? Yeah. next slide.

Just a little bit of the history. The metal plating site was originally the location of two automobile maintenance

facilities known as Buildings 258 and 259. Subsequently, this building was modified into a metal plating operations, but was demolished in 1981. The site was originally designated as Site OT-2 in the early part of the investigation here at Kelly, but as the program grew it was renamed IRP Site SS040. The site is actually located in the northeast corner of the 300 area of the waste management area of Kelly.

Like Paul said, it's currently an asphalt parking lot adjacent to Building 171. It's barren. There's really nothing there.

In 1998, it was determined that a pool of DNAPL, which is known as dense non-aqueous phase liquid, which is basically a by-product, remaining residue of the processes from the metal plating shop, were thought to be contributing to some of the groundwater contamination that we're seeing in this area.

In response to this, the Air Force did an interim remedy which consisted of four groundwater recovery wells and the installation of a slurry wall to contain contamination and to stop off-site migration. In addition to that proposed remedial action, it called for excavation of some of the in-situ soil to remove the source area and that's what Tetra Tech's goal is here today. Next slide.

This is just on an overview of where the site is. As you can see, it's down along the railroad track, Zone 2 or

3 I believe it is, and it's in close proximity to Building 171. Next slide.

This is a site -- just a site layout so you can see what the site looked like years ago. You had former Building 258, 259, 259A. All these structure have since been demolished. And as you can see, it's now underneath those green lines. That's just a picture of what the current site conditions are, an asphalt parking lot just to kind of give you some clarity of what we're working with. Next slide.

The first thing that we're supposed to do as part of our scope of work is the preparation of our project quality control program plan. And this is basically -- it's our combination of a remediation work plan with a quality assurance project plan addendum and then a site specific safety and health plan that we have to follow throughout the course of the project. And the work plan basically tells us each step -- sequence as to how we're going to accomplish our cleanup goals. Next slide.

As part of the investigation, the first thing we're going to do is go out and do a geophysical survey. The geophysical survey will be for -- to do a number of things. Primarily it's going to be to confirm the boundaries of the existing slurry wall and then we want to locate the footprint of any of the existing structures such as the foundations, any pit areas that were, you know, demolished and pushed back into

the foundation zone, whatever, and backfilled over the top. We're going to identify those areas very early on.

There's also an existing utility corridor that we want to kind of further identify with geophysics to see where some of the old lines ran. Some of these areas will have to be taken out and abandoned. And then also just basically for any subsurface anomalies that may be able to be detected in the geophysical survey, like vaults, stuff like that, old dip pits and such, which we know we're going to find, but we want to kind of get a heads up to know where to start digging for it. Next slide.

Then the next thing we want to do after we do the geophysics is we want to come out and do some additional investigation. And what this is going to entail is basically we're going to go out and install about 30 additional soil borings. And what we want do is put it on a 29 by 20 foot grid within the slurry wall area and we want to get a refined area of the footprint for the excavation area. We'll collect soil samples at five-foot intervals starting at three to five feet below the ground surface and we're going to go like that all the way down to below the water table, about 45 to 50 feet, till we get to what is known as the Navarro clay formation.

The reason for the additional site investigation will be to help us characterize the in-situ soils so we can go

into direct loading. As we excavate, we want to minimize the amount of time we stockpile soil on the site. So we can take it right out of the ground, put it on trucks and dispose of it as much as possible. Next slide.

The other portion of this work that we're going to do up front is the utility abandonment. This will occur inside of the site that we have to do excavation on. There are three existing utility conduits that run through the site One of them is an existing potable waterline. The other one is an existing sanitary sewer line and the third one is an electrical line.

Abandonment will be conducted in compliance with what they call the SAWS guidelines, which is the City of San Antonio utility people. We've got a select subcontractor to do that work for us. Basically it's going to include -- the potable waterline will be cut off just past Building 171 and we'll cap it in place with a shutoff valve. And then the sanitary sewer line is going to be abandoned in place by removing the four existing manholes out there and we will abandon those per SAWS guidelines, which basically we go out, we take the rims off two feet below the ground surface. We have to puncture the bottom out of the existing manholes and we backfill it with a free-flowing material, like the slurry wall mud if you would.

Then the last thing we want to do is to take out the

existing electrical line conduit. It appears to be an old electrical line that served the former Building 258 and such that's no longer in use. Just existing old vaults and stuff. Next slide.

This is just to show -- just a slide that shows you the existing waterline that we're going to abandon. And basically we're going to cut it off in front of Building 171 with the shutoff valve and cap it. And then this line right here, we're going to shut it off and cap it just beyond the existing fire hydrant and put another valve box in.

And then what we have to do to be in compliance is we're going to put an eight-inch main, connect this eight-inch line to this six-inch line. That's a compliance requirement by SAWS to, you know, maintain proper water pressure and stuff for fire protection for hydrants and stuff. Pretty straightforward. Next slide.

This is a shot of the existing sanitary sewer line that is in place out there. This portion of it is not active anymore. So this is going to be relatively easy for us. There's four manhole locations here. One just to the west -- east of the property, one at the base of our slurry wall, one inside of our slurry wall and then one at the very north end of the slurry wall. That's the portion of the existing sanitary sewer that we're going to abandon in place out there. Next slide.

And then what you see here is the outline of the existing electrical conduit. And you can see it shows that it originated just outside the fence line, travels back through our site. I think it used to be at one time Building 171. But according to the local utility company, Building 171 now has the power coming from the north so this is a dead line in here and we're going to remove it as part of our excavation activities. Next slide.

All right. Then we're going to get into the real work. What Paul wants to see us do, we're going to start doing some excavation and so forth. And to start that, one of the first things we'd have to do is to construct a site lay down area. The proposed work area will be located just south of the existing Building 171. And then what we're going to do is go and install portable chain link fence panels around the entire site. This will be done for the safety of the environment, people and security of site so no one can meander in, you know, no one falls in the hole, that kind of stuff.

And then we'll also establish a temporary staging area for equipment and clean soil as we'll need to backfill the site as we go. You want to go to the next slide?

This is kind of what it's going to look like. As you can see, this is Building 171. This dash line, that's the outline of where the chain link fence is going to go. And you can see we got a potential soil staging area, equipment lay

down area. And then down at the south end, we're going to have gates where our trucks and equipment will enter the site and exit the site. We want to minimize any disturbance to the Building 171 as much as possible. All our work is going to be contained inside this chain linked area. Next slide.

Okay. Next thing we want to do is go into the actual soil excavation and then that's going to consist of first we got to remove the asphalt cover. And it's roughly a 300 by 300-foot area and then we'll take that material off site to an asphalt recycling plant to get rid of it. And then the other thing we have to do is there's sections of this slurry wall that we're going to have to install sheet piling in front of to protect it. Because as we're excavating, we don't to want to jeopardize the integrity of the slurry wall so we're going to have to come in and drive sheet piling.

Can you go to the next slide, please? I want to show them a little better. No, that's the wrong one. Back up. Back up to the original.

Anyways, we got sheet piling that will go in along the north section of the slurry wall and then it will be in the northeast, northwest corners, protect the slurry wall as we dig. And the next thing that we're going to do once the sheet piling is installed is we will start the excavation activities. And basically we'll first move the clean over burden soils that were going. Those soils that are cleaned

below the TCEQ guideline levels will be stockpiled on site to be used as clean backfill if the concentrations are below an acceptable level.

After that, the excavated soils will be segregated. That's to make sure we don't mix non-haz waste with hazardous waste or anything. And then transportation of each soil type will go to an approved disposal facility. Go to the next figure.

This is the anticipated haul route that we've got. Basically they're going to come in off General Hudnell Road, take a right down Clarence Tinker Drive, turn into our site. They'll come in, load out their soils, turn around and go back out Clarence Tinker, back up General Hudnell Drive and back out to the disposal facility. What we're trying to do is minimize as much traffic within the main area of 171 as much as possible. In addition to this, we're going to have to do some dewatering out there.

Can you go back one slide? Back one. Yeah.

We're going to have to some dewatering within that slurry wall and then this water will be taken out and we'll pump that to the OU3 treatment as well. It's an in-situ treatment plant that's already operating and this water can go straight to there. Okay. Next slide. Next one.

Okay. In addition to the soil excavation activities, we're going to go in and put what we call a carbon

source within the pit floor. This is kind of a safety guideline for us to make sure that during the excavation if any residual contamination is around, we're going to put a carbon source in there which will degrade and destroy any residual compounds once we backfill. Then we're going to put it -- that's going to consist of a mixture of gravel, mulch and vegetable oil. And basically what this does, it provides an oxygen source to -- or a carbon source, excuse me, to the environment and it degrades any residual compounds that may have remained after we did the excavation. That's to ensure that nothing else can come back, you know, two years down the road or anything to raise the levels. Next slide.

Once that's completed, we're going to go through the site restoration activities and that will consist of backfilling the excavated area with clean soils. We'll backfill these things up to, you know, a foot or so below the existing grade and then we got to reconstruct the parking lot area. The parking lot area will be, you know, structured to support any of the vehicles that you have on base, you know, commercial vehicles and such.

And then the last thing we'll do for site restoration will be to replace the existing monitor wells, which were abandoned due to the excavation purposes. We don't know exactly how many we may have to take out because we're not quite sure how much excavation we may have to do. Next

slide.

Okay. Once all the excavation is done, then we go into the groundwater monitoring phase of this project. And then basically we perform groundwater sampling and analysis on ten groundwater monitoring wells and then we'll first conduct baseline sampling prior to excavation to get an idea of what the existing conditions were. Once the excavation is done, then we're going to come back and do annual sampling for up to three years to see what kind of reduction we've got outside of the slurry wall and actually within the slurry wall, make sure we've met our cleanup goals. Next slide.

Okay. And then as part of this, we have to go through a reporting period. And this basically involves the preparation of a corrected measures completion report, which provides the summary of all the data we've collected to date. It compares it with the proposed cleanup criteria and guideline and that's kind of how we show that we've met our objectives for this. And then also part of the report will be a site closure report and that just demonstrates the effectiveness of the removal activities and it just kind of provides closure for the site as, you know, documentation. Okay. Next slide.

And just to let you know the schedule of our proposed activities, we're going to start the geophysical survey in November of this year. And then from there we're

going to move right into the site characterization in December. And at the same time, we're going to do the utility abandonment in December as well. That will get us through the holidays. And then early January, right after the holidays, we want to start the soil excavation activities. Those will run from early January to mid July 2009. About mid July, we should be through with all the restoration and we'll repave the parking lot and be done with all the intrusive activities by August 2009. The only thing that will remain then are the new monitoring wells where we'll do the annual groundwater sampling for compliance.

All right. Any questions? Yes, sir.

MR. SKROBARCEK: So what are the contaminants of concern that you're going after?

MR. NORTON: TCE, PCE, vinyl chlorides, degreasers, solvents, that sort of thing. Typical what you've seen at Kelly Air Force Base.

MR. SKROBARCEK: So the historic site, the plating facility was -- what type of plating was conducted there?

MR. NORTON: That I'm not sure.

MR. HOWARD: It was nickel.

MR. NORTON: Nickel?

MR. SKROBARCEK: No chrome?

MR. HOWARD: No.

MR. SKROBARCEK: So the contaminants associated with

that operation, the nickel or the metals, hasn't that already been abated at this point?

MR. HOWARD: That wasn't identified as a chemical of concern out there. It was primarily tetrachlorethylene.

MR. SKROBARCEK: Okay. Because the historic way that those operations, historically, I believe were done is the -- I believe it was a prop -- aircraft prop plating facility and those were done typically subsurface. So I was just curious where the nickel went and how that was abated.

MR. NORTON: Again, historic data did show that as a contaminant concern.

MR. HOWARD: There's borings everywhere out there. I mean it's really high density that was identified there.

MR. SKROBARCEK: Okay.

MR. NORTON: Yes, ma'am.

MS. CUNNINGHAM: To get to the excavation stage of this, I know in all the past projects, the S1 site, even when they installed the drainage system down McLoughlin Street I believe it was years ago, they would take readings, air readings, when they got --

MR. NORTON: Yes, ma'am.

MS. CUNNINGHAM: Are y'all going to do that?

MR. NORTON: Yes, ma'am, we are. As a matter of a fact, we plan on doing baseline air readings before we even start. And one of the things we've talked to Paul about is

we'd like to get into Building 171 with some Summa canisters, do some air readings inside the building before we even start construction. And -- inside and outside. And that will establish a baseline so we can kind of monitor that as we -- but we will have a full-time health and safety officer here that will be continually, daily, doing readings in the excavation area.

MS. CUNNINGHAM: Great. Thank you so much.

MR. NORTON: Yes, ma'am.

MR. GONZALES: I just have a question.

MR. NORTON: Yes, sir.

MR. GONZALES: On the -- you indicate that you will be doing -- part of your process is to do reports and submit reports. And will those be done by an independent contractor or --

MR. NORTON: We have one of our teaming partners, who won't do the excavation, is Earth Technology. They'll actually prepare the reports for us. They'll do an independent review of the analysis and everything.

MR. GONZALES: And then are those reports subject to the RAB requesting for them to be validated or is --

MR. NORTON: That would be a question for Mr. Carroll.

MR. GONZALES: Those reports, would they require any type of validation because of what we're doing?

MR. CARROLL: We can -- we'll share the reports with the RAB. We -- the process for that is that we look at them and, you know, provide comments to the contractor. The contractor will address our comments and then we'll send them in to EPA and TCEQ for their review and approval.

MR. WEEGAR: When you -- when you say validation, are you talking about the TAPP contractor that we've used in the past?

MR. GONZALES: Right. Right.

MR. WEEGAR: Paul, what is the -- is there -- I thought the TAPP contract had pretty much run its course as far as the available funding that could be used. Do you have any idea what the --

MR. CARROLL: That was my understanding, too. I'm not absolutely sure, but I think that's the way I understood it.

MR. WEEGAR: Ultimately those -- the report that they generate will be submitted to the TCEQ and we -- you know, we'll be reviewing those and we'll be -- we'll be determining whether or not they have done what they needed to do or not. I mean the ultimate validation comes when the state either says, you know, We concur with what's in this report, or, We have questions or comments and you need to go back and, you know, address these, do additional work, what have you.

You know, we're going to be looking at what they're doing out there to ensure that what is actually done meets the remedy that was approved by our commissioners, which was excavation of that contaminated soils and vadose down in the subsurface as well -- in the saturated zone as well.

MR. GONZALES: Like I said, my point is basically that, as the RAB, we would be able to have something to say as well. It's something that was, you know -- at least the -- the findings were at least, you know, found to be such by an independent source or source of interest to -- you know, to the community. So that's what I was after. So those reports would be coming back to the RAB at some point.

MR. CARROLL: We will -- we'll continue every RAB as long as this project is ongoing to report to the RAB what we're doing, what kind of progress we're making. We can report, you know, what we're -- what we've taken out, what kind of contamination we've seen.

MR. GONZALES: In the report in the fall?

MR. CARROLL: Yeah. Be glad to do that.

MR. PEREZ: I don't want to sound picky, but I remember twelve years ago or something like that, there was confusion between chemicals and swiping and so on. And some were sent to prison that were actually doing work here. And y'all are going to be supervising it? Texas?

MR. WEEGAR: Are you referring to the laboratory

that did some --

MR. PEREZ: Uh-huh. Yes.

MR. WEEGAR: -- had some --

MR. PEREZ: Right.

MR. WEEGAR: -- issues with how they were calibrating their --

MR. PEREZ: Right.

MR. WEEGAR: I mean that's --

MR. PEREZ: Yeah. They were taking a cutback (sic).

MR. WEEGAR: Yeah. That -- that did happen and it affected projects, you know, all across the United States.

MR. PEREZ: Yeah, but it happened here. I'm talking about here. I can't worry too much right now with the United States. I get to watching a little bit for them. We need to take care of our area here.

MR. WEEGAR: I mean the state now requires that any analytical data that is generated is generated by a laboratory that's gone through the state accreditation process. They have to -- they have to have been in the -- have been reviewed by the state and the state has to basically sign off that these folks can meet the requirements for precision and accuracy for doing these analytical tests.

And again, you know, I will be reviewing the reports that come in. If you're asking me will I be out here on a daily basis watching them dig this pretty big hole in the

ground, the answer to that is probably no. I will come down here.

I'm sure that the San Antonio region will have folks that come out here periodically. But as far as will we be out here on daily basis watching this project, the answer is no. Just like we're not there on a daily pro -- daily basis at the vast majority of projects that are -- you know, that are ongoing around the state. We just don't have the resources to be there every day.

I mean we ultimately look for the data to be reported to us in the report. I mean the Air Force has a vested interest in ensuring that -- that any contractor working for them is providing, you know, validated accurate data to them as well as to the state and to EPA.

MR. SKROBARCEK: So back in '97 with Site MP, my understanding of it at the time was -- is to basically create an isolation box around the --

MR. NORTON: A containment box, if you will, sir.

MR. SKROBARCEK: A containment box.

MR. NORTON: Yeah.

MR. SKROBARCEK: So basically this project is going to excavate the box.

MR. NORTON: What's inside the box.

MR. SKROBARCEK: What's inside the box.

MR. NORTON: Part of the proposed remedial measure

that was accepted was the installation of the slurry wall, the bore extraction, wells for groundwater, and in addition to that was the excavation of the contaminated source within that box. As the process moved along, we now have the funding available to be able to come and do the excavation aspect of it.

MR. SKROBARCEK: Okay.

MR. WEEGAR: Well, actually the accepted remedy was that the slurry wall and the recovery wells inside the slurry wall would remain as the interim actions until the Air Force has funding to do excavation of the source material inside the slurry wall. I mean that was -- ultimately was the -- was the approved remedy was excavation. That's what went out to -- for public comment. And in reality of all the public comments that TCEQ and the Air Force received on the remedy for Zone 2 and Zone 3, one of the very few positive comments that we received was that, We're glad you're going to be excavating the source at Site MP.

MR. GONZALES: Just a -- just a comment to make on the soil. I'm sure you have a system that's going to determine where the soil ends up.

MR. NORTON: Yes, sir.

MR. GONZALES: I'm going to point to, you know, some of the things that can happen is that somebody ends up with a pile of soil somewhere and the first thing they're going to

say is, Well, did it come from over there. So I know there you've got your --

MR. NORTON: We have. And that comes back to what we talked about the initial -- the additional 30 soil borings we're going to do up front. And what we're going to do is in-situ characterization. We're going to characterize this soil before we take it out of the ground. And we'll have a profile on 29 by 29-foot grid, that's five-foot intervals. We'll know the hazardous and nonhazardous, you know, type II class soil so we can segregate that as we dig and monitor it.

And we'll have an elevation set for that so we'll know exactly what depth the hazardous stuff starts and the nonhazardous stuff. And then even the clean elevation is and we'll be tracking that. And we also -- you know, we'll get our analytical back from that and we'll do a contour map before we even start.

MR. WEEGAR: I mean, ultimately have they have got to -- any final report that they submit will have to have manifests that shows where if there were 50 cubic yards of material that was considered hazardous, this is where -- this is landfill that it went to. And it has to be signed off on by the receiving landfill.

And any of the other stuff that is not background material or can't be used for backfilling, it has to -- any landfill that it goes to, they're going to have to document

through manifests that they transported X amount of cubic yards from Point A to Point B and Point B signs off that we in fact did receive this many cubic yards. I mean that's -- that's how -- typically how the, you know, manifesting of the transfer of contaminated solid waste is done.

MR. GONZALES: I think it's good. I think that's important for the community to know that that -- that that has already been taken care of.

MR. SKROBARCEK: In addition to that, there should be a sampling and analysis strategy as far as the characterization of the waste on so many cubic yards.

MR. NORTON: And that's what the 30 borings are for. We went in and we set this up in a profile. We've already talked to our disposal facilities, what they'll accept for classification, and they demand a certain number of samples per cubic yards of soil. And we set this sample profile up on that in advance. And that's how we'll follow.

I mean it's extensive and we're probably going a little overboard with it. But trust me, the liabilities of doing it wrong for our company way out-risk any kind of gain we could get from doing something stupid.

So we understand, you know, the -- the reason behind that and we're very aware of it.

MR. MARTINEZ: Ms. Abbott, you had your hand up.

MS. ABBOTT: Actually they asked pretty much most of

the questions I was going to ask. The only thing I was going to ask you is after it reaches those disposal facilities, does it get treated or does anything happen to it after that?

MR. NORTON: Typically no. Because you pay a premium charge for it, it can go a couple of ways. The class II non-haz soil that's got contamination in it but it's not considered hazardous, some landfills -- Larry, correct me if I'm wrong -- can use this even as cover in some instances or they can dispose of it directly into a cell within the landfill. Don't have to do anything to it.

The hazardous soil -- and it's a price issue, to be honest with you. If you want to take it to them and say, This is hazardous soil, here's my concentration, they'll charge you so much per ton to just incinerate it on the spot and be done with it or they can treat it to lower it say below a cutoff level of 500 parts per million for some specific compound and give you a cheaper disposal rate.

MS. ABBOTT: Who is paying for it?

MR. CARROLL: We're funding --

MR. NORTON: Mr. Paul Carroll.

MR. WEEGAR: Everybody here. Just like the bailout.

MR. NORTON: Did you have to compare me to that?

MR. WEEGAR: Ultimately, taxpayers.

MR. CARROLL: Bottom line is even at the disposal, if it's going to be put into the ground, it's got to meet the

requirements called Land Disposal Regulation, LDR.

MR. WEEGAR: Restrictions, Land Disposal Restrictions.

MR. CARROLL: Land Disposal Restrictions. Got to meet certain concentration levels before it can be disposed.

MR. NORTON: And that's all part of the manifest we spoke of earlier. We have to have a paper trail that shows the analytical results for each cubic yard volume of soil that goes out of here. We have to have that paper trail that shows the history of it, you know, the chemical concentration before they'll even accept it.

MR. SKROBARCEK: So which TSPF does it go to?

MR. NORTON: Which one have we looked at, Ginger?

MS. MULLINS: Deer Park for the hazardous --

MR. MARTINEZ: Can you please speak up?

MS. MULLINS: My name is Ginger Mullins. And it's Deer Park in Houston, operated by Clean Harbors.

MR. WEEGAR: I think ultimately wherever the different kinds of soil go to, if it goes to a landfill that's authorized to receive that either class I, class II, nonhazardous or hazardous waste, those landfills in order to receive that waste and be permitted, they've been -- they're not just a hole in the ground. They're designed with a -- they've got a liner in them. They've got a leaching collection system. They have groundwater monitoring wells

that are designed to basically detect any type of releases that might -- might happen before there's problems.

So they're actually designed, before any waste ever went to them, to manage this type of waste based on federal and state regulate -- you know, requirements before being permitted to receive that type of waste. So they're not just trucking it to, you know, somebody's hole in their ranch where they were mining, you know, caliche for roads or something like that. These are -- these are commercial facilities that are -- that have liability if they take this material and it releases into the environment. So they operate them in a way that they comply with regulations.

MR. GARCIA: One more thing. Don't worry. We don't think you're as bad as the banker on Wall Street --

MR. NORTON: Thank you. I appreciate that.

MR. GARCIA: -- or an inside trader. What's the budget?

MR. NORTON: Paul.

MR. GARCIA: More or less.

MR. CARROLL: I think it's around nine to $10 million.

MR. HOWARD: 9.8.

MR. NORTON: 9.8.

MR. CARROLL: 9.8.

MR. NORTON: And a big chunk of that is disposal.

MR. PEREZ: I just want to let you know next time -- I'm not trying to mess things up. But I got some -- some experiences that are in black and white that they didn't go through that process. I mean the truth. You know what I'm talking about. The distribution of the contamination around the --

MS. CUNNINGHAM: Oh, Alamodome dirt?

MR. PEREZ: Alamo, yeah. Later on it --

MS. CUNNINGHAM: Well, that's another story.

MR. GARCIA: That was a dirty story.

MR. PEREZ: They don't go through the process.

MS. CUNNINGHAM: They didn't.

MR. PEREZ: It's very bad what happened. And they're all over San Antonio, everywhere.

MR. NORTON: We're required in our proposals --

MR. PEREZ: There's contaminated areas all over San Antonio.

MR. WEEGAR: Hopefully we all learned from our errors.

MR. PEREZ: No, but that's like tension load, you know.

MR. NORTON: Yeah, but we're required --

MR. PEREZ: But even so, no -- no --

MR. NORTON: When we do our proposals for the Air Force, we have --

MR. PEREZ: I believe it --

MR. NORTON: -- to identify our disposal facilities up front.

MR. PEREZ: I believe it when -- I don't know where this company was. We could have used you a long time ago. Really, really.

MR. CARROLL: They would have been glad to do that.

MR. NORTON: Did you hear that, Paul?

MR. PEREZ: I was amazed at this information.

MR. NORTON: Thank you.

MR. MARTINEZ: Are there any other questions from members of the RAB for Mr. Norton or Mr. Carroll?

Thank you for a very thorough report. You can imagine the amount of planning that went to prepare that report.

We are at 8 o'clock, the dedicated time for specific involvement, public participation. As I stated earlier, we would ask that any member of the audience, general public that would like to make a statement, ask questions about any topics that have been discussed up to the moment or pertaining to the overall environmental cleanup at this former base. It is now your opportunity. Anybody, please? Yes, ma'am.

MS. PANEK: Bea Panek, nursing student, UT Health Science. I have a question for Mr. Miller.

MR. MILLER: Yes.

MS. PANEK: You said that the --

THE COURT REPORTER: Ma'am.

MR. MARTINEZ: Could you raise your voice?

MS. PANEK: The testing that you did during the summer, pretty much people had opened windows and doors and you want to do it during the winter where the house pretty much is closed. Would that make health hazards for the people in the house because of all the vapors?

MR. MILLER: No. I mean if -- assuming that the house was grossly contaminated, yes. But it's -- because the intent is that there's -- there's dilution from having the windows open is a great thing if your house is really contaminated. We don't really feel the houses are contaminated based on the results we've got.

And, you know, not every house was open. I mean a few of the homes you'd notice, you know, they had windows open, doors open and people running in and out of the house all day. What we ideally would like to have for 24 hours is the house to be closed up while you have the -- you have the Summa canister inside collecting samples.

But we also went into the houses as part of that study with a -- with a mobile lab where we went into the house. We walked through each room, room by room, and took instantaneous samples and we did not find anything with that. And so we feel that we have a pretty good handle on the indoor

air environment. But we just -- because of questions that were asked, raised by other people and because Kelly had also done the study several years ago, if I remember, where they did a seasonal study and we wanted to duplicate that. We want to try to duplicate that with residential so...

MS. PANEK: Thank you.

MR. MARTINEZ: Thank you very much. Anybody else, please? All these bright minds. Yes, ma'am. Could you identify yourself and stand up, please.

MS. MONTEMAYOR: My name is Natalia Montemayor. I'm from La Prensa Newspaper and this question is for Bill Norton.

What was the name of the other contracting company? You said y'all --

MS. MULLINS: Earth Tech.

MS. MONTEMAYOR: Earth Tech?

MR. NORTON: Yes, ma'am.

MS. MONTEMAYOR: All right. I had just wanted to make sure what that was. And what exactly will they --

MR. NORTON: They're going to do the report preparation for us, corrective measure study --

THE COURT REPORTER: Mr. Norton, will you stand up, please?

MR. NORTON: Yes, ma'am.

Earth Tech will do the corrective measure study report and it will also prepare the site closure reports for

us.

MS. MONTEMAYOR: What exactly are those areas?

MR. NORTON: Yeah. The corrective Measure Study report, that basically provides a summary of all the analytical detail. It provides the computation of all the cubic yards disposed of. It gives a tracking of where the material was disposed of. It does a comparison to what remained in the ground. Because part of this we have to take confirmational samples on what they'll do in the excavation on the side walls and the pit floors so we'll see what's remaining.

So that corrective measure study report will give a summary of that with the data we've collected to show that we've met our cleanup guidelines. The site closure report is basically just a summary of this is how we finished the project to date. It gives a brief overview of the history of the site, this project. It talks a little bit about the excavation, be a final summary. It won't go into nearly as much depth as a corrective measure study. It's kind of, you know, a punch list. We're done, here's the signoff for it.

MS. MONTEMAYOR: Okay. Thank you.

MR. MARTINEZ: Any other questions, comments from any members of the general public? Seeing none, hearing none, we will proceed to the next item on our agenda which was going to be presented by Ms. Laura Guerrero-Redman, a member of the

staff here at the base, former base, but right before the meeting, she had a phone call. Nonemergency, but nevertheless, I apologize. Non life-threatening, but emergency injury to one of her children.

She is probably home by now, but she had to go to the emergency room to take care of a really truly important matter. So she asked me to make a few comments about the next item on the agenda, which is the Kelly Restoration Advisory Board membership renewal.

You'll note that the only members -- community members that are listed on this slide, whose terms do not expire December 31st, are -- if I can read this correctly -- Mr. Perez and Mr. Gonzales. All the other members -- community RAB members, their terms expire December of this year. It's incredible how -- how fast time has passed.

Is that -- are you -- those up -- those of you community RAB members in attendance tonight, do you agree? Do your records, do your memory agree with that record, that information first of all?

Okay. The reminder -- next slide, please. Let's go on to the next slide.

A reminder on the matter of representation. Well, let's see. Those -- those of us that have been involved with the BRAC will note and remember this quite vividly that the new RAB rules that were -- I believe were dated May of '06

require that community RAB members should live and/or work in the affected community or affected by the installation's environmental restoration program. And there is a text description here, which you will see then graphically in the map in the -- in the next slide.

The government representation, you have heard, you have seen the presentations by the members of TCEQ, EPA, the health department, of course Port Authority. Next slide, please.

This is a graphic representation I believe of the boundary, which is described in the prior as bounded by Commerce on the north, the river on the east, Interstate Highway 410 to the south, Pearsall Road, Lackland AFB and South Acme Road to the west. The next slide, please.

The RAB established two cochairs, one representing the Department of Defense, in this case the Air Force installation, and then of course the other as Ms. Beverly Abbott is currently the cochair -- community cochair. And needless to say, it is a non-compensated voluntary activity. Next slide, please.

The process that was started in June -- in May of '06 for the final RAB rule as reported in the Federal Register required the creation of a selection panel that again had specific recommendations or requirements for membership of that selection panel. The selection panel recommends to the

installation commander at this former Air Force base and it is then the commander that appoints the community RAB members. That is a process that we went through a couple of years ago. That is a process that we will continue doing so according to the federal regulations.

So the RAB -- the panel would actively set procedures for nominating the community RAB members and implement the process and transmit those names to the installation commander. Next slide, please.

So then, as I stated, the installation commander in consultation with the state and EPA will review the nominations to ensure that there is a fair representation of the local community and the commander will then accept or reject the list of RAB nominees for appointment. Next.

I'm not going to read all this. It is all in your text and I think we're all familiar with. May I please ask for the next slide.

There is one slide that apparently is not in the materials that are -- I will summarize. The process is as follows. We discussed this this afternoon. It is mid October. The staff is going to be sending a letter to those of you community RAB members that are on the RAB at the moment asking if you would please consider renominating yourself to the RAB. And we hope that you will because, as you have seen, this is a very important function.

We hope then that by the middle -- if there are new nominees, by the middle of November, the installation commander will reconvene the selection panel that will review the nominations. Any member that satisfies the requirements as stated in the Federal Register, living, working, in this immediate area, or affected by the work -- the remediation work going on at the former Kelly Air Force Base is eligible to be nominated, self-nominated or nominated by another party. That selection panel by mid November will evaluate, will accept or reject the nominees. They will then recommend by the end of November to the installation commander. So it is now December -- yes, sir.

MR. CARROLL: That installation commander is the AFRPA director, just for everyone's clarification.

MR. WEEGAR: Who is that?

MR. CARROLL: Currently Jeff Domm is currently and there's a new director. His name is Bob Moore. And he will be our new director.

MR. WEEGAR: So Bob Moore will be the installation commander?

MR. CARROLL: Yes.

MR. MARTINEZ: So Mr. Moore by the first of December will receive the nominations, if there are new nominations from the selection panel, and it will be expected that he will then accept or reject the nominations by mid December and

communicate with the community nominees, community RAB member nominees, or new nominees I should say, their acceptance to the RAB and they will then take office with the rest of the RAB at the first meeting in January. That is a process that is -- literally all military installations or former military installations across the nation are following the same process.

Any comments or questions on that process?

Ms. Redman did ask me to plead for you current community RAB members to please renominate yourselves.

Any comments or questions on that topic? Yes, ma'am.

MS. COIRA: Mr. Martinez, I also have a comment.

I'd like to draw everyone's attention to the fact that we have membership nomination forms here as well. If anyone is aware of somebody that would be interested to become involved in the Restoration Advisory Board, please pick up a form and hand it to them. Or if somebody is here that is not currently a member, please feel free to take a form with you and consider it. We greatly appreciate your involvement as a community and that's about it.

MR. MARTINEZ: Thank you, Elizabeth. Thank you very much. Yes, sir.

MR. CARROLL: Folks who haven't been here for a few times, I don't know if some of you know them. You might want

to try to contact them and be sure that, you know, they're aware that we're doing this and that we'd like for them to come back, you know. It's hard to come by RAB members nowadays. Kind of hard to get.

MR. GONZALES: Follow up to that would be if we could get a listing of the names or information on them or how we go about getting it. And then the second would be do we have an idea of what their attendance patterns have been? By their attendance, we might find that people just are not interested.

MR. CARROLL: Do we have that?

MR. GONZALES: Attendance matters, how many meetings have they missed?

MS. COIRA: Of current RAB members?

MR. SKROBARCEK: Or have other obligation conflicts.

Paul, one of the things that was brought up previously was going out in the community and doing some awareness, you know, opportunities like this going on. What is -- is there a current plan to either go out public notice or something like that to notify the community that there are some vacancies and of the process or ...

MR. CARROLL: We have our community relations plan that has -- it kind of outlines how we go to select the RAB members and we -- we don't advertise. We haven't advertised for RAB members I don't believe, unless we did during the

initial solicitation after we got -- we adopted the new RAB rules.

MR. MARTINEZ: If I may, there was an extensive solicitation process. It was advertised in all local media. The lady from the media is gone, but it was advertised not only in English, but in Spanish. Not only in the immediate area, but throughout the city.

MR. PEREZ: It's been out there.

MR. MARTINEZ: They put out press releases so it was not only the print media, but the electronic media as well. Radio and television.

MR. SKROBARCEK: If you would, if you guys would consider that. Because that was when I first came that was -- I remember there was some concern on this.

MR. CARROLL: Okay.

MR. MARTINEZ: Elizabeth, any additional comments?

MS. COIRA: It's something we've already been talking about, how to solicit folks and definitely if the media supports our efforts.

MR. MARTINEZ: Thank you, Elizabeth. The last -- yes, sir.

MR. MILLER: One quick comment on membership. I just want to tell the RAB, I have accepted a new job and will be leaving the Kelly project. So there will be a new member from EPA that will be attending the meetings and participating

with the RAB. It will either be Greg Lyssy, who has been the alternate for me, or a new individual from my former office will be taking over Kelly. Greg will probably remain an alternate for it.

MR. MARTINEZ: You will be sorely missed.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: With that said, you're still going to be involved with the vapor study?

MR. MILLER: I am going to finish the vapor study.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Just to throw that out there.

MR. MILLER: So you will probably see me twice more at RAB meetings just to give an update on that and present the final results.

MR. MARTINEZ: Thank you. Last item of the agenda is discuss among RAB members, yourselves, as to what you would like to have presented at the subsequent meeting, being the January meeting. Paul.

MR. CARROLL: Of course we have the ongoing projects that are -- that have been briefed and will continue to brief Building 171, Site MP, further developments seen in Building 360, the Building 301, system that we've got installed. Did I say Building 171? Probably did. But we'll continue to brief those. Anything else?

MR. GONZALES: I think you have a survey.

MR. WEEGAR: Well, I would be interested in knowing what the status is of the Leon Creek -- various Leon Creek

studies are because obviously the TMDL projects of TCEQ is being done out of the chief engineer's office and that's a different part of the agency. And while we do communicate, I would be interested in just having an idea what's going on there as well as the -- whatever y'all are doing with San Antonio River Authority and USGS just to get kind of an idea what's going on with the -- with the --

MS. CUNNINGHAM: We can do that. I'll try and pull something together. It may be just more than me speaking, but we'll pull something together, a good report.

MR. WEEGAR: And -- I mean if it is appropriate at this time. I mean obviously we don't want you to come in here and say -- or somebody come and say, We're doing these studies.

MS. CUNNINGHAM: No, I understand.

MR. WEEGAR: But I mean if the studies are at a phase where there's some kind of preliminary information or it doesn't have this kind of an overview of what the studies are, and I think that everybody would be interested in knowing what's going on.

MR. MARTINEZ: Mr. Gonzales, you had a --

MR. GONZALES: (inaudible) explain to another person the survey, according to this. When is the survey going on? So we'll have some results.

MR. CARROLL: Yeah, that will -- we'll report that

as part of the Building 360 report next time, yes.

MR. MARTINEZ: Any other suggestions to an agenda item? Yes, sir.

MR. GARCIA: I was reviewing the text from the report that we got in our packet. And on page 35 and 36, you will see the same issue with Leon Creek where we asked for some information from these people. And I mentioned all the people that we need to go through to get some information. Because I have been getting a lot of concerns for people that live around Old Highway 90 and Leon Creek and all that. You know, they're concerned about, you know, people that live around Ben Rodriguez Park, Rodriguez Park, about Leon Creek.

That is a grave concern for all the people that live north of Kelly where I live. I live just north of Castroville Road. And it has been brought up before and I wish, Mr. Carroll, that if you do not get any cooperation from the Lackland Community Council of Restoration or the cochair for the federal people over there, if you will let me know so that I can go to my congressman, Mr. Mata over there, and I can go to Kay Bailey Hutchison and I will go to the joint chiefs of staff, the secretary of the Air Force, the under secretary of the Air Force and hold them accountable for telling not only the exclusive ring of people that sit on their CCR that live around 410 and Valley High Drive, which is their little area that they set the membership area for, but they need to be

held accountable by everybody that lives around Leon Creek, not just those little people that live around 410 and Valley High. We need to start doing something with Valley -- with concern over Leon Creek. Also, at Medina Base Road and Military across from that intersection, all that radioactive material that was buried in there, radioactive dials, radioactive carcasses, that was done and supervised by the ASTAS -- CGR people.

You know, a lot of people that live at Valley High area have expressed concern over was that ever solved and it's been completely done. You know, there's still a lot of areas that was realligned to them that was part of us when I started on the RAB in 1996 and '97 that have not been solved and a lot of people are not satisfied with the answers.

And we're not getting any answers, from EPA, TCEQ, and especially the Air Force people over there. We need -- that's not your fault it got realigned over there, but they need to be held accountable. And if it takes our elected representative and we need to --

MR. MARTINEZ: Mr. Garcia, may we allow Paul a second or two to make a --

MR. GARCIA: Go ahead. I'm sorry.

MR. CARROLL: A lot of that is Lackland issues that you're talking about and we are in communication with Lackland to talk about things that we jointly do under -- underneath

our TCEQ permit and I'll express your concerns to them.

MR. GARCIA: Thank you.

MR. MARTINEZ: Yes, ma'am.

MS. CUNNINGHAM: Just one comment, as far as -- it's not that we don't want to report on Leon Creek. It's a matter of having data that's been -- is good data. It's not preliminary data. It's data that we really can stand on. And so when we do a report, we'll have a report for you in January. You know, it may be just more about how this project is -- what the time line is, what exactly we're doing, etcetera.

But when we do have good data, we'll certainly put it out, but we don't want to do that until it's data that we can really stand on and is backed up. So but it's not a matter of not wanting to make a report.

MR. GARCIA: No, ma'am. I don't hold you or a lot of people responsible for my bad attitude. I hold the Air Force responsible for it. I've been in the battle with the Air Force since 1996. And I hold it very personal because my dad died from cancer from working here and I hold them responsible and that's my war with them and they're not being held responsible.

MR. MARTINEZ: We have covered the entire agenda, unless any member of the RAB has anything else to discuss. Yes, ma'am.

MS. ABBOTT: Just one question. I know we -- the executive summary went through December 2007. When will the results come out from January to June 2008 report?

MR. CARROLL: We should have that report available on our administrative record now. It's been submitted to the agencies.

MS. ABBOTT: I appreciate y'all sending this. I know there's two areas in there that are real concerns, 300 and that Zone 1.

MR. MARTINEZ: Ms. Cunningham.

MS. CUNNINGHAM: One thing I wanted to point out to everybody, because it is kind of through us for a little while, there is a new site. If you want to go to the administrative record, there is a new site and it is in our package. So I just wanted everybody to know if you're looking for that, that's where you're going to have to go.

MR. MARTINEZ: What page number?

MS. CUNNINGHAM: That's page number 61.

MR. MARTINEZ: Thank you. Page 61.

Any other comments? As I said, we've covered the agenda. If there are no -- not any other comments, questions, issues to be raised by member -- yes, sir.

MR. PEREZ: Let me just -- one thing, short and simple. Mr. Garcia was mentioning that nuclear problem and so on. Well, I brought up some time concerning an explosion that

happened over there, you know, I think and in three days it came out in the newspaper. It got things going and so on. And we need -- we need to check that area. We need a report and all that.

MR. MARTINEZ: Could you identify yourself?

MR. SALAZAR: I'm Jorge Salazar with the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality. I'm with the federal facilities coordinator in the San Antonio office. I also sit on the Lackland CCR. They do talk about that stuff. If you have any concerns on that, you may want to come and visit and sit in on a Lackland CCR meeting.

MR. PEREZ: I also want to let you know that I'm a state employee.

MR. MARTINEZ: Yes, ma'am.

MS. ABBOTT: One last thing. I wasn't quite clear. What is it you want to us to do if you want us to consider staying on RAB for another term?

MR. MARTINEZ: Talk to that young lady over there.

MS. COIRA: In terms of the people that --

THE COURT REPORTER: Ms. Coira, I can't hear you.

MS. COIRA: Oh, I'm sorry.

For our current RAB members that would like to remain, you will not have to fill out a new application but we'll send you letter in the mail kind of explaining the guidelines and humbly asking you please renew your membership

because we enjoy seeing your faces every quarter and --

MR. MARTINEZ: Elizabeth, is it --

MS. ABBOTT: Maybe could we --

MR. MARTINEZ: -- as simple for the RAB members to simply fill out the form and turn it in?

MS. COIRA: It would take them longer to fill out the form here than the one we're going to send because that --

MR. MARTINEZ: That's all that's required.

MS. COIRA: Right.

MR. MARTINEZ: They've already been tested. You already -- you're kosher.

MS. COIRA: You've already been approved. But again, for anyone additional who's interested in RAB membership or if you know somebody who would be a great addition to the RAB, please feel free to pick up one of these forms and pass it along. Give us some heads up, too.

MR. MARTINEZ: Ladies and gentlemen, the meeting is adjourned.

(Proceedings ended at 8:28.)

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. 97
10100 Reunion Place , Ste. 660
San Antonio, Texas 78216
(210) 340-6464 (210) 341-5533