



KELLY AFB
TEXAS

ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD
COVER SHEET

AR File Number 3227.1

KELLY RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD
TECHNICAL REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE

December 13, 2005, 6:30 p.m.
Environmental Health & Wellness Center
911 Castroville Road
San Antonio, Texas 78237
Reported by Irene Maldonado, CSR

APPEARANCES

RAB Community Member Attendees:

Robert Silvas, Community Cochair
Ben Galvan (Alternate for Ms. Esmeralda Galvan)
Rodrigo Garcia
Coriene Hannapel
Henrietta LaGrange
Nazirite Perez
Michael Sheneman

RAB Government Member Attendees:

Gary Miller, Environmental Protection Agency, Region VI
Melanie Ritsema, San Antonio Metropolitan Health District (SAMHD)
Mark Weegar, Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ)

Other Attendees:

David Smith, Facilitator
Don Buelter, Air Force Real Property Agency (AFRPA)
Todd Colburn, AFRPA Contractor
David Plylar
Abigail Power, TCEQ (Alternate for Mark Weegar)
Ellie Mae Wehner, TCEQ

COPY

1 MR. SMITH: Let's get started. Hi, I'm David
2 Smith. I am the RAB Facilitator and I would like to welcome
3 you to the December 13th, Meeting for the Kelly Restoration TR
4 Subcommittee. I believe we have a speaker. Let me walk you
5 through the agenda review so that you will know what's on the
6 docket for this evening.

7 We will do a quick review of the items that are on the
8 packet. And then we will do the Administrative Items Report
9 with you on today's BCT Meeting and the updates on that.

10 Mr. Martinez will talk about the documents that are being
11 transmitted to TRS and the RAB and the responses and the
12 action item. Mr. Buelter will then also talk with you about
13 the AFRPA update.

14 The main part of today's meeting is focussed on the TAPP
15 briefing. Mr. Lynch is with us to do that briefing. Tonight
16 as you recall the way that works is that briefing is done for
17 the TRS to give you a chance to respond to what we asked
18 there. And also, to provide you of any feedback that you
19 would like to see or add and address between now and before
20 the report at the meeting.

21 We will remind you of it again, but on the very back page
22 of your packet there is a little form that you can use to fill
23 out for information that you need to transmit to Mr. Martinez
24 about things that you would like to see addressed clarify.

25 MR. MARTINEZ: I have the forms back here. So

1 we could hand those out when they're done.

2 MR. SMITH: I am sorry. I lied to you, but they
3 will be here when he comes up. One thing I want to say to you
4 and I'll mention it to you again is that given that this is a
5 holiday period and that Mr. Lynch will need to make whatever
6 changes that he needs to make for the January 10th, RAB
7 Meeting, we will hand these out tonight. And we will need the
8 responses by the 20th, which is a week so that we could give
9 him time to do that. We'll talk about that again soon, but as
10 you hear the presentations please be aware that we need to get
11 those responses fairly quickly. We will try to give you
12 plenty of time for questions and answers for Mr. Lynch and a
13 meeting wrap up at the end of the meeting.

14 Let me walk with you for a moment through the
15 packet, because there are lots of materials in the packet for
16 you tonight. All, virtually, all of them will be addressed at
17 the meeting. So you don't need to hit that too hard, but let
18 me tell you what's there.

19 The first item that you will see after the
20 agenda is a listing of documents that need to be transmitted
21 to the TRS and RAB Library tonight. The second item is a
22 signed list of the documents that were transmitted at the last
23 meeting. The third item is a response to Ms. Hannapel's
24 request for documents from the meetings that she was unable to
25 attend. The fourth item is Mr. Garcia's request for cleanup

1 plans. The fifth item is Mr. Silva's request for the proper
2 request for the Class 2 Modification Compliance Plan and
3 associated questions along with supporting Texas
4 Administrative Code Documents. And there is quite a few pages
5 of the Texas Administrative Code there for you to take into
6 account. Item number six is the Action Item Report that Eddie
7 will pick up on as we go through that. Item number seven is a
8 previous newsletter that included the RAB Application that we
9 have talked about in the past providing for you information,
10 but additional information will be provided about that. Item
11 number eight, our collection of letters regarding super fund
12 NPL Status of Kelly. Item number nine, are the RAB Minutes
13 from October for your review. Item number 10, are the TRS
14 Minutes from November for your review. Those are followed by
15 a couple of pages by the news items. Things that appeared in
16 the newspapers or the news of some kind.

17 As I said the main item then is the TAPP Report
18 and the TAPP Presentation. Those are the two pieces there.
19 One of them is the former report that Mr. Lynch provided.
20 Number two is the power point slides and the presentation.
21 And as I have said if it's not there the things you want to
22 request for your comments for Mr. Lynch. So that's what all
23 of that stuff is in that packet. And as I say virtually every
24 item will be addressed as we go through this, but it let's you
25 know what we are working with.

1 The first item on the agenda of the
2 Administrative Items. The first one is the update cleanup,
3 update from today's meeting. Mr. Buelter would you come up
4 please.

5 MR. BUELTER: We had a short BCT Meeting today
6 and so we really had three agenda topics. The first was just
7 going through the various zones that we have. We have, you
8 know, AFRPA is not responsible for cleanup on Zone 1, you
9 know, the old golf course, which is between the boundaries of
10 the Compliance Plan. We are kind of the owner of that. They
11 came over to discuss the correct measurement study that they
12 are working on for the Zone 1 area. Basically, they have a
13 Volume 1 of report that would be coming in for Air Force
14 review that's kind of going through these investigative
15 activities that they have done before they continue on with
16 the corrective measure study.

17 For the Kelly Zones, not a lot of activity going
18 right now. We did for the permeable-barrier reactors in late
19 November. We collected groundwater samples around all of
20 those areas so those results are available in 2006, early
21 2006. The second item of agenda I think at the last RAB
22 Meeting as Mr. Antwine pointed out that the greater Kelly
23 Development Authority is of some interest in early transfer in
24 the property. So today we just discussed, because of the
25 permit and the plans that we have what kind of issues may come

1 up if this early transfer goes through. And just kind of work
2 out some of the details of what that will involve mainly
3 dealing with the owner of the permit listed and GKDA would
4 have to be the Air Force if that transfer goes through. The
5 Air Force will still be done.

6 The operator, which means therefore being
7 responsible for funding that and as part of that we just gave
8 some preliminary schedules for a transfer that will take place
9 at some property down at, here where the jet engine terminals
10 are located down in the southern part of the base. It is very
11 preliminary right now. So he will give a schedule to transfer
12 that, if it goes according to schedule it will probably be
13 sometime about September of 2006.

14 The last item we had was just documents that are
15 to be submitted within the next 90 days. And really two
16 documents due in January the Brick Road Facility Investigation
17 for the Environmental Process Control Facility, which is Kelly
18 that was their Wastewater and Treatment Plan. So we will be
19 submitting final documents. You should receive comments from
20 the PCE too. And then the other document that will be
21 submitted in January will be the January 2006 is my
22 understanding.

23 MR. SMITH: And my understanding is that the
24 meeting was today?

25 MR. BUELTER: Yeah, the meeting minutes for this

1 day's meeting will be in your January RAB Packet.

2 MR. SMITH: Okay.

3 MR. BUELTER: And there was no November BCT
4 Meeting. So that's why there are no minutes for November.

5 MR. SMITH: Thank you, sir. I appreciate it.

6 MR. GARCIA: That's the second page here that
7 he's talking about?

8 MR. BUELTER: Those are the documents that
9 were in there.

10 MR. GARCIA: Those were discussed at the BCT?

11 MR. BUELTER: No. No. These were. Those are
12 in. And Mr. Martinez will talk about those. These are
13 documents that --

14 MR. GARCIA: When was the BCT Meeting?

15 MR. BUELTER: What?

16 MR. GARCIA: When was the last BCT Meeting?

17 MR. BUELTER: Today.

18 MR. GARCIA: And the one before that?

19 MR. BUELTER: It was October. October.
20 Whatever the second Tuesday of October is.

21 MR. GARCIA: Did you provide us executive
22 summaries about all of these decisions being made at the BCT
23 Meeting so that we could put in our input or know what's going
24 on? Or you are just throwing them out in little segments like
25 you do all of the time? When are we going to be part of the

1 BCT so that we could hear what comments are being made and all
2 of that?

3 MR. BUELTER: Issues are being brought up in
4 answers.

5 MR. GARCIA: It has been brought up and its been
6 time, but you don't change the procedures. You all make all
7 of the decision statements like you do this and do that and
8 without even knowing or letting the RAB members or even the
9 community know about what you do behind closed doors. And it
10 keeps on and on and on.

11 MR. BUELTER: We supply the minutes for all of
12 our meetings. You'll get today's meeting minutes will be
13 given to you in January.

14 MR. GARCIA: I am talking about participation
15 and letting us observe all of the options, not just you guys
16 making the decisions on this and this and that. I am talking
17 about having discussions with the community, inviting the
18 community about all of the decisions you make and having
19 community input on all of the options available. You just ram
20 all of the decisions down our throat.

21 MR. BUELTER: Yes, Robert.

22 MR. SILVAS: First of all, the notes that you
23 just went over are they in our package?

24 MR. BUELTER: No.

25 MR. SILVAS: Why?

1 MR. BUELTER: The minutes from the meeting today
2 will be given to you in the January packet.

3 MR. SILVAS: Would you include your presentation
4 or your notes with those?

5 MR. BUELTER: The meeting minutes will be much
6 better.

7 MR. SILVAS: I know, but I am asking you to
8 include the both of them.

9 MR. BUELTER: I could probably do that.

10 MR. SILVAS: Secondly, the status on the fish
11 kill. What is that?

12 MR. BUELTER: We have not received anymore
13 correspondence from that.

14 MR. SILVAS: And still it is the Air Force's
15 position not to pay that fine or to replace the fishes?

16 MR. BUELTER: That's --

17 MR. WEEGAR: We responded back. Do you want me
18 to?

19 MR. BUELTER: Yeah.

20 MR. SILVAS: Excuse me. I would like for him to
21 respond to that.

22 MR. WEEGAR: I'm with TCEQ.

23 MR. SILVAS: Well, I asked him the question.
24 Would you just wait until he finishes for you to answer it.

25 MR. SMITH: I think he is just referring the

1 question to Mark.

2 MR. WEEGAR: I think I have a better handle on
3 what the response is to the question is if you don't mind?

4 MR. SILVAS: I do mind.

5 MR. WEEGAR: Okay. Fine. Then you won't get
6 the information.

7 MR. BUELTER: We responded back and received the
8 letter responded back to the State. They sent a letter back
9 saying it was going to administrative review of the meeting.

10 MR. SILVAS: So now it falls back in the State's
11 court to respond back?

12 MR. WEEGAR: Now, would you like for me to tell
13 you where it is at?

14 MR. SILVAS: No, sir. I have another question.
15 Regarding the status of the Compliance Plan, where is that
16 right now?

17 MR. BUELTER: That is with the TCEQ too. We,
18 they request an extension from us to extend the discussions
19 that should have been made. You will see in the packet that
20 we responded back saying that it is okay that we gave them a
21 90 day extension to finalize that class.

22 MR. SILVAS: And the CMS Study for Zone 2 and 3.
23 What's the status on that?

24 MR. BUELTER: We just, we incorporate comments
25 from our response from the comments that we received from the

1 contractor and the TCEQ that document, revised document
2 submitted to the State last week and it's in the package.

3 MR. SILVAS: I have one final question. The
4 approval for the 2005 CMS Report.

5 MR. BUELTER: Sorry. I didn't hear you.

6 MR. SILVAS: The approval for the 2005
7 Compliance Report for January and June of '05. What's the
8 status on that?

9 MR. BUELTER: I don't recall right offhand. I
10 know we received a letter in July that had some comments that
11 we have addressed.

12 MR. WEEGAR: TCEQ approved the July 2005
13 Compliance Report with some comments that we asked AFRPA
14 addressed in January of 2006.

15 MR. GARCIA: Who is doing this? Is it the same
16 contractor doing the Semiannual Compliance Report?

17 MR. BUELTER: Yes.

18 MR. GARCIA: Is that TCEQ who doesn't want to
19 come here and make a presentation in public and doesn't know
20 how to make a presentation in public? Are you still using
21 that same incompetent contractor to do the work?

22 MR. BUELTER: He did the work.

23 MR. GARCIA: Why do you continue to use that
24 contractor if he continue to refuse to make presentations to
25 the RAB or to the community. And doesn't know how to make

1 presentations to the RAB or the community? Why do you
2 continue using the same contractor?

3 MR. BUELTER: Partly the quality of the work
4 that they have done in that report for a number of years.

5 MR. GARCIA: Well, if they were professionals
6 and you approved the quality of work, part of being a
7 professional is being able to interpret your professional
8 material to the people that are paying for it. And the people
9 who pay for it are the RAB and the taxpayers. So why don't
10 you put some type of, like a back and forth, some type of
11 requirement and tell them that they have to make this, not
12 only a scientific report, but they have to make executive
13 summaries and put it in laymans terms because the people are
14 demanding it. Doesn't AFRPA have the common sense or the
15 professional dignity to do that?

16 MR. BUELTER: I think as we responded before,
17 the purpose for that report is to meet the requirements of the
18 compliance to the State. And that's what we are, as far as
19 the legitimate contact and what we are available to get
20 funding for, that's the reason we do that.

21 MR. GARCIA: Well, there is more than just being
22 a professional than just responding to a corresponding, to an
23 agency like these guys. They also have a professional
24 responsibility to the people that pay for that, which is the
25 taxpayer. And you and Adam and the rest of the clowns at

1 AFRPA don't seem to understand that. And I keep bringing that
2 up over and over and over and you don't do a darn thing about
3 it. You take that back to Antwine and ask him why he refuses
4 to put these people under professional pressure to do a job,
5 not only for the State people that need the report, but for
6 the taxpayers and the public who are paying for it.

7 MR. SMITH: I will step in before this gets out
8 of hand. Mr. Garcia, I will not let him talk to you in those
9 terms and with that tone, nor will I let you talk to him in
10 that tone. I respect you.

11 MR. GARCIA: I am asking him a question.

12 MR. SMITH: No. You are doing more than that.
13 You are pretty abusive. I will ask you to slow it down. I
14 would not let him to treat you that way. I won't let you
15 treat him that way. Mr. Silvas.

16 MR. SILVAS: The spill that took place at the
17 Kelly Station Water Treatment Plan, has there been
18 notification on the plan on that on the actions that they may
19 take.

20 MS. POWER: The Air Force turned in a report to
21 the regional office and is currently under review.

22 MR. SMITH: I'm sorry. The other thing is that
23 we have a new court reporter tonight who doesn't have a clue
24 about who any of us are.

25 MS. POWER: Abby Power with the TCEQ.

1 MR. SMITH: Would you help me with that please.
2 Mr. Silvas, again. I'm sorry.

3 MR. SILVAS: Lastly, has there been anything new
4 on spill that has come to surface? Anything new on the
5 details that we haven't been told about?

6 MR. BUELTER: On these, no. I think you have
7 all of the material on that.

8 MR. SMITH: Thank you, sir. Next item on the
9 agenda, RAB materials and our responses. And Mr. Martinez is
10 here to walk you through it.

11 MR. MARTINEZ: How's everyone tonight. I am
12 Eddie Martinez some, I guess most of you know me. And I know
13 everybody from when I used to work here a couple of years ago.
14 Sonia was out sick today. She started feeling really bad and
15 called in, so I will try to answer the questions or your
16 questions as best as possible. Okay. All right.

17 We are going to talk about what is in your
18 packets. First of all, the documents to the TRS. There is a
19 list located right behind the agenda that sort of details of
20 what it is that we will be sticking in the library back there
21 as soon as the cochair here signs this document. So there are
22 some pretty cool letters in there. And there is the CMS for
23 Zone 2, 3. Is that is pretty much the extent of that. Any
24 questions? All right.

25 The second thing that I am covering are the

1 responses. We have had a couple come in and I am going to
2 direct you to some of them that have come in. I think the
3 first one was from Ms. Hannapel and it is located right behind
4 the signed document. And I will tell you what reports were
5 submitted to the library last month. And this is from
6 Ms. Hannapel. She requested a couple of materials that were
7 handed out to RAB members in which she was not present. I
8 believe those were mailed to you, Ms. Hannapel. Did you
9 receive those?

10 MS. HANNAPEL: Yes, thank you.

11 MR. MARTINEZ: Excellent. Any other follow-up
12 with that, that you need? Everything good. Okay. Thank you.
13 The other one was a request from Mr. Garcia to send out 2004
14 Final Semiannual Compliance Plan and the CMS for Zones 2, 3, 4
15 and 5. Again, the Zone 1 CMS, of course, Zone 1 is not the
16 responsibility to FDA was transferred Lackland with a full
17 realignment. So that's why there is no Zone 1 CMS, but zones
18 2, 3, 4, 5 were distributed. Mr. Garcia, did you receive your
19 copies? And other RAB members, did you receive your CDs?

20 MR. GARCIA: That's the problem I don't have a
21 computer. So you-all automatically assume that everybody has
22 a computer.

23 MR. MARTINEZ: Right.

24 MR. GARCIA: And there are a lot of people who
25 don't use computers.

1 MR. MARTINEZ: I understand.

2 MR. GARCIA: That's why you should send us hard
3 copies.

4 MR. MARTINEZ: Okay. There are hard copies here
5 in the library that are available to you. And that's why --

6 MR. GARCIA: That's what they say about all of
7 the documents they send over here, but they send us over here
8 to come look over here and that's wrong.

9 MR. MARTINEZ: All right, sir. Comment noted.
10 The next item on there was the comments that Mr. Silvas
11 submitted. Class 2 Modification. And you could read the
12 response on there. I believe a couple of pages back we had
13 all of the attachments for the Texas Administrative Code like
14 Dave just said was the Action Items Report, which is the third
15 item that I would like to talk about.

16 Ms. Hannapel, you had a series of questions at
17 the last meeting here. So we try our best to respond to them
18 as promptly as possible so that we could get your information
19 and get your questions answered. Do you feel, would you like
20 to cover the reports? There were a couple of things in there.
21 Are you fine with the responses?

22 MS. HANNAPEL: No, I am not.

23 MR. MARTINEZ: Okay.

24 MS. HANNAPEL: It would take too long, but
25 tonight I would like to know how I can do that.

1 MR. MARTINEZ: Well, I think if you submit it,
2 just put your comments in writing like you did the previous
3 time. Maybe even on one of the written forms there then we
4 could address them the that way we have, is that okay?

5 MS. HANNAPEL: Sure, but this is not the first
6 time that I have submitted these and I get different strange
7 answers. So I am not sure what to do. You know, I am not
8 sure what direction to take at this point, but I will think
9 about it. I will look at it and see what I will do.

10 MR. MARTINEZ: Let us know and we will try to
11 reply to those as well, okay?

12 MS. HANNAPEL: I would like to know who replied.
13 Who replied? No one answered it. I have to know who wrote
14 this, you know. It's very important to me.

15 MR. MARTINEZ: Okay. I could kind of speak to
16 that, because we, Todd and I helped to coordinate the answers,
17 but it is mostly the Technical Product Manager who is
18 responsible for these areas, these different areas that we go
19 to that work for AFRPA. So it is technical experts that have
20 managed these projects for a while.

21 MR. SILVAS: Who is the lead on the technical
22 side?

23 MR. MARTINEZ: I'm sorry.

24 MR. SILVAS: Who is the lead on the technical
25 side?

1 MR. MARTINEZ: It just depends on the type of
2 project. For example, okay if there is a question about
3 Groundwater Treatments Plants then we may refer to Mr. Bill
4 Hall. And, of course, that's how it goes. So depending on
5 what type of your question is we field it to the responsible
6 party, the technical expert on that.

7 MS. HANNAPEL: But you don't tell me who that is
8 here. So I have no way to check that.

9 MR. MARTINEZ: Well, okay. It's all of the
10 AFRPA, that's really what the legal letter is from is from
11 Mr. Antwine who is the Senior Rep. So he is responding on
12 behalf of everybody. Yes, ma'am.

13 MS. LAGRANGE: My name is Henrietta LaGrange.

14 MR. MARTINEZ: Thank you.

15 MS. LAGRANGE: Mr. Martinez, are you not clear
16 with the questions that she is asking you, sir? To be
17 specific in names. And that her questions were answered in --
18 is that a problem? You could not answer her question.

19 MR. MARTINEZ: Yes, ma'am. I totally understand
20 them. That's why I asked Ms. Hannapel that whichever question
21 she feels that we didn't answer properly, if she could write
22 us a note. It could even be this, her own copy of the report
23 and just write, you know, what she disagrees with or would
24 like more input on it and we will take it from there. And as
25 far as specific names, I mean, we could go through each of

1 these questions and try to see where the point of contact was,
2 but basically it is AFRPA as a whole really is where the
3 response is coming from.

4 MR. GARCIA: Rodrigo Garcia. You still need to
5 clear this up. You generalize all of these reports and say
6 AFRPA, AFRPA, AFRPA, but you are not telling us who is the
7 cheap person that writes the report. And why can't they write
8 a report showing who wrote it and put their phone number so if
9 we have any questions we could call them direct.

10 MR. MARTINEZ: I will note that, sir. And then
11 I will look into providing specific contact information or at
12 least written by or responded by or where we obtained our
13 information. I think in most of them we try to say where we
14 obtained our information. Like if we, as in Todd or I, did
15 any kind of research, you know, off of the web site, we'll say
16 web site so-and-so refer to that. And even give you a copy of
17 maybe the pages of that web site, but if it is an internal
18 person we will look into putting, you know, sort of assigning
19 their name to this and say that we got a response from
20 so-and-so or Ms. so-and-so. Would that be okay? I will look
21 into that. I am not promising anything, but okay.

22 MS. HANNAPEL: No. Actually it is not okay, but
23 I will go with that for now.

24 MR. GARCIA: Name and phone number if possible.
25 Do we have any questions?

1 MS. HANNAPEL: No. I want the background of the
2 person is what I wanted and that's what I keep asking for.
3 And answers which actually pertain to my questions. That's
4 what I keep asking for, you know. And I really don't know how
5 to solve this, but this is not the time to do that. I am
6 aware of that.

7 MR. MARTINEZ: I will take that back. Thank
8 you, ma'am.

9 MR. SHENEMAN: Michael Sheneman, RAB Community.

10 MR. MARTINEZ: Yes, sir.

11 MR. SHENEMAN: It's like Rodrigo was saying,
12 it's like dealing with faces of bureaucracy. I realize
13 you-all live in that world, but we don't. And so that's I
14 what I think by just listening to this after all of these
15 years. That's the problem that we have. Is that we don't
16 what you are saying. It's just the face of bureaucracy. And
17 so I would rather keep them around. I have been here for two
18 years going onto the next term and we have got no where in two
19 years.

20 MR. MARTINEZ: Okay.

21 MR. SHENEMAN: And I realize you are standing in
22 for someone else; is that what it is?

23 MR. MARTINEZ: Sort of, just taking information.

24 MR. SHENEMAN: So we would expect you to be
25 familiar with all of this, is that what you're saying? And

1 then too, how much time did you have to prepare?

2 MR. MARTINEZ: That's also sometimes a factor in
3 that, you know, we have only a couple of days and there are a
4 variety of questions.

5 MR. SHENEMAN: Okay. How much time did you have
6 to prepare for zones?

7 MR. MARTINEZ: She called in this morning, so
8 that's about all.

9 MR. SHENEMAN: So you had all day to prepare for
10 this. And, of course, you've been away from us for awhile.
11 My hats off to you.

12 MR. MARTINEZ: Well, thank you.

13 MR. SHENEMAN: Because that's tough.

14 MR. MARTINEZ: Well, thank you. I appreciate
15 that. We do want to get the best response possible. So if we
16 have not done a good job, send it back and try to readdress
17 it.

18 MS. HANNAPEL: I would just like to get this
19 question on the record. I would like to know if the PR
20 Department at Allen is the one writing this? Okay. And I
21 would also like to know what part Dr. Smith's staff has in
22 writing any of these responses? Okay. I would like
23 specifically know those answers.

24 MR. MARTINEZ: Well, I know I could speak to
25 that, because I know the procedures, because I work at AFRPA

1 in PR and we do not write any of this.

2 MS. HANNAPEL: Come on.

3 MR. MARTINEZ: I know where you're going, but
4 apparently she used to work for Booz Allen. And we used to
5 have a system where we would run our products and on
6 communications through an internal company, Quality Insurance
7 Department. We no longer do that. We don't.

8 MS. HANNAPEL: Then why aren't you willing to
9 say who is answering them.

10 MR. MARTINEZ: Because I am not exactly sure.
11 We could go through each one of these questions and see who we
12 fielded it to.

13 MS. HANNAPEL: Okay. As I said this isn't the
14 time. I don't want to do this.

15 MR. MARTINEZ: And as far as the role as the
16 field associates' role, it is sort of coordinated. It's sir,
17 I have this question. Can you help me. Sort of an
18 interviewer, but it's all through correspondence.

19 MS. HANNAPEL: That's not the way it has been in
20 the past.

21 MR. MARTINEZ: We could talk a little more about
22 how things have changes with everybody. We will definitely
23 try to get this right for you.

24 MR. GARCIA: You seem to have more of our --
25 than the other bureaucrats. And I am glad of that, but you

1 need to put on there that we need to know, make more AFRPA
2 members accept the responsibility of doing professional work
3 personally. And not run it through this guy here or that guy
4 there. They have to get down and do some of this work
5 personally, because we need to know how many of these people
6 are qualified.

7 If I have to I will go through the Freedom of
8 Information Act and buy all of the necessary resumes at
9 10 cents a copy. And we'll find out who is qualified to work
10 and who is not, but one of the things that we're trying to say
11 is who is writing our reports? And who has the credentials to
12 give us this information? And how credible are these reports
13 that are being presented to us?

14 Do they think we are just a bunch of lay people
15 because they could double talk their bureaucratic talk. And
16 they say you will accept everything you can. Well, we are not
17 all like that. So make sure you put that on there. We need
18 to have more AFRPA people pin their name on the report and
19 where we could reach them if we have any questions, because we
20 need to know how much work AFRPA people are doing.

21 And if we suspect they are doing it and the
22 AFRPA is not and the employees are not accepting their share
23 of the responsibility and that's been the, that has been the
24 case ever since Patrick McCullough left. And AFRPA has driven
25 this to the ground. We have our meetings and we used to have

1 30 to 50 to 100 people attend our Community RAB Meeting when
2 Patrick McCullough was here.

3 Now, the AFRPA people have thrown this in the
4 ground. We are lucky if we get 10, 20 people much less the
5 quantity like we used to you know. And these people are
6 getting, this is not supposed to be Burger King. They are not
7 suppose to be getting this their way. Okay.

8 MR. MARTINEZ: Okay, sir.

9 MR. GARCIA: So you understand the question?

10 MR. MARTINEZ: Yes.

11 MR. GARCIA: We want to see who writes the
12 reports and know more about their credentials and their
13 credibility and their expertise in giving us these answers.

14 MR. MARTINEZ: Yes, sir. Okay. I will take the
15 message back.

16 MR. SHENEMAN: Okay. How are you going to do
17 this when Sonja comes back? Are you going to run this through
18 her or are you going to be personally responsible to come back
19 and answer Ms. Hennapel and Mr. Garcia's answers?

20 MR. MARTINEZ: I will definitely take
21 Ms. Hennapel's question that she wanted for the record.

22 MR. SHENEMAN: You will be responding?

23 MR. MARTINEZ: Actually, it depends.

24 MR. SHENEMAN: What is your normal job?

25 MR. MARTINEZ: My job is to support the AFRPA.

1 MR. SHENEMAN: In what capacity?

2 MR. MARTINEZ: In Public Relations areas and of
3 affairs area.

4 MR. SHENEMAN: What affairs?

5 MR. MARTINEZ: By support, you know, assisting
6 with coordination writing. If you want to consider it
7 administrative it's more than that, but I don't do any of the
8 writing. I don't do anything like that.

9 MS. HANNAPEL: Are you still working for them?

10 MR. MARTINEZ: Yes, ma'am.

11 MR. SHENEMAN: So how are you going to do this?
12 Are you going to do this or are you going to send it over to
13 Sonja?

14 MR. MARTINEZ: I will. I have some here and I
15 will sit down and discuss it with Sonia.

16 MR. SHENEMAN: We want to know who is coming
17 back to respond.

18 MR. MARTINEZ: Most likely it will be in the
19 form of the Action Item Report where Sonja is speaking to
20 you-all directly.

21 MR. SHENEMAN: You are open-minded and you are
22 real and I appreciate that. Thank you.

23 MR. GARCIA: You are open-minded and you are
24 real. That's something that we get very, very few
25 corporation. We never get it. In the last year you are the

1 only one that has had a good decent conversation with us on
2 what we need to do. Like on the second page here, all of
3 these things that are going, that are going on, on this list
4 on the second page. You know, the staff should have told us
5 look all we did was give them a list on this. They should
6 have given us at least a two or three-inch paragraphs
7 describing each one so that we know what is going on.

8 All they give you is a list on it. They should
9 given us an executive summary about a two or three-inch
10 paragraphs explaining to us what all of that meant. A lot of
11 us are still banging on the same door that we need to have, we
12 need to have Community and RAB Member Representation in
13 reviewing all of the options and the decisions made by the
14 BCT. That's, you know, a lot of our doors and community
15 participation are shut in our faces by Adam and the higher-ups
16 way above you that do this to us.

17 So I am glad you that are taking notes. I am
18 glad that you are professional enough to listen to us in a
19 frank conversation in what we are telling you, because you are
20 the only one that has come by here to any of the meetings in
21 the past year. And I should have mentioned to you that we
22 need to change things. And these people are not doing their
23 job, for somebody with your open-mindedness needs to start
24 getting the hammer, hitting Adam with it and Sonja and whoever
25 else there is and say hey, these people are dying in this

1 community.

2 They want to have more of a say-so. And they
3 need to have more open-mindedness, because we are the ones
4 that live here. We are the ones that are dying, not them.
5 All of these rich people get the AFRPA money and they live on
6 the north side. They don't live here on Castroville Road.
7 They don't live here next to Brady Garza. They don't live
8 here next by Kennedy High School. They don't live in the
9 south side by New Laredo Highway. They live on the north side
10 with this big, big free Government check. And they don't
11 care. They are just ramming down our throat whatever. And we
12 need to find a way to get more people into our meetings. And
13 we've told this to Adam. And Adam keeps grinding us into the
14 ground like you are putting out a cigarette.

15 MR. MARTINEZ: Okay. You said something that
16 actually sparked and I want to talk about it. Well, first as
17 far as the BCT, I think that issue has come up before.

18 MR. GARCIA: We keep asking.

19 MR. MARTINEZ: But really when we think about it
20 this is the opportunity for the exchange. These public
21 meetings, the RAB, the public meetings, the TRS, that's the
22 opportunity. So anyhow, but I wanted to point out on the
23 Action Items Report about something we will be doing. I
24 believe, I wasn't here for it, but somebody recommended that
25 hey, this annual mailer that's in here is one of the

1 attachments, it's really a nice looking card stock mailer.

2 We will take your recommendation on that and we
3 will convert it into an add that we will place on the south
4 side reporter, which is the paper that basically is tailored
5 to this community and La Prensa. So that way, you know, we
6 are hearing you guys. We are translating it into Spanish and
7 we will send that out to the newspapers. So be looking for
8 that.

9 MS. HANNAPEL: And one other thing about this,
10 this is very nice, but you know this is what the public sees,
11 right? And so when you say that one of my questions is
12 permeable clay, okay. You might say that impermeable means to
13 be the geologist, not easily permeable, but I think to the
14 average person on the street it means hey, it can't go
15 through. Okay. And that, that is the pass smell test, you
16 know, this answer that you gave me. And this is what is going
17 out to the public. And the public relies on the Air Force.
18 And the Air Force is not giving them the information that is
19 correct or misleading. There is a problem.

20 MR. MARTINEZ: Well, I think what the Air Force
21 tries to do is to sort of communicate the highly technical
22 information at times and try to put it in a laypersons, you
23 know, Mr. Lynch is going to do for us tonight for a highly
24 technical report, you know, he will try to translate a little
25 bit.

1 MS. HANNAPEL: I have seen Mr. Lynch's Reports
2 before and I am sure he is not going to talk down to us the
3 way these factions have. If he does, I would ask him to
4 leave. And like I said I have already seen these reports and
5 I know that he doesn't do that.

6 MR. MARTINEZ: Well, let's go back to the report
7 and address where we haven't answered your question. Okay.
8 Mr. Silvas.

9 MR. SILVAS: Going through this coach here on
10 the book there is something that came to the surface here and
11 that's regarding the responses for the comments on the other
12 Environmental Zone 2 and 3. And I think we received this.

13 MR. MARTINEZ: These are your comments?

14 MR. SILVAS: No. These are the Air Force's
15 responses.

16 MR. MARTINEZ: Responses to your comments?

17 MR. SILVAS: No. These are the AFRPA's
18 responses to comments on their Leak Environmental CMS Zone 2
19 and 3.

20 MR. MARTINEZ: Okay. So he reviewed it, the
21 Zone 2 and 3?

22 MR. SILVAS: Yes, sir.

23 MR. MARTINEZ: Okay. And then the Air Force
24 replied to the review?

25 MR. SILVAS: These comments.

1 MR. MARTINEZ: Okay.

2 MR. SILVAS: These need to go out to the
3 community members as soon as possible.

4 MR. MARTINEZ: I believe, Todd, if I am not
5 mistaken that may have been sent out already?

6 MR. COLBURN: No, I don't know.

7 MR. MARTINEZ: No. Okay. Hold on one second.
8 Just so that we don't loose track of that, sir, if you could
9 write that down.

10 MR. SILVAS: Thank you.

11 MR. MARTINEZ: All right. So that's the Air
12 Force's response in this matter. Okay. Anything else?

13 MR. GARCIA: I just want to make one last
14 comment. You know, you go back to Adam and all of these
15 high-priced bureaucrats over there, half of them aren't worth
16 10 cents. And you tell them that you had a nice conversation
17 with the RAB members and to the TRS last night. And that a
18 lot of these comments were a good civil conversations
19 open-minded and that they want them to support you and that
20 you need to start working with us. And start bringing the
21 community back into this. We need to start doing that.

22 And Adam needs to realize that he cannot be
23 shutting doors and squashing it the way they are doing it. It
24 can be done. Patrick McCullough did it very well. He used to
25 fill up the gym or the library at Kennedy High School at the

1 auditorium with people during our meetings. He had booths.
2 He had presentations. He had booths for everyone to go ask
3 every representative questions. We had massive, we had
4 massive notices. We had people coming in there and asking all
5 kinds of questions, but he really cared. He was one of the
6 very few bureaucrats that has gone through here, through the
7 AFRPA, in the name of Patrick McCullough.

8 I know he retired already and I think he is an
9 outside consultant, but if we can't get that from Adam, we
10 need somebody that is really going to care and have an
11 open-mind and an open heart to the community, because we are
12 the ones that live here and we're the ones that are dying.
13 And we need to get Adam to support you and say look our old
14 AFRPA staff is going to support you, Eddie.

15 Let's find a way to bring the people and the RAB
16 back into this, so we won't be fighting so much. And change
17 Adam and these people's attitudes and be more open, give us
18 more reports and ask us to participate in a lot of this. If
19 we give you wrong technical advice or our suggestions aren't
20 feasible, that's when these professionals are suppose to say
21 no, this is an impractical, scientifically you can't do that
22 or something like that, you know, but at least we had a right
23 to participate. And the community has a right to participate.
24 And we need somebody like you to do one specific job in this
25 community. Its better cooperation between you and the AFRPA

1 and bring back the community to ask questions and to
2 participate with the RAB.

3 MR. MARTINEZ: Yes, sir.

4 MR. GARCIA: And you have the right attitude and
5 you have an open-mind and you can understand, because I am a
6 professional too. I'm getting ready to get my second degree,
7 but I do not show it. I am not some high-class lowlife. I
8 work with the Department of Transportation. And I have people
9 calling me and asking me questions about railroads, asking
10 questions about highways, asking questions about this and
11 this. And I have to take these questions and I have to answer
12 them in writing and all of this through my public relations
13 and my inspection work that I do. So, you know, I know what
14 you have to go through. It's a tough job. I got hired at
15 that particular level, because nobody else wanted to do the
16 job. People got bothered to deal with the community. It's
17 too much bother to deal with that, but I believe you are the
18 person to do it. And you need to tell Adam that and all of
19 these others.

20 MR. SHENEMAN: We do need to tell Adam that.
21 Where is Adam at?

22 MR. GARCIA: Where is Adam? Where is William?
23 Those are the two people that need to start coming to the
24 meetings and start having open conversations like we are
25 having between us and you, because they need to understand and

1 lose that attitude and lose that door or the policy of
2 squashing so much of the community that should be involved in
3 all of this. Okay.

4 MR. MARTINEZ: I will take that back with me,
5 sir.

6 MR. SHENEMAN: Mike Sheneman. Okay. As this
7 property is transferred from the Government to the private
8 sector then this body, this is going to die. I guess as long
9 as there is one tract out there, one parcel we haven't touched
10 it. What type of schedule are you looking up there do you
11 think? I heard you early on say talking to somebody about
12 transfers.

13 MR. MARTINEZ: Transfers. That's a whole
14 complete different subject that I won't even go to, because I
15 don't know the first thing about it, but the life cycle of a
16 RAB is ultimately going to dwindle down. And it sort of
17 coincides with the way the technical cleanup is going. So if
18 all of the technical environmental systems are installed and
19 they are operating properly and there is proof that these
20 systems are helping to cleanup, then the RAB sort of starts to
21 diminish a little bit, so that there isn't such a need for the
22 involvement. It could be one year, it could be 20 years.
23 There is no set deadline, but it does sort of intend to flow
24 with the life cycle of the technical cleanup.

25 MR. SHENEMAN: Question two, I didn't quite

1 understand. We are talking about your function and your job
2 and I almost like your job description and the PR. And I love
3 PR, you know that. You and I go way back before in here in
4 another setting, but then in passing I got the idea that the
5 QAQC is in the mind and shoved aside and I am familiar with
6 the Congressional Federation. I had to operate a number of
7 years ago, are you operating under the CFR in the capacity and
8 if so, which one? The CFR talks to the department literally.
9 I am serious. I looked it up once and it talks about
10 endangerment.

11 MR. MARTINEZ: Are you talking about the way
12 Booz Allen operates?

13 MR. SHENEMAN: I don't know who is operating it
14 now. You see we're getting into this bureaucracy.

15 MR. MARTINEZ: And that's --

16 MR. SHENEMAN: I don't know.

17 MR. MARTINEZ: I don't even think we need to go
18 down that path. It's just, you know, I am having a hard time
19 understanding your question.

20 MR. SHENEMAN: Well, without the QAQC Program
21 you got no rules.

22 MR. MARTINEZ: No, we do.

23 MR. SHENEMAN: We do?

24 MR. MARTINEZ: And Booz Allen I could say that
25 we have a Quality Assurance Department.

1 MR. SHENEMAN: You have QAQC people over there
2 watching what we are doing over here?

3 MR. MARTINEZ: Booz Allen has an internal QA,
4 Quality Assurance Department.

5 MR. SHENEMAN: Do they stay outside auditing you
6 like you are having to do right here?

7 MR. MARTINEZ: That's a good question.

8 MR. SHENEMAN: Who's watching you?

9 MR. MARTINEZ: I can't answer that, sir. I
10 don't know.

11 MR. SHENEMAN: That's what I am relating to you,
12 because I have been right where you are.

13 MR. MARTINEZ: I really don't know.

14 MS. HANNAPEL: -- my program, but I had that
15 case is where I was operating, and if you don't have that all
16 of a sudden I am sitting there just shocked.

17 MR. MARTINEZ: I think maybe what you are
18 referring to is more of an editorial type of Quality Assurance
19 Department with documents and reports.

20 MS. HANNAPEL: No. No.

21 MR. MARTINEZ: I don't want to go into that one,
22 because I really don't know.

23 MS. HANNAPEL: This is safety relating.

24 MR. MARTINEZ: Oh, okay. Okay.

25 MS. HANNAPEL: I used to do the safety. You

1 don't do that kind of thing?

2 MR. MARTINEZ: Well, that's all we have is sort
3 of an editorial review.

4 MS. HANNAPEL: Now, there's your problem right
5 there. That is the whole problem right there. The watch, the
6 in-house unfortunately. I don't understand it, because I have
7 done exactly, sir, what you are doing under the similar
8 circumstances.

9 MR. MARTINEZ: Okay. Hold on. Sir, Mr. Silvas.

10 MR. SILVAS: Yes, who oversees your QC for you?

11 MR. SHENEMAN: He just told us nobody.

12 MR. SILVAS: There is somebody in charge, right?

13 MR. MARTINEZ: There is no hierarchy, but its
14 all internal. That's how we operate our business.

15 MR. SHENEMAN: He said they will him that I am
16 afraid.

17 MR. SILVAS: So you don't know if there is a
18 person that we could direct questions to?

19 MR. MARTINEZ: In our internal department?

20 MR. SILVAS: Yes.

21 MR. MARTINEZ: Yes, there is.

22 MR. SILVAS: And what's his name?

23 MR. MARTINEZ: I could get you that contact
24 information. It's her name, I believe.

25 MR. SILVAS: You know her name at this moment?

1 MR. MARTINEZ: It should be Lynn Thompson. It
2 should be, sir.

3 MR. GARCIA: Yeah, I just want to say maybe you
4 need to do this. I think there is two amendments that came
5 out to the RAB Rule, the final RAB Rule and two amendments and
6 review it and see if you find anything pertaining to what we
7 have talked about. And what you both can do to enhance your
8 position here with working with us. And I think there is a
9 final RAB Rule and two amendments. See if you could find
10 those and then give us copies. And then maybe give us --

11 MR. MARTINEZ: He has the RAB Rules before.

12 MR. GARCIA: See if you could find some
13 information on that on what we have talked about tonight, sir.

14 MR. MARTINEZ: Okay. Anymore questions? All
15 right. Thank you all. Have a good night.

16 MR. SMITH: I think the next item coming up on
17 the agenda is the AFRPA update. While Don is getting ready to
18 start, I appreciate the way you kind of managed that. I
19 appreciate, it. Don.

20 MR. BUELTER: For the update really there is
21 just two items that I want to bring to your attention. At the
22 very back of your packet, there is a notice of application and
23 preliminary decision of water quality and amendment for
24 customer wastewater. That is published last Friday,
25 December 9th. This is for the discharge permit that we have

1 for Groundwater Treatment Plants. We had renewal come up.
2 There is an amendment to the, it's the very, very last page
3 and the language down here.

4 MS. POWER: Don, can I bring it to your
5 attention that it may not be in everybody's packet. I don't
6 know.

7 MR. BUELTER: I think it's in all of the RAB
8 members packet. I think there was some.

9 MS. POWER: Okay.

10 MR. BUELTER: Like that one. You got it right
11 there. The language that is in here is given to us by the
12 permit people of the State. And that's why it is as long as
13 it is. There is a copy of the draft final permit at the
14 central library. And I think we could probably bring a copy
15 of that over here if we haven't done so, because I know this
16 is a little more accessible.

17 In the comments there, there is a 30 day comment
18 period if you wanted to comment on that. We will make sure to
19 get a copy over here. The other item is in this Friday's
20 paper, December 16th, San Antonio Express News. We received
21 on November 22nd, the approval of the Logical Risk Assessment
22 Tier 2, Tier 3. With that approval there is a number of sides
23 in our Compliance Plan that enclosure was pending approval of
24 that document. So there are 10 sides to the Compliance Plan.

25 The next step is to do a public notice with a 60

1 day comment period. And that add will be in the Metro Section
2 this Friday of the San Antonio Express News. That will be a
3 very, there are 10 sides. So it will be a very large ad. It
4 won't be a notice like this. It will be an ad that is and
5 like I said there is a 60 day comment period on that on the
6 instructions.

7 One thing, for both of these to go, comments are
8 to be addressed through the State office on both of those.
9 And the comments go directly to the State of Texas and the
10 Permits Division can handle those. Its a little different
11 than some of our process to the State. Any questions on these
12 two items? Yes, Mr. Silvas.

13 MR. SILVAS: On this first request for the
14 permit, the application of wastewater there is a section down
15 there that says the borrower of the paragraph at the end where
16 it says the former Lackland Air Force Base Golf Course, former
17 part of Kelly Air Force Base with groundwater application
18 there. Is a reason why the request is being made on behalf of
19 Kelly to get that permit golf course?

20 MR. BUELTER: Actually, it was in the existing
21 permit as something that was carried over. And that's,
22 Mr. Kennedy and others have brought up that golf course is no
23 longer a golf course. So we are asking them not to send any
24 water over there, but this is really doctoring up more areas
25 on, within the down of the former Kelly for air aerate. So

1 GKDA wishes to use the water to aerate trees rather than
2 Edwards Water that is available for them to us.

3 MR. SILVAS: So Lackland is overseeing this
4 site, the cleanup?

5 MR. BUELTER: Yeah.

6 MR. SILVAS: You aren't getting the permits
7 reviewed?

8 MR. BUELTER: We are analyzing the plans we
9 operated. There is a few questions about Lackland. They go
10 get the funding to run the operations on their site. And then
11 they build that into our contract that we have.

12 MR. SHENEMAN: Don.

13 MR. BUELTER: Yes, sir.

14 MR. SHENEMAN: You said was a golf course. What
15 the hell is it now?

16 MR. BUELTER: It is, they are a couple of
17 things.

18 MR. SHENEMAN: A load zone, a buffer zone.
19 Something that we will forget?

20 MR. BUELTER: No, no. There are a couple of
21 things going on. They are, it's Zone 1. So they are actually
22 doing a bunch of former landfills. So right know Lackland is
23 working on the Corrective Measure Study. It's primarily going
24 to be landfill probably. We haven't seen the report. They
25 are building bicycle trails. They are going to use it more as

1 a, when the landfills are done as a recreational park kind of
2 use area.

3 They will actually have I think some BMX bike
4 track and things like that. So I haven't been quite sure that
5 they have a new pricing contract.

6 MR. SHENEMAN: It's like the country club went
7 broke. Any community golf course?

8 MR. BUELTER: It was, it was when it transferred
9 over since Lackland had the other golf course. And the Kelly
10 golf course wasn't enough business and it's part of that, that
11 branch is not incorporated funds, which means they have to
12 basically make a profit to pay for their people. They don't
13 get DOD money to do that. So they weren't making enough money
14 to keep the golf course open. Since they had the other
15 18-hole golf course it was, they just decided that they were
16 going to stop operations.

17 Plus, the fact that there was going to be a
18 fairly large landfill that would put it out of service for a
19 couple of years anyway while they did the mediation. So it
20 wasn't feasible to keep operating it. As far as the schedule
21 and some actives I am not quite sure who at Lackland you would
22 call, but I would call their Private Affairs Office. They
23 have their number in the phone book. And ask them what kind
24 of activities they plan to do there, but they have a whole
25 list of plans.

1 MR. SHENEMAN: Do they have a RAB?

2 MR. BUELTER: Yeah.

3 MS. POWER: Community Restoration is what they
4 call it, but it is the same functional body. They meet
5 quarterly.

6 MR. BUELTER: Probably in January.

7 MS. POWER: January, yeah. And they meet on a
8 Wednesday. Hang on. I have the date.

9 MR. BUELTER: Yes, she's right.

10 MR. GARCIA: When Patrick McCullough first gave
11 us the AFRPA material concerning Zone 1, there was a bunch of
12 radioactive carcasses that were under that golf course. There
13 was a lot of radioactive drums buried under there. And he had
14 told us when we first started talking at Community Meetings
15 that it was going to be taken care of by the AFRPA, because
16 that was their original jurisdiction.

17 Now, has anybody ever investigated any of this
18 stuff that's in the AFRPA and all of that stuff been dug out?

19 MR. BUELTER: Yes, actually it has.

20 MR. GARCIA: Is there any documentation?

21 MR. BUELTER: We could look for it. Probably
22 Lackland has that. It was actually brought in the transition
23 between Kelly Air Force Base Environmental Management Office.
24 The AFRPA was never really involved in that. And then they
25 were working with the ATC. There were some concrete cylinders

1 top bottom, all of that material was removed. There was some
2 radio dials.

3 MR. GARCIA: Yeah, that was there, but how about
4 the big ones?

5 MR. BUELTER: No, that's the --

6 MR. GARCIA: There was 40 or 50, 55 gallon drums
7 buried all around that golf course with radioactive chemicals.
8 I forgot what the chemical as, but it is in the AFRPA Report.
9 I still have that book that Patrick McCullough gave us. And
10 he highlighted all of the stuff on them where they had all of
11 those drums and stuff. That's how come I ask you when you
12 talk about Zone 1, where it was transferred and it was part of
13 that Kelly thing.

14 MR. BUELTER: Right.

15 MR. GARCIA: Did they take all of that stuff out
16 and who's doing it now in taking all of that stuff out?

17 MR. BUELTER: I am not very familiar with Zone
18 1, so as far as the drums I am not sure. That I don't
19 remember. I remember the concrete cylinders, the radio dials
20 and the potential for some of the carcasses.

21 MR. SMITH: How about if we ask Eddie to have
22 him turn that in an item in our next meeting. If he could put
23 it on his list.

24 MR. BUELTER: I am not familiar, but I know the
25 other areas that we're talking about. I know the radio dials

1 were removed.

2 MR. SHENEMAN: I want to mention the ones that
3 glow in the dark.

4 MR. BUELTER: Right. Right.

5 MR. SHENEMAN: I remember when we were kids it
6 was a big deal to watch them.

7 MR. BUELTER: Right.

8 MR. GARCIA: I live near Kelly and I probably
9 will in another six months or so.

10 MR. SHENEMAN: Originally, you don't have a
11 bunch of people in here, because they are all dead.

12 MR. SMITH: Abby, you want to say something?

13 MS. POWER: Just to follow-up with the Lackland
14 Community Restoration will be on January 18th, 2006.

15 MR. SMITH: That's a meeting that's an evening
16 meeting?

17 MS. POWER: Yes. It's an evening meeting. They
18 typically start at 7:00 and it should be held at the public
19 elementary school. It's right over by the annex, the Lackland
20 annex. It's a public school. If you call the information
21 office over at Lackland they will have an address and the name
22 of the school. I apologize for not knowing it.

23 MR. SMITH: Eddie, could you add that to get
24 that address.

25 MR. SILVAS: I have got a question that is

1 directed to TCEQ, the AFRPA response to comments on the final
2 CMS Study. Have you received that?

3 MR. BUELTER: TCEQ?

4 MR. SILVAS: Yeah. Did you receive that?

5 MR. BUELTER: Did we receive that? Yes.

6 MR. WEEGAR: Your response to comments on the --

7 MR. SILVAS: Air Force's response.

8 MR. WEEGAR: When was that? Recently or?

9 MR. SILVAS: Did he send it to me recently or?

10 MR. BUELTER: No. No. It was back before you
11 came in.

12 MR. WEEGAR: I would have to look at my file.
13 It doesn't, if I would have received it sometime ago, I just
14 don't remember having received them, but I could look at the
15 file.

16 MR. SILVAS: I would like to get an answer on
17 that by next week.

18 MR. SMITH: Eddie, will you write that down.

19 MR. GARCIA: One last question. Did you find an
20 engineer solution to stop anymore actions like the one we had
21 the plant over there of dumping of the contaminated water on
22 the other side.

23 MR. BUELTER: Yeah, they have. They have gone
24 not only on some of groundwater turn off switches. They have
25 got that at the mechanical switches for not just relying on

1 the computer to shut things down. So they are and then the
2 inspection of those switches is weekly rather than monthly.

3 MR. GARCIA: No. I am talking about heavy duty
4 engineering solutions. Like putting up a parameter curb with
5 a slab and then putting an area drain so that they won't have
6 another accident into a underground storage of some sort.

7 MR. SHENEMAN: There are two reservoirs at least
8 out there.

9 MR. GARCIA: Do you see what I'm talking about.

10 MR. BUELTER: Yeah. No, we haven't.

11 MR. GARCIA: You need to consider engineering
12 solutions of a parameter curb with an area drain. So that it
13 overflows and goes underground storage tank. That's what we
14 did at some of the scientific facilities that I designed on
15 mechanical engineering.

16 We put parameters first and we put in there, we
17 put four-inch drain line into a 10,000 gallon, I mean 10,000
18 gallon underground tank so that if that ever happens again you
19 need a 500,000 gallon, you could automatically go into the
20 drain system in the building or the parameter curb outside and
21 then go with the tank. That's what the mechanical solution
22 should be, besides the mechanical gauges and stuff like that.

23 MR. SMITH: Guys we are cutting into
24 Mr. Lynche's time. Can we go into this and pick up after
25 Mr. Lynch is finished. Okay.

1 Okay. As we said in the agenda this part has to
2 do with the TAPP pre-debriefing 2005. The 2005 Semiannual
3 Compliance Plan. This is time that we will handout to you
4 that little thing for your comments and your questions.
5 Things that you want Mr. Lynch to change. The way that has to
6 work is that those comments have to come back through the
7 contracting office in order to be delivered to Mr. Lynch. So
8 if you want, Eddie could pick them up for you. If you want to
9 send them, then we provide you the address to where you could
10 send those to, but that's the one with the September 20th --
11 December 20th date. Thank you.

12 Okay. Mr. Lynch, I think you have your
13 productions.

14 MR. LYNCH: My name is Patrick Lynch, Chemical
15 and Civil Engineer from California. I live in the community
16 in Alameda which also has a closing Naval Base. So I am, I
17 can relate to community concerns with some of the
18 contamination issues.

19 The report that I reviewed was sampling that was
20 done in 2004 from March to July. And the report, the
21 Compliance Report is basically three parts. There is an
22 assessment on the quality of Leon Creek that I'm not really
23 going to go into in any detail.

24 There is another volume that specifically
25 addresses three sites that are sampled on a semiannual basis.

1 And then there is a large document that address the sampling
2 of over 700 wells and the measuring of groundwater levels and
3 over 1,000 wells throughout the base. And that will pretty
4 much be the focus on what I will talk to you about tonight.

5 Again, it is a report that is done to comply
6 with the specific requirements set by the State. And as a
7 result, because it doesn't necessarily, it is not a repost
8 setting. There are other groundwater samples that are being
9 collected from these areas during the same time. They are not
10 being incorporated into the report. So we are basically
11 saying primarily the information that they are required to
12 report to the State in this report.

13 In terms of the task outline that I got and how
14 to go about providing my review was to look at the overall
15 report and focus specifically on where contamination had
16 traveled off-base on Zones 2, 3, 4 and 5. I was to identify
17 locations where I thought there might be data gaps that do
18 monitor wells that should be installed.

19 Then I was to look at trying to identify any
20 trends and contamination to see whether we had any cleanup
21 occurring or if the size of the balloons were actually
22 increasing in general. My review and this will go to
23 something that we just discussed here. The groundwater
24 balance that was prepared for Kelly USA and used in their
25 computer models as well as the elevation maps that were drawn

1 that were used to determine groundwater flow show that very
2 little horizontal flow or lateral flow of groundwater is
3 actually coming on to Kelly Air Force Base. So all of the
4 groundwater that is flowing off of the base is essentially
5 coming from rainfall, which the model estimated over a
6 different period, different years to be between 70 and
7 80 percent of the groundwater volume.

8 And then some of it is actually coming up
9 through the Navarro clay. So as long as there is a sufficient
10 ground level in the deeper aquifer it creates pressure, which
11 causes groundwater to flow upwards. So some of the
12 groundwater in the shallow aquifer at Kelly, that's the source
13 of it.

14 Two reasons why this might be important. We've
15 only been monitoring the groundwater around the base for the
16 last 10, 15 years. And so if there is any periods where there
17 was a large amount of rainfall or drought conditions, where
18 the ground level water and the drinking water aquifer
19 underneath the Navarro clay was lower, so in essence the
20 grading was reversed in groundwater was opened infiltrating
21 into the clay.

22 Those extreme periods could say a lot more about
23 the chemicals that had been distributed in off-base
24 groundwater, rather than what we are seeing under average
25 conditions. The groundwater extraction in treatment wells,

1 basically in the vicinity of where groundwater is being
2 extracted we are seeing the contamination levels decrease
3 below cleanup levels. And the same isn't true in other areas.
4 So, again, it seems like the groundwater extraction treatment
5 is very effective, but needs to be potentially applied in
6 other areas of the groundwater cleanse.

7 Originally, the Air Force concept was to try to
8 treat groundwater at the parameter of the base and allow
9 natural continuation to decrease the contaminations in the
10 plume off-base. I see now that they have taken a more
11 proactive approach. And they have tried to solve a permeable
12 reactors in a number of locations.

13 Now, normally when this technology is applied
14 the term barrier you put it at the leading edge of the plume
15 and as a result no contaminated groundwater will make it
16 through your reactor. And you basically have stopped the
17 migration of the plume. Here we have a situation where in a
18 number of cases the barriers are being placed arbitrarily
19 within the plume. And so we make the treatment of groundwater
20 that will pass through the reactor, but we won't see any
21 treatment for the downgrading inside of the plume.

22 Most of these reactors that were installed
23 during 2004, there wasn't any indication that monitoring wells
24 had been installed that we need to monitor the effectiveness
25 as well as whether groundwater was diverting around the

1 reactor. So new wells are needed in those areas. There was a
2 system installed on-base in Zone 3. There was two barrier
3 reactors installed there. And in those days there was about a
4 dozen new wells installed in each one of those locations to
5 monitor the reactors.

6 So in these other locations new wells are being
7 installed as well. I also measured the three major plumes
8 that are coming off of the base. One would be coming from
9 Zone 4 on the north side of the base. A second one from east
10 Kelly. And the third from the metal plating shops by MP in
11 Zone 3. And coincidentally all of them are about three miles
12 long.

13 In order for the contamination to travel that
14 distance based upon the estimates in the Compliance Plan of
15 groundwater and contaminate flow rates, it would have taken a
16 little over a 1,000 years. So it is clearly that we may get
17 these instances of high rainfall that have allowed the
18 contamination to distribute that. Basically isn't, isn't
19 caught in the analysis that the Air Force is doing with the
20 data that they are collecting.

21 Okay. The 10 principal groundwater contaminates
22 that were focussed of the Compliance Plan Report were the two
23 cleaning solvents PCE and TCE. Those two chemicals are
24 responsible for the DCE and which are formed as by-products
25 when they decompose in the environment. Benzene is a

1 component of petroleum fuels normally only found in gasolines,
2 but there are isolated spots on the base where it is found.
3 Chlorobenzene is used as a paint removal solvent. And there
4 are some areas where Chlorobenzene is found that have been
5 active remediation systems that seem to have done nothing to
6 really change the concentration of the chemical over the last
7 six years.

8 The rest of the four chemicals are inorganics
9 and let's talk about manganese. It is a chemical that is only
10 found in water that is a void of oxygen. And it has a
11 drinking water standard established for it, because if you
12 turn on your tap and there is high levels of manganese on it,
13 it will immediately precipitate form a solid and stain your
14 fixtures.

15 If you use it in your washing machine it will
16 stain your clothes. It is also under the same conditions iron
17 will dissolve in water. And what has essentially happened is
18 the decomposition of all of the organic wastes that have been
19 spilled here lowers the dissolved oxygen in groundwater. And
20 it has allowed this chemical to become soluble. And it is
21 something that may have an effective on the effectiveness of
22 the barrier reactors. And it is also a chemical that when
23 they are extracting groundwater and treating it, they have
24 problems with one of their treatment systems in meeting the
25 discharge standard from manganese, which basically delayed the

1 treatment system from operating.

2 The big concern there is if manganese
3 contaminated water and again will contain a large amount of
4 iron that goes into Leon Creek or some other open stream and
5 it will immediately remove the oxygen from the stream. And
6 that will result in a fish desk. If the result of oxygen
7 level goes low enough.

8 Arsenic is commonly found in soils. And the Air
9 Force is attributed its presence in here to its disillusion
10 from soils. And one of the things that arsenic does when it
11 separates out of groundwater is that it absorbs onto manganese
12 oxides or afferent oxides and those have been dissolved. So
13 it doesn't have that spot on the soil to absorb, which may
14 explain its presence.

15 However, there is two. And I will go through
16 those in my slides to be distinct in arsenic plume that is
17 coming off-base and doesn't seem to be consistent with any
18 soluble contamination. Chromium, the Air Force has attributed
19 to staining steel as screening and wells. And that
20 contributed to go to the same source. I find that too, they
21 have done a number of studies. I have reviewed one of the
22 earlier studies in 1999.

23 In some cases they attribute it to the stainless
24 steel well screens when the samples they collected were
25 collected from wells of constructed PVC. And chromium was a

1 way to use in their plate shops and in most of the areas where
2 it was found it was actually impounded in chemical evaporation
3 kits. So it is very likely to be a source on the base.

4 Nickel is a chemical that is found in jet fuel.
5 And none of the analysis here specifically looked at petroleum
6 hydrocarbons. We just looked at specific toxic components.
7 The area that it is found though is a significant nickel plume
8 coincides in an area where there is significant jet fuel
9 release. So even after the jet fuel may have decomposed
10 biologically, we still see the inorganic nickel in solution.
11 And it is very difficult to precipitate that, unless you are
12 at a high PH or you end up in a situation where, again all of
13 the oxygen is removed from groundwater to the point where
14 sulfate is formed that will reciprocate it. So it will be
15 something to look at over the years, whether or not this
16 nickel plume continues to travel any further off-base or
17 actually is able to dissolve nickel is able to basically only
18 swerve onto the soil.

19 All right. One of the task is to try to find
20 trends in the data. And the report contained a map that
21 compared plumes for the four chlorinated solvents, PCE, TCE
22 and DCE and vinyl chloride. And it compared to plumes from
23 1998, 2000, 2002 and 2004. The 1998 plume amounts were at a
24 time when the full basic extent contamination was not known.
25 And it looks over at the course of the 2000 and 2002. The

1 plumes again were better defined. And then in the 2004 map,
2 you actually start seeing some reductions in the plume in the
3 specific areas, the base where groundwater is being extracted.

4 But again, one of the things with, around the
5 covering wells when you stop pumping the groundwater and allow
6 the groundwater to recover to its natural level tendency for
7 the water to become recontaminated by any residual chemicals
8 on the soil. So it is unclear whether that reduction in
9 concentrations in groundwater by the recovery wells will be at
10 something that is permanent.

11 The other data that I had available besides the
12 trend maps was in the report that sample three cites. They
13 looked at each of those cites and actually put together a
14 figure showing a trending contamination in their semiannual
15 sampling events over the period of four to five years. And
16 then the Compliance Plan Report took different groups of wells
17 at a number of different monitoring cites and provided the
18 minimum and maximum concentration detected. Again, over a
19 period of years for comparison sake.

20 When I looked at some of those different data
21 sets that were used, it was clear that over the years what
22 they are presenting is for instance, a point of compliance
23 well average or high and low data, which was not based upon
24 the same point of compliance wells. So there is variations on
25 that.

1 When I try to verify some of the sample analysis
2 reports, they weren't in the document itself. So I couldn't
3 look at the actual lab report. I found some data that was
4 shown on the plume maps that was not, that was not included in
5 the list of wells that was sampled. And there would be a lab
6 report for that information. And at the same time I see wells
7 that were sampled and the results of that sampling would not
8 be depicted in plume maps.

9 So again, it is really hard to get a sense of
10 what I was comparing from year to year in trying to identify
11 these trends. Here is an example of the two different tables
12 that I had available to me. And this is for a chemical and
13 evaporation kit that is down by Leon Creek about 600 feet from
14 the creek. It is referred to site E3. This would be in Zone
15 2. So we are looking at the monitoring well, NW 100 and it is
16 called a Point of Compliance Well. This is the boundary of
17 the site where they want to achieve a water quality objection,
18 which in this case is 100. And you could see the
19 concentration has consistently been around 10,000.

20 Now, again, this chart here was from the regular
21 site report. And if we look down at the sampling that is done
22 at the same Site E3 and reported in the semiannual Compliance
23 Plan Report and we look at the concentrations of chlorobenzene
24 in 2000, 2001, and then all of a sudden 2002 there is no
25 chlorobenzene depicted, but if we look at the graphs at the

1 top it seems like chlorobenzene has always been detected at
2 that site. So I don't know whether this well was not included
3 in the wells, the point of compliance wells that were sampled
4 in that sampling event in 2002 or whether it was in the data
5 that, you know, just reported over that level.

6 Also, the interest in this cable looking at
7 trends in the data. If you look at the DCE and the final
8 chloride you will see right above the chlorobenzene the DCE.
9 And the DCE you will see that they are relatively low
10 concentrations in 2000, 2001, and then all of a sudden their
11 concentration increased by about a magnitude of 100.

12 One of the potential explanations of that is
13 that the site, the groundwater extraction wells used at the
14 site used to use five groundwater extraction wells in one
15 location. And they were replaced by two groundwater
16 extraction wells in another location. And so contamination
17 that wasn't captured by these other wells is now being
18 captured by these wells and it is impacting what is monitored
19 at that point of compliance well.

20 So, again you could see that these trends are
21 not very clear from the data that has been generated today.
22 So again, look at how they develop these groundwater flow
23 direction maps. These blue lines refer to the height of the
24 groundwater and you will see this, half a donut up there where
25 they, that's the highest groundwater elevation that is

1 measured. This is right at the north end of the base. This
2 would be at the end of the runways. That's the highest
3 groundwater elevation on the base. So everything is kind of
4 flowing outward from that location. And you could see this
5 depicts very little opportunity for flow actually onto the
6 base.

7 The problem that I have when we are putting
8 together a map like this is that we are trying to take
9 measurements at two points. And then we are trying to
10 interpolate it between those two points.

11 MR. SHENEMAN: You made it. You made it. You
12 made your wells. You went from five to two.

13 MR. LYNCH: Well, no. I mean, if we use two
14 wells. For instance, if I take this well here and this well
15 here and take the groundwater that is leveled that is measured
16 in there, then I will just find basically average points
17 between them where I could draw the contours.

18 The problem that I see though is this well is
19 being compared to a well way over there far more than these
20 contours up here. And you get three miles away and you don't
21 have two things that you could compare to one another. This
22 well that we're actually showing here was dry. So we don't
23 even know what the ground level of that location is.

24 So this is one of the areas where to better
25 understand groundwater flow, particularly since there is an

1 off-base plume immediately to the north of the base to get
2 some ideas of what the groundwater level elevation is in that
3 particular area, so that we could better define groundwater
4 flow direction.

5 This is a look at the PCE plume and again, this
6 used to be shown as a continuous plume extending, again from
7 east or what is it Kelly Gardens neighborhood.

8 MR. SHENEMAN: Yeah.

9 MR. LYNCH: And extending for three miles. Some
10 of the levels are now showing below the concentration of five
11 parts per million, but again whether or not that's a trend
12 that we continue to see. It could be just a seasonal effect
13 in groundwater level changes. We could see those
14 concentrations coming back out.

15 Let me point out one other thing too. Here is
16 the location of one of the new, I guess new being it was
17 installed in 2004 permeable-barrier reactors. And that's one
18 of the areas where there needs to be a look at installing
19 additional wells to monitor the performance of that reactor.

20 We also have a second one that was installed
21 down here. As you could see on the next slide that's
22 primarily the treat of PCE plume. That's another data of no
23 PCE found in that particular area. And again, determining
24 whether or not this plume is flowing off-base and causing that
25 contamination, again it should be an exercise. Imagine

1 there's an large industrial site.

2 MR. GARCIA: Alamo Aircraft.

3 MR. LYNCH: Is that what it is. Yeah. I got
4 that from the aerial photograph. So I think it could be more
5 of a source of that contamination too. So I think there could
6 be more information on groundwater flow reactions in that
7 area. This is a look at the TCE that is coming off of east
8 Kelly or Zone 4. And again, you see some improvement in
9 groundwater pulling immediately downgrading from where
10 groundwater is being extracted. And this is also an area
11 where the interpretation of the plume down in here could have
12 been done with greater care.

13 The area to be, this area should be shown
14 probably as contaminated based upon the information that is
15 the wells that they collected. The other thing that is not
16 depicted on here that didn't show up on the plume map is
17 commercial street. There was a large number of wells that
18 were used to inject iron. It is the same concept as trying to
19 put in a permeable-barrier reactor. And, again those, that
20 material was injected, was injected in the operator of that
21 location. And there are no nearby monitoring wells to monitor
22 the effectiveness of that treatment.

23 MR. SHENEMAN: The river is nice and close.

24 MR. LYNCH: I'm sorry.

25 MR. SHENEMAN: The river is nice and close.

1 MR. LYNCH: No. This isn't too bad. Here is
2 the river here. And the commercial street I think is about
3 right here.

4 MR. SHENEMAN: Yeah, the river.

5 MR. LYNCH: Zone 3, this is actually a figure I
6 used when I reviewed the 1998 report. And what this shows
7 here is basically if you could imagine going to the order of
8 Zone 3, along the railroad tracks and taking a knife and
9 cutting a cake. This is what our cake would like look along
10 the boundary of the base. And what we are interested in the
11 elevation of the Navarro clay. And how that includes where
12 groundwater comes and goes off of the base to the most part,
13 most of the groundwater is flowing in this direction towards
14 Leon Creek, but there are three areas where it is coming
15 off-base. And they are all coincidentally low points.

16 This is site S4 and the contamination goes
17 off-base. The other one that is shown is Site MP. And then
18 this little low spot here corresponds to Site S4. So those
19 are the three sites that we have seen off-base migration and,
20 again it is the Navarro surface that's controlling it. One of
21 the areas that concerns me is down here. Where they put in a
22 groundwater drain in that Quintana Road neighborhood.

23 The surface on the Navarro clay there is very,
24 what we call heterogenous. It is filled with little pockets
25 where water could enter and be stagnant. It would no longer

1 flow. A number of wells in that area are not consistently
2 monitored. And it's an area where I think you want to get as
3 much monitoring information as you can for the simple reason
4 that the Navarro surface is in that area.

5 And as you could see again, the PCE plume
6 primarily travels down towards Leon Creek. And off on this
7 side where Site MP is, they installed a slurry wall. And they
8 are not doing an adequate job of withdrawing water from within
9 the slurry wall to maintain an inward groundwater. And that's
10 something that should be improved on. There is only about a
11 foot difference between elevation of groundwater in the well
12 and the elevation of groundwater outside of the well.

13 And you could see that there has been some
14 improvement on this large TCE or PCE plume coming off of the
15 base in the immediate vicinity of where they have their
16 extraction wells. And the PCE plume down towards Site S4 here
17 is basically following what their computer has predicted.
18 And, again that's about a 25 to 30 year time frame to actually
19 achieve groundwater cleanup objectives.

20 This is the major arsenic plume and it is
21 associated with the Site S4. And one of the things that
22 interest me, this is again showing a 50 part pavilion contour
23 plume and a 100 part park pavilion contour plume. In January
24 the drinking water standard for arsenic is going to be reduced
25 to 10 from 50, which will indicate that there may be a much

1 larger problem to address with arsenic.

2 Again, this is the large nickel plume that
3 again, may have originated from jet fuel. And the Air Force
4 is maintaining from their stainless steel wall screens which I
5 guess could be eliminated if they stop installing wells with
6 stainless steel wall screens, but, again this has traveled the
7 far distance. And it would be something to watch, because of
8 the high concentrations. And there doesn't seem to be much
9 ability for the soil to actually continue to dissolve nickel.

10 And this is, again looking at manganese down in
11 Zone 2, so we have the Leon Creek going through here. And
12 again, my concern here is this groundwater entering the creek.
13 And it probably contains a large amount of dissolved iron as
14 well. And what will have an effect on the dissolved oxygen
15 levels measured in the creek.

16 When I looked at the Leon Creek Assessment, what
17 I found was that they measured dissolved oxygen levels
18 anywhere between point five and 20 parts per million. And 20
19 parts per million is basically above what you would consider
20 the water to be saturated with oxygen when it's at about eight
21 parts per million. So the readings are suspicious in that
22 case.

23 They did do also some fish tissue testing in
24 this area. And each fish they tested high levels of PCBs.
25 And there is also a presence of a chemical that is often found

1 near disposal sites that was found in one of the tissue
2 samples. And it is reported that some demolition man occurred
3 in this area.

4 In terms of what is happening here they
5 dissolved a permeable-barrier reactor and this yellow line
6 that is standing off of it is a slurry wall to basically
7 capture more groundwater to flow through the reactor, while
8 the reactor there is plenty of monitoring wells in the area to
9 monitor it, there is nothing to monitor whether that slurry
10 wall is going to be effective in diverting groundwater flow,
11 since some additional monitoring wall should be installed on
12 either side of the slurry wall. And what is curious here if
13 you see the way the plume map looks this seems to be installed
14 right at the front end of the plume. And that seems to be the
15 way the plume is moving, but when you look at the
16 interpretation of groundwater contours in this area, the
17 groundwater appears to be slowing perpendicular to the barrier
18 wall.

19 So whether they can correct that using the
20 recovery wells that they have to get the flow direction they
21 want is something to look at. So again, that's the
22 conclusions. Again, the monitoring wells primarily needed in
23 the vicinity of these new permeable-barrier reactors of slurry
24 walls.

25 Again, there should be a developed way to

1 evaluate data trends to make sure that we are looking at using
2 consistent and complete data. And it seems that with the
3 effectiveness that they have seen around the groundwater
4 extraction and treatment systems that using some of those
5 systems, both in areas on-base and off-base can reduce some of
6 the formation of this dissolved arsenic and manganese that may
7 lead to problems, again with their treatment systems
8 discharges.

9 MR. SHENEMAN: Awesome.

10 MR. LYNCH: I couldn't inspire a single
11 question?

12 MR. SHENEMAN: You said you were an engineer.

13 MR. LYNCH: Yeah.

14 MR. SHENEMAN: How did you know so much
15 chemistry?

16 MR. LYNCH: Because I'm a Chemical Engineer?

17 MR. SHENEMAN: They don't know that much.

18 Awesome. What the hell do you think we should do?

19 MR. LYNCH: Sir, its a problem that's going to
20 be there for a long time. And the more proactive measures
21 that are taken, you know.

22 MR. SHENEMAN: You are saying what we have been
23 suspecting for sometime.

24 MR. PLYLAR: The highs and the lows.

25 MR. LYNCH: Yeah, yeah. And honestly, I must

1 say that this again is an extraordinary number of wells here,
2 but I must say that on both sides they should do quarterly
3 monitoring to try to identify the seasonal trend, even if they
4 only do it for a year. And then, you know, use that
5 information to --

6 MR. SHENEMAN: This one year that I could call
7 your attention to since I was here in the '40s and up to about
8 1950. These folks down here did not have city water. They
9 all had water wells.

10 MR. LYNCH: Right.

11 MR. SHENEMAN: Through and through all of this
12 da, da, da, da. Then right down the Edwards is so big how
13 will you ever measure it? Water is going to follow the line
14 of resistance and downhill and I don't know anymore.

15 MR. LYNCH: Well, these Chlorine chemicals are
16 bad because they sink. And that's one of the reasons when you
17 look at the contours of the clay, you know, if it sunk to the
18 low spot that's why you see contamination.

19 MR. SHENEMAN: Is that the reason why it is
20 going parallel to the -- help me out. Parallel relevant to --

21 MR. LYNCH: Yeah, it is going parallel.

22 MR. SHENEMAN: Parallel to that are, gee.

23 MR. LYNCH: You know, some of that flow is
24 influenced by the creek itself. Some of it is being
25 influenced by extraction wells that they have operating.

1 MR. SHENEMAN: And we had a drought spell here
2 in the 50s. And I have always wondered about that.

3 MR. LYNCH: That would be about the time that
4 they started using the chemicals.

5 MR. SHENEMAN: That just blows me away. And two
6 or three years later it almost got washed away. And in '98
7 and 2002 we had two floods back-to-back.

8 MR. LYNCH: Right. And I know that the 1998 was
9 mentioned because of the creek resistant out there so.

10 MR. SHENEMAN: Thank you.

11 MS. HANNAPEL: Yeah. Well, I am excited because
12 he had the same questions that I had. The monitoring wells,
13 the placement of the barriers, all of these things. Would you
14 be able to get more data? You say evaluate transit complete?
15 Would you be able to get more data than you have already or --

16 MR. LYNCH: I mean, what I have is and I am not
17 going to be able to get more data, but what I have is, I don't
18 know if I am comparing apples to apples, because it's a set, a
19 set of wells. And sometimes the wells are dry or there is
20 difficulties with cars parked on top of it. So there are a
21 number of explanations. And another one may be the seasonal
22 change as well, even the wells that are presented on plume
23 maps were sampled over a three month period. And during that
24 time I think they said it was around 20-inches of rain.

25 MS. HANNAPEL: And what did you say about Leon

1 Creek? You would not be looking over it?

2 MR. LYNCH: I said that I just looked briefly
3 out there. It is more of a biological assessment that they
4 did of the creek. And the information about this tissue
5 sampling came from that report, but I didn't do a thorough
6 look at the, it looks like very substantive testing they have
7 done.

8 MR. SHENEMAN: We are lead to believe that some
9 of this contamination came from outside of the fence, under
10 the fence. It's almost like -- except for the one industrial
11 site.

12 MR. LYNCH: You know there is flow in Leon Creek
13 introduce contamination but, yeah, for the most part it looks
14 like at the top of the runway they are saying a high on the
15 groundwater and then it flows out to every direction from
16 there. As it flows across the base, the runway decides
17 whether it will go into Leon Creek or east Kelly.

18 MR. SMITH: Mr. Silvas.

19 MR. SILVAS: Yeah. There is a couple of
20 questions. Speaking with the data that you said you reviewed.
21 Where, what did you receive to review? Was it actually hard
22 or was it a disk data?

23 MR. LYNCH: I actually got both.

24 MR. SILVAS: You got both?

25 MR. LYNCH: Yeah. So essentially what I had was

1 an appendix that contained all of the lab reports. And, you
2 know, when I started to notice this missing data and I
3 actually went through and counted how many wells they sampled.
4 I came up with 476 lab reports, which is three more than the
5 number of wells examined, but I know that in at least three
6 instances I couldn't find wells that were sampled, but I
7 couldn't find their data report.

8 MR. SILVAS: Well, I think a lot of this stuff
9 has been brought up and seen in others. It seems to be a
10 pattern. Secondly, the arsenic seems to be a real concern,
11 especially to the community because the longevity and the
12 harmful, the harm it causes. There is a concern that arsenic,
13 you could, you know, treat it or how would you approach that
14 in assessing to, you know, deal with it.

15 MR. LYNCH: The arsenic wastewater treatment
16 systems that I have worked on is primarily changing the
17 oxidation state, which is similar to changing the form of
18 magnesium or iron to a form that is less soluble and then it
19 usually has an PH adjustment. And the PH is usually up about
20 nine or 10, with just upper end. I think there is nine or 10
21 wells that maybe have Phs that high.

22 MR. SILVAS: Another concern is the Treatment
23 Plant where they discharge the water. There has been some
24 concern that the Treatment Plant has not allowed any kind
25 of -- well, they haven't, the water they treat and they

1 discharge they are finding no contaminants. Everything is
2 being found clean even the waste that we ship out is being
3 shipped out nonhazardous. They aren't finding any kind of
4 waste. Is that something that is like a concern, because of
5 what we are seeing here. Some of the high contaminations and
6 the treatment of that water. Is that something that is
7 possible to claim that they are not getting any kind of
8 contamination.

9 MR. SHENEMAN: Where did the contamination go?

10 MR. LYNCH: Well, most of the organics in the
11 water are being treated with a new oxidation process.

12 MR. SHENEMAN: We are talking about the organics
13 and the manganese.

14 MR. LYNCH: Well, the manganese they are using
15 what is called a green filter.

16 MR. SHENEMAN: Green filter?

17 MR. LYNCH: To remove that material.

18 MR. SILVAS: But at the discharge level, what
19 they are discharging it is all zero contaminates.

20 MR. LYNCH: I suspect that they probably have
21 the same water quality standards or at least the ones that
22 were for Leon Creek would apply to the discharge so that they
23 are limited at least for the solvents. It was the same as
24 their drinking water standard five.

25 MR. SILVAS: Okay. Other concern was that they

1 are not allowed by the city to discharge the water that they
2 treat back into the city supply or the sewers. They are only
3 allowed to discharge the water back into the creek, because of
4 the treatment that they, the treatment steps that they use.
5 They are claiming that the water is treated so good and it is
6 so clean that they don't want to get it mixed up into the city
7 water. The city denied them the permit. Is that possible?

8 MR. LYNCH: You know, two extreme plants are
9 all, you know, in different situations. The big problem with
10 having an entry going to the sewer plant is that, you know,
11 it's not designed to handle clean water. I mean, you want
12 some water with some solvents in it. And so that's why they
13 put a prohibition on hooking up rainwater drains through a
14 sanitary sewer and sewer basement pumps and things like that.
15 I mean, if their plant is having a problem, you know, with
16 that then that could be the issue.

17 MR. SILVAS: The stainless steel wall pipes that
18 you mentioned that they may be finding too much nickel, is
19 that typical that those pipes that are used that they will
20 start to deteriorate in that short amount of time?

21 MR. LYNCH: You know, first of all stainless
22 steel is very expensive. So the only places that they would
23 be even rationalized even in the well is a stainless stream
24 would be in areas where they are actually present, because it
25 will take a clear chemical to actually do some damage to PVC.

1 MR. SILVAS: The other one is the issue where
2 any claim that there is a site where there might have been
3 some handling of ordinant or something like that. Now, the
4 thing is what would you be looking for in those areas, because
5 there was a concern here back that there is a concentration of
6 residual market fuel that is being found in all areas of
7 different communities in their water. And that was something
8 that was brought up in the past and they claim that there was
9 no handling of the rockets here on this base, which I find
10 hard to believe. Is that something that should be looked
11 into?

12 MR. LYNCH: You know, its one of those things
13 where this type of activity, unless it was concentrated in one
14 area. You may be looking for a single incident. That
15 chemical that you are talking about is sulfates or Chloro that
16 recently has been assigned to really load the drinking water
17 standard risk, because it causes Thyroid Cancer.

18 MR. SILVAS: The other concern was the radio
19 activity and other kind of nuclear contaminants was that ever
20 looked into in the water or the studies?

21 MR. LYNCH: You know, I can't, I mean they
22 certainly haven't done anything in the groundwater. I am not
23 sure if they are. The Leon Creek monitor might have actually
24 looked at the ratio.

25 MR. SILVAS: What would you look for in that

1 sense if you want?

2 MR. LYNCH: Usually, its just like alpha and
3 gamma radiation in water.

4 MR. SILVAS: Okay. That's all I have.

5 MR. LYNCH: I know that they have a similar
6 landfill on the base near my house. And they have done their
7 radiation survey and redone it. They finally got to the point
8 where they put an ad in the paper looking for anyone who
9 worked in the division that handled the material. So they
10 could get some sense of why it is all over the place.

11 MR. SILVAS: Right. And they looked up those
12 same chemicals that you mentioned and they found?

13 MR. LYNCH: Right.

14 MR. GARCIA: Yeah, we talked about nickel and
15 Magnesium in there, but that place that we were talking about
16 Alamo Aircraft, that should have been looked at by the EPA on
17 site inspection. EPA and TCEQ too. Would that nickel and
18 that manganese leak out of those aircraft engines that have
19 never been drained properly and are sitting in the mud in
20 pieces or in bulks. Did they have nickel and Magnesium in all
21 of those aircraft engines that could have over the years that
22 those engineers have been sitting there for 20, 30 years and
23 they are starting to rot out and rust out and rot out and all
24 of that. Could those manganese and nickel come from those
25 rotten engines that they have sitting in asphalt? Sitting in

1 the mud? Sitting in the weeds from those sites that we talked
2 about at 36 and --

3 MR. LYNCH: Generally, it is very difficult for
4 metal contamination to move through a soil on the ground. I
5 mean, you have to have like a landfill.

6 MR. GARCIA: Like the fill from the metal from
7 the rain drops hit it will the landfill have a little bit of
8 contamination before?

9 MR. LYNCH: I think most of it would be trapped
10 in the, you know, for the first step of soil and the real
11 concern is that storm water run on property.

12 MR. GARCIA: Right there by all of that garbage
13 from Alamo Aircraft right there on 36 and one block away on
14 34. We put a -- on there probably for their benefit, you
15 know, could they be a source of the problem also?

16 MR. LYNCH: Definitely.

17 MR. GARCIA: Could you tell us anything or
18 should we go directly to EPA and TCEQ until we get a court
19 order or something and go inside of there and look at all of
20 that mess that they have in there. And force them to clean it
21 up.

22 MR. LYNCH: You know, that's a situation in the
23 bay area where a bunch of private parties have a super fund
24 site and that contamination is going onto a needy super fund
25 site. At least in that case the private parties put a lot of

1 pressure on them, the Navy, to at least accelerate their
2 cleanup so that it is on the same schedule as theirs, but
3 yeah, it is foolish to just spend money to cleanup
4 contamination. And potentially it is continuing the cause.

5 MR. GARCIA: Mr. Weegar.

6 MR. WEEGAR: Yes, sir.

7 MR. GARCIA: What do you think about that? Do
8 you think you could go over there and hit Alamo Aircraft for
9 all of that junk and mess that they have over there. And
10 check it for any of the chemicals that are spread out in the
11 mud or in the weeds or in all of those open aircrafts and
12 chemicals that they were never jet fuel and they are just
13 sitting there rotting all over the place. Do you think that
14 is something that you guys as TCEQ need to go and AFRPA need
15 to go out there and need to go out there and hit them hard or
16 something?

17 MR. WEEGAR: Well, it is my understanding that
18 the regional office conducts Compliance Inspections of Alamo
19 Aircraft like they have and other facilities. And we looked
20 at that PCE area out there and basically the inspections have
21 been found. And found no records or indications of their use
22 of PCE in that area, but one of the reasons that, that slurry
23 wall or the permeable-barrier was, you throw me off with
24 your --

25 MR. LYNCH: Barrier.

1 MR. WEEGAR: You weren't using the difficult
2 terminology for referring to the permeable-barriers. One of
3 the things that was installed was to address potential, a
4 potential off-sight source, but as well it did appear that
5 well was migration of contamination from Kelly off to that
6 part of the plume as well.

7 Like I said we have done, we do inspections and
8 unless we note some violations or mismanagement of waste and
9 things like that we are very limited on what our ability is to
10 go in there and force something to do some type of
11 investigation.

12 MR. SHENEMAN: So you got to be invited in?

13 MR. WEEGAR: No. I mean, we do inspections, but
14 until, unless we find, unless we find through our inspections
15 that somebody is violating SAWS Regulations. We can't just go
16 in there like the Gus -- or something like that and tell them
17 that they are going to do this and this. They have to be
18 cited for some violation. Just like any of us citizens of the
19 United States would not want the Government coming onto your
20 property without any kind of reasonable cause and telling you,
21 you will spend your money and do this, this and this. And
22 that's not, you got constitutional protections against things
23 like that.

24 MR. SILVAS: That's why we are here today,
25 aren't we?

1 MR. WEEGAR: Pardon me?

2 MR. SILVAS: That's why we are here today,
3 aren't we?

4 MR. WEEGAR: I have no idea what you are talking
5 about.

6 MR. SILVAS: Well, because the Air Force went
7 and dumped the stuff on the ground for so long and you didn't
8 find any reason to go and investigate and recycle. We are
9 here today overlooking these issues today, aren't we?

10 MR. WEEGAR: They caused, they released solvents
11 to the environment and they are, that's why. Why we are here
12 is to oversee the corrective action that they are doing to
13 clean the mess up.

14 MR. SMITH: Ms. Hannapel.

15 MS. HANNAPEL: Is it possible with the number of
16 wells around to tell whether they are working correctly?

17 MR. SHENEMAN: You said you may need more.

18 MR. LYNCH: Well, again, its a scale of about
19 that permeable-barrier reactor. For instance, on 34 Street
20 isn't practical to put in a downgrading monitoring well in
21 there or do you have to go a block away. And you have to go a
22 block away, you know, it may be a year or two before that well
23 down here will even see that effect. So that was the idea to
24 get some wells closer to the PRB. And then the location where
25 there is none detected on the maps.

1 MR. SILVAS: I got a question. The next
2 presentation you will be presenting this to the Restoration
3 Board. Is there anything that we could do to furthermore your
4 or are you done with what you need to do? Is there anything
5 else?

6 MR. LYNCH: If you guys have a question about
7 any of those zones and you want, I have the information. I
8 could certainly try to elaborate on any topic on that.

9 MR. WEEGAR: I have got a question. As you
10 stated in the first part of your representation. The purpose
11 of the semiannual Compliance Plan is to address specific
12 requirements placed on the Air Force for monitoring their
13 Compliance Plan. And it is really kind of a semiannual
14 snapshot of what is the status of these sites. The status of
15 the remediation and things like that. Obviously, you pointed
16 out some, some of the issues that you had with the Compliance
17 Plan, but would you say from the standpoint of what the
18 function of that Compliance Plan Report is designed to do.
19 Again, snapshot of what is going on out there. Does it
20 provide an adequate snapshot of what is going on at Kelly with
21 the remediation systems?

22 MR. LYNCH: You know, let me just say that it
23 does provide a lot of information, but I really had a problem
24 with this base, with the private parties in the Navy. They
25 have an agreement. They call it Black Thursday. And they go

1 out and sample like 3,000 wells in one day. And, you know,
2 the wells here that were sampled, you know, was done over the
3 course of the week. And obviously, less time the data is
4 collected over the more representative it is at times. So my
5 concern was more though, again with the period of time of
6 which the water ground samples were collected. I mean, it did
7 look like they focussed on one area, but when all of the
8 information is put out together whether it paints it a clear
9 picture or not. And a lot of that has to do with the
10 considerable amount of rainfall that fell during the sampling
11 period.

12 So I would say like on an individual
13 side-by-side basis it will probably provide a better snapshot
14 than it does when you look at the whole base together.

15 MR. SHENEMAN: So did he answer the question? I
16 don't think so. I kind of got lost.

17 MR. WEEGAR: Well, no. I think he answered the
18 question. Again, the report is designed to look and, of
19 course, one of the things that you said that you didn't look
20 at was the report is designed to address what is the quality
21 of the surface water settlement. And the different biological
22 indicators in Leon Creek. And it is designed to do a number
23 of things.

24 Again, it is a snapshot, which we use to
25 evaluate and the Air Force uses as well to identify, granted

1 it gives kind of an overall picture of what the plume does
2 look like. It is really designed to the systems at Site S4 or
3 systems at S8, at E1 Building 360301MP and things like that.
4 Are those systems functioning? What's the snapshot of those
5 systems? That's really what, yeah, there is a requirement
6 Compliance Plan to provide these kind of large scale big
7 picture of what is the extent of the plume. What does it look
8 like, but it is really to some degree or to a higher degree
9 focussed on how are these individual systems operating. I
10 think you are saying when you look at that scale that does
11 provide a pretty accurate snapshot.

12 MR. LYNCH: The problem is a little bigger and
13 off-base wise.

14 MR. WEEGAR: Right.

15 MR. SILVAS: But there is something that I think
16 that needs to be looked at a little bit more too, and I think
17 that's the issue that is done by these agencies here. And
18 that's the chemical agent that was released and disbursed
19 throughout the base.

20 There is a concern of the by-products, which I
21 know arsenic is one of them and some of these other chemicals.
22 And if that's getting into water that is a concern. And I
23 think that maybe if you are not being provided that data.

24 MR. LYNCH: Yeah, there was some pesticide done
25 down in the creek, whether or not it included that analysis, I

1 could look at.

2 MR. SILVAS: I think too that you will run that
3 their test is always looked at the commercial side of
4 chemicals that are made up into the pesticides. They are not
5 looking into the actual dioxides and the pesticides chemicals
6 of that agent. And sure enough it needs to be looked at
7 sooner or later and with these agencies here who have
8 knowledge of a criminal investigation that went on into the
9 release of this agent will have to look at it sooner or later.
10 So I think now is a good time.

11 MS. LAGRANGE: Mr. Lynch, you said that you had
12 the same problem. What diseases or illnesses do those people
13 have?

14 MR. LYNCH: We had a counsel member recently die
15 of stomach cancer. And he grew up in a well segregated
16 housing project for some of the ship base workers. And that's
17 recently undergone a multi-million dollar remediation to renew
18 soil contamination.

19 MR. SHENEMAN: But you are not talking about a
20 whole trend?

21 MR. LYNCH: You know, I mean, yeah. There is
22 lot of people on-base who obviously developed a number of
23 symptoms. Everything from asbestos to, you know, cancer.

24 MR. SHENEMAN: What about thyroid cancer?

25 MR. LYNCH: Again, I couldn't say how

1 progressive they are. I haven't heard anything to indicate a
2 big trend in the community. Again, I can't say. It was a
3 military community up until real recently. And it was a very
4 transit, you know, the turnover in the apartments and stuff is
5 very quick. There is not a lot of long-term residents.

6 MR. SHENEMAN: Where is this?

7 MR. LYNCH: Alameda in the San Francisco Bay. I
8 tell you this is a word to the warning. The one portion of
9 the base that was transferred, the developer took out an
10 insurance policy for any undisclosed environmental liability
11 and the city came back to the insurance agency and collected
12 four and half million dollars that was pesticide contamination
13 that the Navy disclosed. That may hurt the chances of
14 transferring this base, because people are going to be less
15 likely to get insurance on transferring bases.

16 MR. SILVAS: What base is that?

17 MR. LYNCH: It's Alameda Naval Station.

18 MR. SHENEMAN: This is Texas?

19 MR. LYNCH: Well, I got a call from the lawyer
20 who was working for the insurance company trying to get the
21 money back from the Navy.

22 MR. SMITH: One more question.

23 MR. PLYLAR: Why is it that lead and mercury are
24 not considered?

25 MR. LYNCH: That's a good question. Metals can

1 be removed from groundwater. One of the mechanisms that they
2 form are salt precipitators. And lead reacts to things like
3 fluoride and forms an insoluble precipitator in very low
4 concentrations. Mercury is, it's in metallic form is more
5 likely to -- and to impact groundwater.

6 MR. GARCIA: I just had one quick comment.
7 Mr. Lynch, I would like for you to give us your
8 recommendations in extensive detail on equipment and some kind
9 of activity that we need to enhance our cleanup process.
10 Then, we'll -- Mark.

11 MR. WEEGAR: Pardon me?

12 MR. GARCIA: Can we finish this because it
13 involves you and Abby and --

14 MR. WEEGAR: Sure.

15 MR. GARCIA: Will you give us your
16 recommendations and extensive detail on equipment and
17 supplemental activity that we need to enhance in our existing
18 cleanup process. Then will EPA and TCEQ, Mark, Abby and Gary
19 Miller force the AFRPA to implement all of the recommendations
20 that you give us to improve our process? Would that be
21 possible? Could you evaluate? Suppose he gives us a
22 recommendation to improve how the work would work. Would you
23 consider it and say this is a good idea. We will recommend it
24 to the Air Force that they implement this or implement that?
25 Any recommendations that he might give us on how to improve

1 our cleanup process.

2 MR. WEEGAR: Well, let me first say that what
3 Patrick has reviewed is, again a report that is designed to
4 evaluate existing systems. Some of them are in the interim
5 stage. You have been briefed. The Zone 4 and Zone 5 CMI Plan
6 and Compliance Plan Mod has been submitted to TCEQ. And that
7 is actually the process that will drive the finalization of
8 the off-base to Zone 5 and Zone 4. I think very likely that
9 some of the comments or concerns Patrick had with some of the
10 BRBs are due to the fact that the sampling that was done that
11 was contained in the report, he reviewed was not designed to
12 address specifically the PRB sampling.

13 I know for instance 34 Street the PRB there are
14 transits that cross that PRB both upgrade and within the wall
15 and downgrading throughout that system. The same thing for --

16 MR. SHENEMAN: Excuse me, Mark, on what vehicle,
17 because I was out there and I didn't see that.

18 MR. WEEGAR: I believe there are probably some
19 of the wells go up, but I think they are like within may be
20 five or 10 feet of either side of the PRB. Some of these
21 wells are actually used to specifically address the
22 performance, you know, because these PRBs are installed. So
23 the contractor is required to do detailed testing out there to
24 demonstrate to the Air Force before they get paid that these
25 systems are working.

1 MR. SHENEMAN: After the barriers or before?

2 MR. WEEGAR: Well, the wells that are installed
3 currently. And you got wells that are installed right in the
4 PRB itself. You have some that are installed outside, very
5 likely they were installed after the PRB was put in the ground
6 to answer your question.

7 Well, to answer your question the CMI work plans
8 that have come in for Zone 4 and 5 and will be, you know,
9 submitted in the near future for Zone 2 and 3. Those really
10 contain not only what the as built final remedial systems are
11 for these sites, but will also identify what the long term
12 monitoring program would look like. What wells would be
13 installed to monitor the forms of those systems. So it is to,
14 you know, I think until those systems have all been fully
15 installed to say that hey, we are missing a lot of information
16 out there that doesn't recognize the fact that those final
17 cleanup systems have not been put in place, nor the monitoring
18 systems installed there that are designed to monitor the long
19 performance of those systems.

20 I mean, much of what the Semi Compliance Plan
21 right now is showing is the operation of interim systems.
22 Systems that were installed, you know, in many cases a number
23 of years ago to try to control the on-base source of the
24 release so that it doesn't get further off-site. And then
25 once that has been controlled installing the natural off-site

1 systems.

2 MR. GARCIA: Okay. Well, why, interpreting that
3 is some of the systems that are in, in case you make some type
4 of recommendation to enhance it and improve it, would it be
5 taken into consideration? Or if anybody reviews any of the
6 documents and that say consider this improvement to something
7 that is already working when you evaluate it and say yeah,
8 that's a good idea. We will force the Air Force to do it.

9 MR. WEEGAR: Let me just say this. There is two
10 systems that have been, that have had final systems installed
11 are S4 and S8. And in my review of the proposed plans for
12 those sites, I evaluated the comments I received from the TAPP
13 contractor. I don't know, Patrick if you have reviewed one of
14 those or whether it was Nelly or who it was, but I evaluated
15 the comments from the PATT contractor, whoever it was as
16 comments from the RAB. So I do evaluate that. I mean, if
17 there are, if there are systems.

18 MR. GARCIA: All right.

19 MR. WEEGAR: If there are things associated with
20 the S4 or S8.

21 MR. GARCIA: That need improvement?

22 MR. WEEGAR: Yeah, that need improvement. Yeah,
23 whether there is some concern. I mean, if the RAB submits
24 those to, you know, AFRPA. And we will look at that, again I
25 would say that the problem with looking at and drawing a lot

1 of site specific concerns from this particular report is that
2 there are a lot of things that have gone, since that sampling
3 was done or that sampling is not designed to address some of
4 the details that are out there. It is just not designed to do
5 that, but, you know, if the RAB thinks that there are issues
6 that need to be addressed, I mean, your mechanism, I mean
7 ultimately the RAB's role is to provide advice to the decision
8 makers, right? That's what the RAB is designed to do.

9 MR. GARCIA: You're not even giving me the
10 opportunity to do that.

11 MR. WEEGAR: The decision makers are TCEQ, EPA
12 and the Air Force. And we welcome, you know, advice or
13 concerns that you would have on some of these issues. We will
14 look at them. Am I going to sit here and tell you that we
15 will implement everything that you --

16 MR. GARCIA: No. No. I understand that.

17 MR. WEEGAR: No. We won't do that.

18 MR. GARCIA: In case of all of this he
19 recommends this.

20 MR. SILVAS: I got a question. Were you
21 provided the prior TAPP contractors like Netherly? And I am
22 not sure who it was before him.

23 MR. WEEGAR: Geomatrix.

24 MR. SILVAS: Were you provided with their
25 reviews or their final conclusions?

1 MR. LYNCH: I did sit through a presentation
2 through one of the Geomatrix Presentations.

3 MR. SILVAS: Would it help if we give you those?
4 Some of those comments?

5 MR. LYNCH: Sure. Sure.

6 MR. SILVAS: I would like to get those to you.
7 I could give you one perhaps, but yes.

8 MR. SHENEMAN: How did you go about doing this,
9 Patrick?

10 MR. LYNCH: Well, I think one document that had
11 all of the drawings in it.

12 MR. SHENEMAN: How much did you know?

13 MR. LYNCH: I took and spent an hour in folding
14 them all. And then I didn't have any floor left.

15 MR. SILVAS: I have a question regarding, well,
16 first of all, I would like to apologize on the initial, Air
17 Force Action on losing your submittal for the bid and all and
18 how you were almost left out of the process. Luckily, I was
19 able to contact you and get that rolling. And we are glad to
20 have you here. There were some issues regarding the final
21 submittal of your bid that there was something that the Air
22 Force said it was too much. And you came back with something
23 on your --

24 MR. LYNCH: We basically eliminated me coming
25 out here to a meeting and did it on a telephone conference.

1 MR. SILVAS: Again, did you have enough time to
2 review the documents?

3 MR. BUELTER: Yeah, absolutely.

4 MR. SILVAS: Okay. And how many hours would you
5 say you put in?

6 MR. LYNCH: About 70, 80 hours.

7 MR. SILVAS: 70 or 80 hours.

8 MR. LYNCH: I mean its about 50 pounds of paper.

9 MR. SILVAS: Okay. I would say thank you. I
10 appreciate it.

11 MR. SMITH: Okay. Thanks, Patrick. I
12 appreciate it. I believe that we are coming to the end of the
13 meeting. The thing that I do need to say to you very clearly
14 is that the comments and suggestions and information that you
15 want Patrick to have, please fill out that form, that should
16 probably go with Patrick today. If you will send it in, send
17 it, but please give it. It has to be in by the 20th to get
18 them all in the bunch.

19 MS. HANNAPEL: Do we send it to the address
20 here?

21 MR. SMITH: Yes. Did you all know that your
22 next RAB Meeting is January 10th, at 6:30 at Kennedy High
23 School in the cafeteria. Yes, sir.

24 MR. SILVAS: I would like to make an Action Item
25 for the next meeting in response to the comments by Mr. Lynch.

1 If we could have a response by the Air Force, either prior or
2 after and have them come out and respond to that request.

3 Secondly, the Netherly comments that the Air Force that
4 responded to him, I would like to find out who was in charge
5 of responding to those comments.

6 MR. SMITH: Eddie, did you catch both of these
7 comments?

8 MR. MARTINEZ: Yes, sir. You want the Air Force
9 to respond to Mr. Lynch's final report. And you would like to
10 know also who provided, who basically prepared the response to
11 Mr. Netherly's review.

12 MR. SILVAS: Yes.

13 MR. SMITH: Anything else? No other items. We
14 are at the end of the meeting. The meeting is adjourned.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 COUNTY OF BEXAR

2 STATE OF TEXAS

3 I, IRENE MALDONADO, Certified Shorthand Reporter
4 in and for the State of Texas, do hereby certify that this
5 transcript is as true and correct a record as possible,
6 transcribed by me through computer-aided transcription.

7 And further certify that I am not a relative or
8 employee or attorney of counsel of any of the parties; nor a
9 relative or employee of such attorney or counsel for any of
10 the parties hereto, nor interested directly or indirectly in
11 the outcome of this action.

12 In witness whereof, I do hereunto set my hand on
13 this 29th day of December, 2005.

14
15
16 Irene Maldonado, Texas CSR 6311
17 Expiration Date: 12/31/06
18 In the State of Texas, County of Bexar
19 10100 Reunion Place, Suite 660
20 San Antonio, Texas 78216
21 (210) 340-6464
22
23
24
25

FINAL PAGE

ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD

FINAL PAGE