KELLY AFB
TEXAS

ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD
COVER SHEET

AR File Number 3226.1

KELLY RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD
TECHNICAL REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE

November 8th, 2005, 6:30 p.m.
Environmental Health & Wellness Center
911 Castroville Road
San Antonio, Texas 78237
Reported by Arlinda Rodriguez, CSR

APPEARANCES

RAB Community Member Attendees:
Robert Silvas, Community Co-Chair
Rodrigo Garcia
Michael Sheneman
Armando Quintanilla
Henrietta LaGrange
Coriene Hannapel
Nazarite Perez
Nancy Garcia - Alternate for Mr. Ruben Martinez

RAB Government Member Attendees:
Mark Weegar, Texas Comission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ)
Gary Miller, Environmental Protection Agency, (EPA) Region VI

Other Attendees:
David Smith, Facilitator
Sonja Coderre, Air Force Real Property Agency (AFRPA)
Norma Landez, AFRPA
Bill Hall, AFRPA
Todd Colburn, AFRPA Contractor
Eduardo Martinez, AFRPA Contractor
Heather Ramon-Ayala, AFRPA Contractor
Abigail Power, TCEQ (Alternate for Mr. Mark Weegar)
Greg Lyssy, EPA, Region VI (Alternate for Mr. Gary Miller)
Kyle Cunningham, San Antonio Metropolitan Health District (SAMHD) (Alternate for Ms. Melanie Ritsema)
Alan Ferrell, SAMHD
Bianca Guerrero, Community Member
Norma de los Santos, Community Member
Chris Cunanan, Community Member
Carol Yzaguirre, Community Member
Mr. Rob, Community Member - (unidentified last name)

ORIGINAL

(Proceedings began at 6:36 p.m.)

MR. SMITH: My name is David Smith. I'm the RAB facilitator. This of course is the November meeting of the Kelly Restoration Advisory Board Technical Review Subcommittee. If we can take a quick moment and run through an agenda review and a packet review to reaffirm what's in your packets.

On the agenda are standard administrative items -- the BCT update, the documents that are being forwarded to the RAB, and the action item reports. You'll also find somewhere around 7 o'clock ready to look at the spill summary report followed by Class 3 modification update and a cap update. Those are reflective in your packets.

In the packets the first item you'll find are the October RAB draft minutes. Also the October RAB BCT minutes; the listing of documents that are going to the RAB; the action items from September, October including a tab summary, which will also be reflected with the agenda; information on the Class 3 modification update; and, finally, Mr. Hall's presentations on the ground water treatment plant spillover.

So those are all in there. We will try to pick them up as we go through that. We've been asked by one of the RAB members, Ms. Hannapel, to have a

moment to make a comment. If this will work for you, this will be the time you can do that.

MS. HANNAPEL: Just a very quick comment. Okay. It's pertaining to the letter that was sent out to the 12,000 people last time -- you know, last time -- the last meeting we did not have any people here. As a matter of fact, no one showed up. Ms. Coderre said she could give me a copy of that letter.

But what I wanted to ask was what kind of information is going out to the people? And I'll try to make this very brief. For instance, did these 12,000 people get a summary of this leak that just happened? Did they get notification of that? And I will actually turn in these questions.

MR. SMITH: Please.

MS. HANNAPEL: So I will do that. I have a couple of fact sheets that were on the Web site. And these fact sheets make it sound to me like everything is going all right. So the people are getting these. I wonder if that was perhaps one of the reasons. I asked this question before. It says, When the chlorinated solvents come into contact with our environments and PRBs, they break down into carbon dioxide and mineral chloride. I'd like verification of that. Okay.

And also one of the fact sheets -- I have a copy of it here. It says lactate is a vegetable-like substance which is used in the remediation. I'd like verification of that. Is it in fact a vegetable oil-like substance, as it says in the fact sheet. Because I don't believe it is, and I think I posted for that.

MR. SHENEMAN: It isn't.

MS. HANNAPEL: I know it isn't. And I'd like verification of that. And I have asked that before and have not gotten an answer to that.

And very quickly, regarding the fact that the Kelly is separated by the -- from the Edwards Aquifer by 1,000 feet of impermeable clay and rock. I'd like for someone to explain how clay and rock can be impermeable. George Rice was here last time. Unfortunately, I did not get the information to him probably in a way that I could print out. He has copies of points that indicate this action did go to the aquifer. I don't know anything about that, but he did mentioned that he has something to me, but I couldn't print it out. Okay.

So I will turn these in. Hopefully I will get some answers. One other question. Has any information gone out to the people about the effects of

these chlorinated solvents as they break down. We're told in the fact sheets they break down to sort of a happy product, like water and carbon dioxide. But, actually, they break down into VCU, Vinyl chloride, which are all carcinogens. So I'd like to know if that has actually gone out to people.

MR. SMITH: Okay.

MS. HANNAPEL: Thank you very much.

MR. SMITH: Ms. Hannapel, I do understand that you're going to write those down?

MS. HANNAPEL: I am, yes.

MR. SMITH: As you may have noticed, we have a new court reporter tonight. Would y'all please -- I have to ask, would you please use your names so that she isn't totally lost. And we'll have to remind you of that, I'm sure.

MR. SILVAS: Robert Silvas. Before we go on, I'd like to throw out, if any other RAB members would like to make a comment before we move on?

Anybody else?

MR. GARCIA: I want to read a speech, if you don't mind.

MR. SILVAS: Will it be brief?

MR. GARCIA: First of all, I want to apologize to my fellow RAB members for missing our last

meeting. I was in school at a major Ivy league university getting more training, certifications in my degree. Yes, my degree. I now have a professional -- a professional degree. I'm a professional who acts responsibly and has a responsibility to the community, which I must fulfill, in construction engineering from Columbia University.

Unlike the AFRPA, I take my professional responsibility very seriously and work in a professional, responsible, and in a manner which requires me to work well with the public I am going to respond to.

You AFRPA people are a disgrace to professionalism and do not take your professional responsibilities to the RAB very seriously. You are crude, rude, vicious, and disrespectful to all members of the RAB and the community and do not function well with us.

You people should attend some of the classes in responsibilities as a government official and your responsibilities to minority communities that I took part in at John F. Kennedy School of Government at Harvard. Maybe there you will learn some dignity, professionalism, and respect for the community you are supposed to be serving. You people also have no

professional on personal honor.

Many men and women earned honor in the military in blood, bullets, and body bags. You bureaucrats don't understand that. Your job is to step on RAB, try to crush us, suck up to your federal supervisors, and collect an undeserved paycheck.

All the RAB members, new and existing, will receive a copy of the complaint that I filed and the answer I got from federal officials that spells out the incompetence, inadequacies, and the poor performance of the AFRPA. It is all full of political rhetoric and excuses.

With that you will also receive a copy of the letter of response from Antwine and his disgraceful staff. These disgraceful people have a bureaucratic answer for everything. This is not acceptable. They do not provide a support data to back up their bureaucracy, nor do they fully justify their actions for providing accountability to community RAB members of the surrounding minority community.

I request that you -- you AFRPA people and Antwine consider submitting your letters of resignation and let the Air Force hire people who will face their responsibilities and work with community RAB members and the community members of this minority

community.

I also request that the RAB members review both letters and then realize the professional and bureaucratic incompetence I received in that letter from Washington.

This is the first skirmish in a war to bring change and professional responsibilities to our work. We need an AFRPA staff who cares about people who are dying in our community due to air, ground, water, and health issue contamination. How many more Kelly workers must die? How many more community members must die?

The war will continue. I'm not -- I'm not through with your people yet. This is just the first skirmish. You will see more actions against you if you continue on your bureaucratic ego trip and now try to start a job on me for trying to bring change and cooperation from you people. You don't care. You don't live here. We look forward to see resignations from Antwine and your Air Force legal stooges.

The war is just beginning. You people need to realize that you're here to serve us, not your little clique of bureaucratic people at the AFRPA. We will seek justice, and this minority community needs justice.

If I have to bring the congressman and senators for a public congressional hearing, if I have to go that far, I will. And believe me, I have the power and the knowledge on how to get that accomplished. Because these people are not cooperating with us. Everything is a bureaucratic answer. And you will see from the letter that I got from Washington when you read it. Thank you, sir.

MR. SMITH: I might trouble you when we -- to get a copy so that the court reporter can get an accurate --

MR. GARCIA: Yeah. I'll give her the original. My name is Rodrigo Garcia, Jr., RAB member from the community. One of the members of the community that's dying because of all this contamination.

MS. HANNAPEL: I'd just like to thank my students from Northwest Vista for showing up this evening. Thank you very much.

MR. SMITH: Okay. That moves us to the administrative section of the agenda. First item I'm showing is the BRAC Cleanup Team, the BCT update. Ms. Landez?

MS. LANDEZ: Good evening. I'm Norma Landez, the BRAC environmental coordinator. I represent the Air Force Real Property Agency on the BRAC Cleanup

Team. The minutes from the October BRAC Cleanup Team meeting are in your packet and available for your review. And we did not have a meeting today as the BRAC Cleanup Team. So I don't have any -- any summary.

MR. SILVA: When's the next meeting?

MS. LANDEZ: It will be December.

MR. SILVA: December what?

MS. LANDEZ: Probably the 6th. We haven't decided yet.

MR. QUINTANILLA: Do we have any documents that will be presented to the -- to the -- for review to the TRS committee for review?

MS. LANDEZ: The only thing that we've submitted in the packet just recently was the -- which was in previous RAB submittal -- document submittals.

MR. QUINTANILLA: But none for this meeting?

MS. LANDEZ: No. I mean, we just had two letters for the TCEQ responded to -- I'm sorry -- to some closures some tank closures that we did and those are identified and then we also had a response to our Class 2 modification and that's in your packet also.

MR. QUINTANILLA: Thank you.

MR. SMITH: As we noted earlier -- excuse me. Ms. Landez just pointed out the documents with TRS

you have are in fact the letters from reports that she mentioned included in the packet. Item C is the action item reports which are also included in your packet. Several pages of that, which they want you to work your way through.

Next item on the agenda is the spill summary report, the East Kelly Ground Water Treatment Plant. Mr. Hall?

MR. HALL: Good evening. As he said, my name is Bill Hall. First of all, I'd like to welcome you and thank you for coming out. I appreciate the folks that are out here. It shows your concern. As we go through this, I've had the opportunity with -- to meet several of you on a tour I did of the groundwater treatment plant a couple of weeks ago. Some of you are new. But I would like to restate something that I stated then. As I go through this presentation, the most important thing is at the end of this presentations, you have your questions answered.

If you have a question, please, I beg of you, stop me and ask me. Okay. If I don't know the answer, I'll tell you I don't know the answer. But I also will tell you that I'll find the answer. If we do that, then I will have done my job, which is to answer your questions about what happened, why it happened,

what we're doing about it. That's what this whole presentation is about.

The groundwater treatment plant -- Zone 4 Groundwater Treatment Plant is located on East Kelly. It's physical address is 3837 Eastern Road. We opened this plant and started operation in 2002. And I'm not going to read this to you. Y'all can read. What I will do is I'll kind of summarize. These are some of the things to show you how we've operated, how much we processed, our efficiency rate. As you look through here, if you have any questions as to what I'm saying, please ask me.

Okay. What I've tried to do is show you that during this time period, we've treated a lot of water. One of the questions that was asked in the previous tour that I gave -- I believe Mr. Quintanilla asked how much water we were producing in certain plants. We went back and looked at, since we opened this plant, what have we processed. What have we been able to do, and how much water have we put through it.

Our efficiency rating, we paid a lot of money to build this plant. What are we doing to make it run? What are we doing to make it more efficient? Those are the numbers that I give you here.

Currently, our normal flow runs about

150 gallons a minute based on the water that we're able to get out of the wells that we're currently using. We have to keep this level in order to keep the system running. As we go through the presentation -- and you have it in your handout -- the flow is very important to this particular process. The day of the spill that morning, one of our wells went down. And we'll talk about what happened. The well went down, what caused the spill, and those kinds of things.

Okay. Before I proceed to each spill, I'll ask the same question after each slide. Do you have any questions on this slide? And the reason I do that is because it makes the flow better. The slides were set up in order to make the flow better so that I can help you understand what went on better. And if you ask a question on our next slide, we won't have to come back and disrupt the flow. Yes, sir?

MR. GARCIA: You mentioned four recovery wells operating and you're recovering 150 gallons per minute. What is the condition of the water you're recovering? What are the contaminants you're finding in that water?

MR. HALL: The contaminants we're finding -- the primary chemicals of concern we utilized are the TCE, PCE. There's a list of them on the last

slide. You don't have to write them down. There's a list. It also gives you some levels on that list that are coming into the plant. The last slide that I'll talk about, the last slide in the presentation. So we talked about what we're getting, how much we're getting. Okay. Yes?

MR. QUINTANILLA: Yes. What time did the spill occur on October the 5th?

MR. HALL: Okay. We're coming up to that. The spill -- the system shut down at 11 o'clock that night.

MR. QUINTANILLA: What time were you informed of this?

MR. HALL: I was informed of it at 7:30 in the morning.

MR. SHENEMAN: How?

MR. HALL: The technician that went to the site noticed that the plant had water coming out the doors. And he called Mr. David Poole, the field technician supervisor. Mr. Poole called me, and we went over immediately.

MR. QUINTANILLA: So this happened on October the 5th, and you weren't advised until October the 6th at --

MR. HALL: At 7:30 in the morning.

MR. QUINTANILLA: -- at 7:30 in the morning. One more question. How many gallons were spilled?

MR. HALL: I believe the number is -- on an upcoming slide. 36,600 I believe is the number.

MR. QUINTANILLA: Thank you very much.

MR. SILVAS: Robert Silvas. How did you come about that number?

MR. HALL: Okay. What you're doing is you're -- all the slides that I have coming up explains all these and shows it to you. So I'll tell you what. When we come to that. Like I'll tell you, when you ask a question like that's on an upcoming slide, it's okay. I'll say it's on an upcoming slide. You'll see it visually and we can talk about it and it will be easier to understand. Okay. Yes, ma'am?

MS. HANNAPEL: What day of the week is that. Is that coming on a slide?

MR. HALL: I believe it was a Tuesday. I don't remember the calendar day.

MS. HANNAPEL: So there's no system in place from nighttime 'til the morning?

MR. HALL: Yes, there is. And we'll cover that in the slide. You bet.

MR. GARCIA: Is somebody watching the

plant 24 hours a day, that they could have discovered this spill at 11:30 at night when it happened?

MR. HALL: Yes, sir. This's a mechanic or a computer mechanism set up to do that.

MR. GARCIA: I'm talking about a human.

MR. HALL: Well, yes. That's -- there's no one at the site, no, to answer that question. But is there someone --

MR. GARCIA: From what hours to what hours is that plant managed?

MR. HALL: That plant is covered -- man-wise, we don't have anybody at that plant full time at any time. That plant is monitored -- remember the plant that you came over to visit that I took you through? The computer that we have there is manned from 6:00 in the morning until 5:00 in the afternoon. That computer has a screen on it that shows the other plant.

It's monitored by means of the computer, reading the computer that is being activated at the other plant throughout the day. So it is monitored and watched throughout the day. Not only is the -- the plant monitored, but each of the wells is monitored. So it's being observed via the computer throughout the day. But there's nobody physically at that site.

MR. GARCIA: So nobody is watching it 24

hours a day to make sure accidents like this happen at 11:00 at night?

MR. HALL: There's someone watching it, but they're not physically there.

MR. GARCIA: So if the spill happened at 11:30 p.m., the response from a human didn't happen 'til 7:30 in the morning?

MR. HALL: That's because the computer glitched. I'm going to explain that later, Mr. Garcia.

MR. GARCIA: Eight and a half hours of negligence.

MS. LAGRANGE: Henrietta LaGrange. Is it possible to put some kind of an alarm system there or something?

MR. HALL: We'll cover that. I'll show you what we have. I'll tell you what happened. I'll tell you what we've done to improve it.

MR. SILVAS: Was this human error or mechanical error?

MR. HALL: Mechanical.

MR. QUINTANILLA: And you're going to explain the cause of that mechanical error?

MR. HALL: To the best of our ability. You bet. Okay. Any other questions.

(No response)

MR. HALL: Okay. Next slide. Normally, this is the process we're talking about. Water comes in. It's received from the field in this particular tank right here. You can see how many gallons it holds. It has a high level alarm switch. It's a sensor that's located right up here that faces down. When that sensor picks up the water getting to a certain level, it sets an alarm off. That alarm takes and tells the computer that we need -- that it will increase the flow in this pump to bring the water levels down. Once it does that, the water levels begin to come down. After the water -- after the high alarm hits the computer, if there's a high alarm and something happens and it doesn't, then the computer will shut down the well fields.

Okay. On this spill day, what we can determine happened at this point was -- remember earlier in the slide before I talked about the fact that we have to have a minimum of around 150 gallons of water to keep the system running. One of the wells went down. It got clogged. It started overheating the pump. The well shut down to protect the pump. We got down to 90 gallons a minute.

My UV/OX skid, which I'm going to show you a picture of here in a second said, Hey, I don't

have enough water to run. What happens if I don't have enough water to run through that system -- you remember the bulbs I showed you when we did the tour. They get hot. They get too hot, they will explode. So what it does is it shuts the system down. It shuts the field down.

Okay. What happened is that night, the sensor, we determined later on with other tests after the spill. We reset the computer and started running over to find out, okay, what happened here. The sensors that we have in this deal were working. It sent a message to the computer saying it got high. It got high because the UV/OX skid shut down to protect itself.

Once it hit the high, it sent a message to the computer and the computer did not get a message out to the field and shut it down. That's why the spill occurred.

MR. QUINTANILLA: Didn't communicate?

MR. HALL: It communicated but it -- yes. Exactly right. The computer did not shut the field down. Exactly right.

MS. LAGRANGE: How often do you do maintenance on these tanks and pipes or ...

MR. HALL: We normally do checks and maintenance on these -- we're at the site on a daily

basis. We're going to check it. We have a weekly physical check of the system itself. To answer your question, a weekly check.

MR. QUINTANILLA: Can you provide us a checklist of your weekly check?

MR. HALL: Sure. Could somebody note that I need to get that? Absolutely. I've got daily checks that get done that are done at each plant. I have weekly checks, I have biweekly checks, and monthly checks. And they're all based on the type of equipment and how the manufactures suggest to check the equipment.

MR. QUINTANILLA: One question. Does all of these weekly, monthly, and daily checks, do you look at the sensor?

MR. HALL: We haven't been.

MR. QUINTANILLA: You have not been looking at the sensor?

MR. HALL: No.

MR. QUINTANILLA: How far back was that sensor installed?

MR. HALL: That sensor was initially installed when the building was built.

MR. QUINTANILLA: When was that?

MR. HALL: It started running in I believe October 2000.

MR. QUINTANILLA: Since 2000? That building has been running in 2000, and no one has ever looked at the sensor.

MR. HALL: We watched -- the computer giving us the indicator that it's been working, yes. The only way you can check that is by filling it up to see that it shuts off. It does that every day. On the weekly checks that's noted. It's noted that it has been -- that it has governed and watched the high flows.

MR. SILVAS: Who's responsible for that computer program?

MR. HALL: Ultimately, I am.

MR. SILVAS: Who wrote it?

MR. HALL: The contractors wrote -- by my contractor.

MR. SILVAS: Which is?

MR. HALL: SAIC.

MR. SILVAS: Thank you.

MR. HALL: The program is out of Pennsylvania, where the primary -- that's their only job, is programing. And those programs -- after this incident occurred, all of those programs were checked and were all properly done. It was a mechanical, not a programming error.

MR. SHENEMAN: Two questions. One: Is

your sensor a ball-cock type of a float?

MR. HALL: No. It's a. --

MR. SHENEMAN: Tube?

MR. HALL: No. It's a -- it sends a signal down, and it's received, bounced back up, and I've gone brain dead on the terminology for it. But it's an ultra sonic type.

MR. SHENEMAN: A doppler of some kind?

MR. HALL: It sends a signal down, bounces off the water, and comes back.

MS. HANNAPEL: Yeah. Two questions.

MR. HALL: I'm sorry. You had two questions.

MR. SHENEMAN: Last time I was there, one of your folks corrected me about what polishing the water means. Well I told -- what we used to hold four water treatment licenses for proper water. What polishing to me is both the activated carbon and the hydrogen peroxide. Is that how you're defining polishing?

MR. HALL: No. We define the polishing as after the hydrogen peroxide is injected in UV/OX, it's treated. That's the treatment. The polishing portion is when after it's been treated, that it's sent through the GAC units, Granulated Activated Carbon

units. And that's what's considered our polishing.

MR. SHENEMAN: So it's a two-step process?

MR. HALL: Actually, the -- well, you're putting polishing together. Where I put primary treatment and the final polishing, the insurance that I have actually cleaned the water to meet the requirements. It's two separate things.

MR. SHENEMAN: That makes sense to me, but I was corrected as far as the polishing.

MR. HALL: Yes, ma'am?

MS. HANNAPEL: Okay. Two questions. One: Do you have routine checks ever at night and on the weekend? And the second question is: Now that the sensor has failed, is there a plan in place to check it?

MR. HALL: Yes. We're going to cover that in depth in the upcoming slides. And we also installed mechanical devices that will eliminate -- if the computer goes down and if we have this glitch that we have, we have now installed -- we will have installed by Friday the mechanism to where it will shut off no matter what.

MS. HANNAPEL: Why wasn't that installed before?

MR. HALL: It wasn't foreseen to be a

problem. We had what we believed was the secondary type of mechanism to prevent this with the high and the high-high alarm. And we had a combination glitch that caught us virtually, I guess, with our pants down.

MS. HANNAPEL: Did you have data or various systems like this set up elsewhere? Data on --

MR. HALL: No, we don't.

MS. HANNAPEL: And the question about the nighttime and weekend checks?

MR. HALL: No. We have no one go out there physically, but we do look at those during the evening. I have a laptop computer that I check that I can plug into the units and check from my house. And the plant manager and the plant operator also has a labtop that we can -- we can punch in and check and look to see that the system's working.

MS. HANNAPEL: But that didn't work. So if it happened -- if this happened at 6 o'clock Friday evening, no one would have noticed it 'til Monday morning?

MR. HALL: No. They would have noticed -- we sample from those plants on Saturday and Sunday. Every Saturday and Sunday. We sample from those plants every day. Those plants are visited every weekend, every holiday. And samples are taken to meet

the regulatory requirements for our permit.

MR. QUINTANILLA: This sampling is done during daylight hours only?

MR. HALL: Yes, sir.

MS. GUERRERO: Bianca Guerrero. Due to the information we have, now that you realize the system has failed, why isn't it going to be implemented that a person will not be there to check on the system itself? You can't necessarily depend on a computer or a double back computer to check on something that is going to be rechecked itself. So my question is --

MR. HALL: I can depend on something mechanically that's been established to depend on nature in order to alert. And that's what we're installing. We're installing a setup to where if the computer goes completely out --

MS. GUERRERO: Yes, sir. But computers will fail.

MR. HALL: Well, that's what I'm saying. Even if it fails, if the computer completely fails and shuts down, by Friday we will have a system set up to where it will shut the fields down as soon as the high level is detected.

MS. GUERRERO: But wouldn't it be better to have somebody actually there and not wait 'til the

upcoming day to notify somebody, say yourself? You know, because you have that leeway time between to where the system will automatically shut down and go into the next day.

MR. HALL: To answer your question, yes, it will be better. But I have a budget, and I need to look at, if I can do it in a manner that doesn't have to sit someone out there -- you know, one of reasons I established this whole computer setup in order for it to have a mechanism to call and stuff was to save in the range of a million dollars a year in man hours so that I wouldn't have to someone sitting out there.

MS. GUERRERO: So you're saying by saving on budget and only going out and looking at this one- or two-plant area once a week and only during the day, you're saving money. But this has caused a great deal of money that's going to be spent because of something that could have been fixed by a minute amount of money. It could have been avoided.

MR. HALL: Well, there's not -- well ...

MS. GUERRERO: I mean, really and truly, this has been creating a great deal more amount of money that's going to be spent than just by having somebody there on a rotator shift of you stay in the morning or somebody else will stay in the evenings of this man hour

over-budget that you're talking about.

MR. HALL: Well, there's not going to be a lot of money spent on the cleanup because of the level of the contaminants in the water. We'll talk about that.

MS. GUERRERO: It's still a contamination and it affects everybody.

MR. HALL: Well, when I show you some numbers, you know, contamination -- the definition of contamination is different to different people. What I need to show you, which I will show you, is levels that will hopefully, or should, make you feel more comfortable about what we're doing. And the last slide that you have there, the one that I told you about with the numbers and stuff, shows you numbers. And that should help you tell you where we're going.

MR. QUINTANILLA: Mr. Hall, you mentioned budget twice. What is your budget?

MR. HALL: My budget currently for running all three of the plants --

MR. QUINTANILLA: Or whatever you were talking in context with what the question was.

MR. HALL: It runs about $330,000 a year to run that plant.

MR. QUINTANILLA: $330,000.

MR. HALL: And the associated fields.

MR. SILVAS: Have you been coming under budget or over budget?

MR. HALL: I don't have an under/over budget.

MR. SILVAS: In the end of your fiscal year, do you have money left over?

MR. HALL: No.

MR. SILVAS: So you flatly go over, or are you meeting the budget?

MR. HALL: I'm meeting the budget. My job is to meet the budget.

MR. PEREZ: On this spill date, the computer failed to shut the well?

MR. HALL: Correct.

MR. PEREZ: So y'all reset it, and then it worked? The test worked.

MR. HALL: Yeah.

MR. PEREZ: And what other procedures did you take after that?

MR. HALL: As far as a safety mechanism built in?

MR. PEREZ: Were you satisfied with the resetting and it working?

MR. HALL: No. That's why we've

established -- like she mentioned, one of the things I have to do is establish -- a computer glitch is going to happen. If you've worked with computers much in your life, you know at some point it's going to lock up. Something's going to happen. What we've established is we a felt mechanism -- even if the computer shuts down like she mentioned, there will be a mechanism in there that will shut that down. It will be at the -- even if the sensor isn't working, there's a mechanical mechanism that simply works by nature.

It's like your toilet bowl. If that float hits a certain level -- like you were talking about before, if that float gets to a certain level, it will hit a switch, which doesn't go through the computer, which doesn't do anything but shut the field down immediately.

MR. PEREZ: Okay. Is this a new setting you're talking about?

MR. HALL: Not a new setting. It's a whole new set of hardware that we're installing. I don't want to piggyback on something that has shown that has a potential for a glitch. That would be silly.

MR. PEREZ: But you're doing something about it?

MR. HALL: Yes, sir. And that's the

important thing? Yes, sir?

MR. GARCIA: Did the EPA and the GEC here investigate this? And what kind of sanctions and fines are they going to give the AFRPA over this act?

MR. HALL: The TCEQ will request a report from us, and they will get basically the same investigation that I'm giving you. If they have any additional questions, they will ask me. And after that is -- after that's done, that report goes through -- Ms. Landez and I have been working on that report. Once it gets up to them, it's up to them. Any questions that you want to know after that, I have no answer to. I have some regulators here that can get you those answers. I don't have them.

MR. GARCIA: Is this reported to the EPA also besides the TCEQ?

MR. HALL: I do not report to the EPA. I report to the TCEQ. I have no requirement to report to the EPA.

MR. SHENEMAN: Let's just kind of walk through this thing. You've got a flow of water in some kind of an aquifer. And as you know, I've been out to classes many times, to your talks. And at one point in time I asked, how fast does this equipment -- does this water course run. And at one point in time, it seemed

like it was 20 feet in 24 hours or 24 hours. I can't ...

MR. HALL: It varies throughout the aquifer.

MR. SHENEMAN: I would think so.

MR. HALL: Depending on the permeability of the -- the water-bearing strength of the aquifer it dictates. It ranges. And quite honestly, I don't know that the low range and the high range. I don't know. But it's a whole lot slower than you think.

MR. SHENEMAN: It's very dry right now. Okay. So then this pump shuts down. That means the contaminated water is going past this point of extraction, right?

MR. HALL: Uh-huh.

MR. SHENEMAN: Is there any mechanism downstream to recapture or does the contaminated water keep on going?

MR. HALL: I can speak to my incident that occurred, given the time that it's down, which is the longest my plant has ever been down in that type of incident. Okay. The water only moved several feet. Once I turned those pumps back on, the radius of influence that I have, which is the area that those pumps will draw water back, captured any water that

traveled from the time the pump shut down 'til the time I turned it on.

MR. SHENEMAN: Let's go back and look at the pump. I understand that these are submersible pumps and they're water cooled with the fluid that they're pumping. I understand that. If you said that there was -- what would you call it? Foreign particulate matter got into it?

MR. HALL: Shuts it down.

MR. SHENEMAN: What was that foreign particulate matter?

MR. HALL: Just dirt.

MR. SHENEMAN: Just dirt?

MR. HALL: Yeah. Any time you have any type of well that's been in the ground for any time period, there's a potential for dirt to get in the slots that we use to bring water through.

MR. SHENEMAN: Right.

MR. HALL: At some point. We pull these horizontal wells that we have over in that area, we pull those out and we clean them. And we watch them on the computer and it tells us -- when they get clogged up and they shut down, we pull them out and we clean them and put them back in. And about a four-hour time period is what it takes to pull them out and clean them.

MR. SHENEMAN: I guess the problem I'm having is if the pump shuts down, if it's not conditioned in this case with water, then how did you have a spill?

MR. HALL: Because I -- that's only one pump of four that were running. I still had three pumps pumping water in the plant.

MR. SHENEMAN: So you had two problems at once. You had a pump down and you had three continuing to pump?

MR. HALL: Well, three continuing to pump is a good thing. The bad thing was because the water flow went below the level that needs to go through the UV/OX skid, it shut down. No. It's good that the pumps keep going. The computer glitch was the only problem. The sensors worked. All the sensors in all the areas worked. But when they sent the message to the computer, there was a glitch and it didn't shut the system down. That's what I fixed.

MR. SHENEMAN: One other thing. When did this thing happen? It was some -- Norma said it was the 5th of October, and one of your colleagues was saying some other time.

MS. LANDEZ: I said the 5th.

MR. HALL: There was a lot of

communications going on, a lot of things happening, and these are the correct dates we have here.

MR. SHENEMAN: One more question, and I'll shut up. Back to the spill. You quoted it was something of 36,000 gallons and some change. Okay. How did you arrive at that?

MR. HALL: I've got the calculation in an upcoming slide, and we'll go through that. Otherwise, I'm going to repeat myself and go with the flow of the deal. It's a real easy calculation.

MR. SILVAS: What evidence do you have that the filters got clogged? Were there any photos taken of that? And what about the dirt? Where did it go?

MR. HALL: No, I don't have any pictures because they clog all the time. They pull them out and clean them and put them back in. And the question on the dirt, when this --

MR. SILVAS: You had to take the filters out, no?

MR. HALL: The filters? No. The pump itself is taken to the groundwater treatment plant where you visited. And they're cleaned there, and all of that dirt and all of the stuff that's there goes into the system. It's treated as a Zone 2 system.

MR. SHENEMAN: How far down is this hole?

MR. HALL: Those are horizontal wells, and they range anywhere from 20 to -- I believe the deepest is 45 feet.

MR. SHENEMAN: Horizontal wells?

MR. HALL: Yes. They're not vertical wells that go down and you have a small area. They go down like the old oil -- it was developed in the oil fields in order to get more. And what we have is we've got ten horizontal wells that overlap, so there's no way it can get through.

MR. SILVAS: Who was the builder of this?

MR. HALL: Weston was the people who built the plant. Bore something -- Long Leer (phonetic) Boring was the people who did the horizontal wells. And they are experienced oil field drillers who helped develop the horizontal wells back when the oil fields first developed them.

MS. LAGRANGE: Were you given any type of discipline for not preventing this accident from happening?

MR. HALL: No.

MR. SHENEMAN: What are they going to

do? Whip him?

MR. HALL: A computer breaks down, which is a normal function. Every computer there breaks down. My job isn't to -- you know, I know when I put the system in things are going to break. I do everything I can to not only look my supervisor in the face but look you in the face and tell you I do everything I can to make sure that it works 100 percent of the time. But I also -- I also know stuff breaks.

MS. LAGRANGE: Also, you mentioned that you hook up to your computer, your laptop, and you check on this. Is there a certain hour that you look at it, or you just do random times? Like before you go to bed, Oh, I'm going to check and see how this pump is working.

MR. HALL: It's just random times, and it's not necessarily every night either. I go by the flow, and all my technicians tell me the systems are running and stuff like that. And when we get to the next couple of slides, it will tell you why I don't under normal conditions.

Does anybody have their hand over here. If you do, wave or throw something at me. Just be careful. I bruise easy. Any other questions? Good questions.

Okay. Go ahead and hit the next slide.

Chain of events. These are the time tables that we're talking about. Chain of events: 7:30, my contractor calls me and tells me this is what's happened. Some of this I've already covered. I'll go through it very quickly.

Mr. Poole was notified. My field technician, supervisor, manager. He calls me. We immediately go to the site and begin the investigation. Two things we investigate, the extent of the spill around the plant and what's the water touched. That's something -- the first question that comes out of your mouth is. Okay. What did the water touch? All right. So we go over and we look. Second thing we establish to ask is, obviously, we shut it down. We start talking about all right. What caused it?

This is not an easy investigation. It's -- those of you who have worked with computers and worked with mechanical things, you know that now you've got to kind of back engineer and try to find out what's gone on and what's happened. So it takes a little bit to do that.

We removed the water in the building. We pumped it out and put it in trucks and took it over to my Zone 2 plant, my large plant. Treated it over there. Washed down the building. We clogged the

water. And then all of that water is also taken to my plant and treated.

MR. SHENEMAN: I don't know that I've been in this plant, but I've be in others many times.

MR. HALL: I don't believe you have.

MR. SHENEMAN: Are there floor drains in there?

MR. HALL: No.

MR. SHENEMAN: Then how did you capture that water?

MR. HALL: It sat there.

MR. SHENEMAN: It pools in the middle?

MR. HALL: Yes. It's a sealed floor. It's a painted sealed floor.

MR. SHENEMAN: I understand that. But it pooled.

MR. HALL: I don't want to put drains for this very reason: If I had drains, then I'd be trying to explain to you why all this water went in the drain that shouldn't have gone.

MR. SHENEMAN: That's right.

MR. HALL: So no. I don't have drains. I'll never have a drain in the plant.

MR. GARCIA: How deep did that water get in the building?

MR. HALL: About seven inches.

MR. GARCIA: So do you have a perimeter, a curb or something that will hold seven inches worth of water, about this much?

MR. HALL: Yes. It's painted up and sealed. Yes, sir.

MR. GARCIA: Even where you have the doors that open?

MR. HALL: Now, the seven inches is up to where that part -- to where it will start flowing out of the building.

MR. GARCIA: So none of it flowed out of the building at that point, like where the doors were?

MR. HALL: Until it got to that point, it stayed in the building. And I showed you. We have some calculations. The questions that keeps popping up, which is an excellent question, is how did I determine how much left the building. And part of that is the measurements of the building minus the depth of the floor. It was still in there. And that determined what was left in the building.

MR. GARCIA: Did any -- you captured seven inches deep worth. But if it got more than seven inches deep, that means it slipped out through the door.

MR. HALL: Yes, it did. And I got pictures of that. Exactly right.

MR. SHENEMAN: Do you have a flow meter in line going to the building so that you know how much water was --

MR. HALL: I have several.

MR. SHENEMAN: At a given point?

MR. HALL: Yes.

MR. SHENEMAN: All you have to do is just subtract --

MR. HALL: I have the calculations here. We'll talk about that in just a minute. But that is a very valid question. That is one we addressed immediately.

Okay. But the most important thing is how much water is left in my building? How much water is on the grass? That's one of the most important questions you asked. And we'll cover that.

MS. HANNAPEL: I'd like to go back to that question I asked about why there was no check on the sensor. Certainly there must be other sensors like this used around the country. I still don't understand why there was no check in several years.

MR. HALL: I missed it in the checklist. I'd like to give you a better answer, but that's the

only one I have.

MS. HANNAPEL: So you missed it.

MR. SHENEMAN: Speaking of sensors, you can have one in the building that would work to --

MR. HALL: I've got preventative measures that were built into the building itself that we're going to talk about. You bet.

MR. QUINTANILLA: Before you go to preventative measures, what was the cost of the cleanup?

MR. HALL: So far the only cost of the cleanup is the man hours that were spent draining the building and taking the water over to get it treated and the investigation portion and the cleanup of the building.

MR. QUINTANILLA: How many truckloads of water was taken over to this -- to the plant? 36,000 gallons?

MR. HALL: No. We didn't take 36,000 gallons. We took 9,300 gallons.

MR. QUINTANILLA: Just the ones inside the building?

MR. HALL: Yes.

MR. QUINTANILLA: The 36,900 gallons, or whatever it was, outside the building, what happened to that water?

MR. HALL: It soaked into the ground.

MR. QUINTANILLA: How is that ground being restored?

MR. HALL: I'll talk to that when we get the --

MR. QUINTANILLA: And how much is that going to cost us?

MR. HALL: Nothing.

MR. QUINTANILLA: It's not going to cost nothing?

MR. HALL: None. Zero.

MR. QUINTANILLA: You mean it's free labor?

MR. HALL: No. I will explain when I get there.

MR. QUINTANILLA: And the other questions is: How long did the cleanup take? Or how long is it going to take, since it soaked up into the ground and so forth?

MR. HALL: It's done.

MR. QUINTANILLA: It's done already?

MR. HALL: Once -- I say that. Once the report gets to the TCEQ, they will look at the numbers that I'm going to show you. We have analysis of the water the day before the spill, and we also have

analysis of the water coming into the plant the day after the spill. TCEQ will review that. And they will come to me and they'll say that if they look at that and they determine that soil samples need to be required or something needs to be done, they will tell me at that point.

MR. QUINTANILLA: And the other question I have, and I believe it's been previously asked: What was the cost of the investigation and what was the cost of the cleanup? It has to cost something. There's some labor in there.

MR. HALL: That's what I said. The time that we spend as far as man hours and stuff --

MR. QUINTANILLA: How many people? How many man hours?

MR. HALL: We had two people working over there. It took about four hours to pump the water out. Probably a total of about 10 man hours at this point.

MR. QUINTANILLA: And how many truckloads of the water for transporting and pumping it in the truck and taking it down to the plant and --

MR. HALL: We moved approximately 9300 gallons, and it's an 1100-gallon tank. So about nine. Just about nine tank fulls.

MR. QUINTANILLA: And that took about ten

hours to fill those nine tanks?

MR. HALL: And clean the facility. These are people who are already paid to work eight-hour days. No additional funds were required to have them do that. It took time.

MR. QUINTANILLA: It took time from their regular duties to do this, so it's over and above what they normally would do.

MR. HALL: Yes.

MS. HANNAPEL: Question on that missed check. What system do you have in place, and how do you know that there's something else that's not being checked?

MR. HALL: We're going back through and reevaluating not only the program, but all sensors have been added to those checklists.

MS. HANNAPEL: Will we get a list of that?

MR. HALL: You certainly can.

MS. HANNAPEL: I would like to get a list that.

MR. HALL: It will be part of the checklist that you asked for earlier. That will be provided. You bet.

MR. GARCIA: Now, you -- that 36,500

gallons that soaked into the ground, how are you going to remove -- are you going to remove that soil that got contaminated by water spilled? How are you going to deal with that soil?

MR. HALL: After the TCEQ evaluation, they will tell me what needs to be done. At this point, I don't know the impact, if there is one at all.

MR. PEREZ: Are they here? Can they answer?

MR. WEEGAR: Mark Weegar, TCEQ. I thought I heard you say earlier that the sensor didn't fail. It was actually an interface between the sensor and the computer.

MR. HALL: Correct.

MR. WEEGAR: There's not -- to your knowledge, there's nothing wrong with the sensor, right?

MR. HALL: Yeah. There's nothing wrong with the sensor.

MR. WEEGAR: It's actually the computer that had the problem, not the sensor itself.

MR. HALL: The sensor is still operating as it should. Right. We reset the computer, and the computer is reset. We tested four different occasions. We raised the water up, and the sensor worked. We raised the water in the other tank, the sensor worked.

We raised the check mechanism in sump. It worked. Everything worked except the computer went down. It didn't send the message to shut down the field.

MR. PEREZ: So really truly, it wasn't mechanical?

MR. HALL: Pardon?

MR. PEREZ: The mechanical part was working?

MR. HALL: No. Yeah. the mechanical portion, the sensors and stuff were working, yes.

MR. ROB: So it wasn't the computer?

MR. HALL: It was a glitch in the computer that didn't send the message out.

MR. ROB: So you were saying earlier when you told her it was a mechanical issue and now you're saying it's a computer issue. Which one is it?

MR. HALL: A mechanical system has been put in to make sure that when the glitch, if the glitch like occurred this time, the mechanical system is being put in to make sure that there's a redundant shutoff valve. But it was always the computer glitch that simply could not be found.

We tried to redo it. We spent three days trying to go back and make this happen again. But every time we send the water up for the sensor to look at, the

sensor shuts it down just like it's supposed to.

Go ahead. All right. Preventative measures that we have currently. All the tanks have high-level alarm systems that shut off once the water reaches a certain level in the tank. We have a sump in the floor I just mentioned that I had mentioned before that, when water hits the floor, there's a small indention place that's about a foot and a half square and about eight inches deep. It's got a float in it like your toilet bowl. When it hits a certain level, it sends a message to the computer and it shuts the plant down. The phone alarm system dials the project team.

Once this system shuts down, those of you who have been on the tour before, the alarm system goes into a dialing system that calls me on this phone. The government pays for this phone. They make me carry this phone 365, 66 days a year, 24 hours a day. I never turn it off. It calls this phone, and it tells me the system shut down. Okay.

This glitch that did not shut the field down was the same problem that didn't get the message to the auto dialer to call me. This system has worked many times. If you don't believe me, ask my wife. She hates it when it goes off at 2 o'clock in the morning. This phone, it calls me -- the plant goes down, it calls me

on the phone. I get this wonderful computer voice that says, Plant so and so has a failure. It's down.

At that point I log in on the computer. I see if I can shut it down. If I see that there's a problem and I can manipulate it, I can keep the plant running and correct the problem.

If I can't then one of two things will occur. I'll shut the plant down. If it looks like it's an immediate problem, then I will call the plant manager and verify that the computer has already called him. Because once the computer calls me, it calls him too. He'll get on, and he'll try it. If we cannot between the two of us shut this down with our laptops, then we meet at the plant right then.

I call him. I say, Let's go. Meet me at the plant. We do one of two things. We get to the plant and we shut it down to make sure that this kind of thing doesn't happen and I don't have to come and explain this again. Or we fix it. But we do it right then.

The glitch that occurred that caused this not to shut the field down prevented the auto dialer from dialing me. And in a minute we'll talk about what we've done to correct that also. We've tested that. We test that mechanism regularly to make sure that it calls

me. Not that we haven't tested it, because there's several alarms that goes off that are what we call nonfunctional alarms that just let me know that something happens.

What's being added. The phone alert system. Currently or when this occurred, the phone systems were segregated. Each plant has a dialer. Both the plant that you visited, this plant, and my Zone 5 plant have a dialer that has the ability to call other people. It's lined up to call four people. Myself, my two plant managers, and my project manager from my main contractor.

Once it goes down, it calls. What we've done is we've programmed it to get away from a simple phone mechanism. What I -- I guess I'm trying to explain it, but badly. What we've done is, initially, they were three separate units. In this case the Phone 2 in the Zone 4 plant did not call me.

The way that it's set up now, if an alarm goes down and it's shut down, that computer, it will take and -- that part of the system will, through RF -- we have it connected through RF to the Zone 2 plant -- it will call me. So, in essence, what I've done is made a redundant system. Instead of if this plant shuts down, the phone dial up, if that doesn't work, the

Zone 2 plant will call me.

So I have two phone -- I'm going to get two phone calls now instead of one. Any time the plant goes down, the plant that it occurs will call me and the Zone 2 plant will call me.

MR. PEREZ: You're referring to a new modification that you did?

MR. HALL: New programing, yes.

MR. PEREZ: Okay.

MR. SILVAS: Who is writing that program?

MR. HALL: SAIC.

MS. HANNAPEL: Wasn't there data from other systems like this indicating that perhaps you should have had this in place already?

MR. HALL: When you say data from other systems --

MS. HANNAPEL: Well, yeah.

MR. HALL: When we put systems in, we research the equipment. We don't have the ability to take data and research and find out, okay, who's bought these systems. What have you done? What we do is we do as much research as far as the piece of equipment and how it works and the liability of it.

And then the engineers that are installing it that design it, they have a background in

what's been working where and what they worked with before. And that's the only mechanism we have for saying, okay, we're using this because we -- this particular engineer has used this in other plants. It's been successful, they haven't had problems with it, and that kind of deal.

And that's why, like I say, the system that we keep talking about worked. It never failed. The only failure I have was the computer glitch that we don't know how it happened.

MR. QUINTANILLA: You mentioned the word reliable.

MR. HALL: Yeah.

MR. QUINTANILLA: Apparently, this wasn't 100 percent reliable.

MR. HALL: There's nothing 100 percent reliable, sir.

MR. QUINTANILLA: Some of our spaceships that are going up, that's the goal, is to make them 100 percent reliable.

MR. HALL: The one that blew up? I have 100 percent goal, too. But let's be realistic.

MR. QUINTANILLA: As long as you have that goal.

MR. HALL: I have to have that goal

because you pay me to have that goal.

MR. QUINTANILLA: You better believe it. Not only me, but all of us as tax payers.

MR. HALL: That's why I'm here, is to assure you that I'm doing everything I can to meet that goal.

MR. QUINTANILLA: Which brings up the next question. How much did it cost to construct that East Kelly plant that you have where the computer failed?

MR. HALL: Right around a million and a half.

MR. QUINTANILLA: A million and a half dollars.

MR. HALL: That includes the wells and the field.

MR. SILVAS: Going back to your program, since you have the first one written by SAIC and it's -- you updated it versus being written by the same company, was there any competitive bid process to put that out?

MR. HALL: No.

MR. SILVAS: How was that company selected?

MR. HALL: They were my O&M contractors, and SAIC is known for their IT. They primarily are an

IT and computer company. And the program didn't fail. The computer glitch failed. The program has been evaluated, and everything was set up properly and the programing was proper.

MR. SILVAS: You just said not to 100 percent. How could you say that's 100 percent if it failed?

MR. HALL: I didn't say it didn't fail. I said the programming didn't fail. The programing showed it was right. There was a glitch that occurred. It occurred because of an electromagnetic glitch in the computer -- a magnet or a mechanical failure in the computer.

MR. SILVAS: What kind of computer do you run?

MR. SHENEMAN: What brand?

MR. HALL: I don't know off the top of my head what's over there right now. I have three different plants. I've had three different computers, as those go out. I know that we have a Dell in one, but I don't know specifically what's in that plant. I can get that information for you.

MS. LAGRANGE: You work there, and yet you don't know what you have there?

MR. HALL: I have a lot of equipment. It

changes routinely because we upgrade routinely. And I can't off the top of my head tell you every piece of equipment I have. I've got 15,000 pieces of equipment out in the field. I can't tell you that.

MS. LAGRANGE: Okay. Are you the one that okays all the purchases of equipment, say even computers?

MR. HALL: They come down and they -- yes, to answer your question.

MR. QUINTANILLA: This is my last question. In the bottom of your charts there and also in the cover of your presentation, you have Integrity, Service, and Excellence. Integrity apparently is something that was not sound in that -- in the system. So integrity wasn't in the system or something. Something was wrong. Service, the -- wasn't -- the service that was being done did not detect the -- a potential failure. So, therefore, we didn't have excellence in this -- in this particular case.

MR. HALL: Well, we're not soothsayers, and to try to anticipate a glitch in the computer is as if you're asking me if we can do that. No, I can't do it. Nobody can do that.

MR. QUINTANILLA: I'm just concerned about integrity, service, and excellence. If I was

going to rate you on our written system, the building here, on integrity, service, and excellence, it wasn't up to 100 percent.

MR. HALL: Well, I agree. It wasn't up to 100 percent.

MR. QUINTANILLA: As long as you agree that the system was not to 100 percent. And not up to your goals here, whatever it is, that integrity, service, and excellence.

MR. HALL: But every effort manually and physically possible is being made. That's the best that you can ask.

MR. QUINTANILLA: And that's good.

MR. HALL: Yes.

MR. GARCIA: I hear this story over and over again about a computer glitch, a computer glitch. Why aren't they any backup systems to analyze any glitch that comes out of the system?

MR. HALL: I'm not a computer engineer. I don't know the answer to that question. I don't got them, sir.

MR. GARCIA: Well, they do have them.

MR. HALL: They do?

MR. GARCIA: Even in my system, they have a backup system that checks for errors and checks for

glitches and checks for overrides. In fourth-year computer classes, they will tell you that they design checks and balances for your computer for glitches, for overrides, for erasers, and for problems with a computer. And when one computer fails, there's usually a computer to back up and override and warn somebody that there's a computer failure going on with one computer. It's built into the building computer engineering system. And that's one of things that should have been considered and not just depend on one computer all the time that caused -- that you claim caused this problem.

MR. HALL: Okay.

MR. SHENEMAN: Do you have a quality program -- quality assurance, manual, and quality control manual?

MR. HALL: For?

MR. SHENEMAN: For this operation.

MR. HALL: That's our inspection checklist, yes.

MR. SHENEMAN: Do you have a quality control manual and its companion is the quality assurance manual and its companion is the quality control manual?

MR. HALL: That's all part of my

operations and maintenance manual.

MR. SHENEMAN: And then do you stand audit from outside?

MR. HALL: No, I do not get audited from the outside.

MR. SHENEMAN: That's something you might want to include sometime, because other people see things that you don't see.

MR. HALL: That's true.

MR. SHENEMAN: I've always been very impressed with what you do. You know, as a matter of fact, when this came up, I was astounded that something got spilled. I can't imagine such a thing unless it was sabotage. Did you look into that?

MR. HALL: Well ...

MR. SHENEMAN: I can't imagine anything getting past you. I know you well, and my hats off to you.

MR. HALL: I appreciate that. But the systems are mechanical. Computers are mechanical. Stuff breaks, folks. I don't care what you have. It's going to break down.

MR. SILVAS: First of all, I wish you wouldn't say that so much. It's really starting to become repetitive that nothing failed. We pay tax

dollars, and we don't pay for these systems to fail.

MR. HALL: You pay for them to work the best that they can work.

MR. SILVAS: We pay for them to work.

MR. HALL: All right.

MR. SILVAS: Secondly, the other thing is are you ISO certified?

MR. HALL: Am I ISO certified?

MR. SILVAS: Your operation.

MR. HALL: No.

MR. SILVAS: You might want to look at that.

MR. ROB: I've got a question real quick. How many plants do you have? And with all of those plants, how many people do you have actually working for you that work at these plants?

MR. HALL: I have three plants currently, and I have three people that work plants. And I have six field technicians that work the field and assist the plant personnel and maintenance that needs to be done.

MR. ROB: And those six helped you with that spill?

MR. HALL: Yes.

MR. ROB: And that's where you got your free work?

MR. HALL: Yes. Well, it's not free work, but it's already in the budget. It's not additional funding. Like he mentioned, it does take them away from their regular jobs, but they make it up.

MR. ROB: Okay.

MS. LAGRANGE: Everything that you buy, does it go out on bids?

MR. HALL: No. There's certain requirements by the AFRPA that requires us to take and bid certain items when we need those numbers then we have to bid it. Until we reach that point, we don't.

MS. LAGRANGE: Okay. And your budget, how much is allotted for salaries and for equipment?

MR. HALL: I don't know that number off the top of my head. I can get that information for you. Do you want it just for that plant or the total operation?

MS. LAGRANGE: Total operation of the plants, salary --

MR. HALL: You say plant or plants?

MS. LAGRANGE: Plants.

MR. HALL: All of them? Okay.

MS. LAGRANGE: What's divided in salary and how much do you spend on maintenance and parts.

MR. HALL: I can get that information.

MS. LAGRANGE: Okay.

MR. HALL: Those aren't numbers I keep at the top of my head.

MR. SILVAS: Are you aware that SAIC has been taken to court regarding padding contracts for the government?

MR. HALL: Yeah.

MR. SILVAS: Are you aware that SAIC also had settled out of court to keep those findings confidential?

MR. HALL: No.

MR. SILVAS: SAIC is a Virginia-based company?

MR. HALL: Yes.

MR. SILVAS: And they also have an office here in San Antonio off of Highway 90?

MR. HALL: Yeah.

MR. SILVAS: How long have you been with them?

MR. HALL: They've been working operations maintenance since '96 when I first took over operation maintenance.

MS. LANDEZ: For clarification, Bill is an Air Force Real Property Agency Employee. He's not an employee of SAIC.

MR. HALL: What we know happened. And this is the questions that were asked previously. At 11 p.m. on the fifth, UV/OX skid shuts down because of low flow. We already talked about that. The time is recorded on the computer system that's built into this UV/OX skid, not the computer system that failed.

When we turned the system back on, it showed us two things. It showed me the flow that was going through at the time of the spill, and it showed me when these systems shut down. The recovery system is not shut down at the computer. We already talked about that. Groundwater from the recovery wells that were not shut down continued to arrive at the plant.

Okay. 45,900 gallons were released. The way this was figured was we took eight and a half hours times the 90 gallons per minute. And those of you that do math pretty quickly realize that this times this does not equal that. The reason is because I didn't put down if this is gallons per minute, this is the hours, you'd have to multiply this times 60 to get that.

That's how it was determined that from 11 o'clock when the UV/OX skid said it was shut down 'til the time we shut it down 7:30, the eight and a half hour time period, running at 90 gallons a minute, which is what that recorded at the time of this shutdown,

that's the amount of water that we put out that overflowed into the -- into the building.

In the building, do the measurements of the building, depth of the water, it was determined 9300 gallons remained in the building itself. Simple subtraction shows you what didn't remain in the building left. This is the amount, the 36,600. Any questions on how we got that number?

MR. SILVAS: All right. To begin with how exact is that first figure?

MR. HALL: Pardon me?

MR. SILVAS: How exact is the first figure? The 45,000.

MR. SHENEMAN: It's either eight and a half or stronger.

MR. PEREZ: Mathematically.

MR. HALL: It's based on the flow meter.

MR. SILVAS: So you're saying it's an exact amount?

MR. HALL: Yes.

MR. SILVAS: Very good. The 9,000 gallons, those 9,000 gallons seeped outside the building?

MR. HALL: No. It was 9,000 that was still in there in the morning when we got there.

MR. SILVAS: But your statement that the building can contain --

MR. HALL: Okay. Yes. It was there. And it was staying there.

MR. SILVAS: 36,600 is what?

MR. HALL: Is what left the building.

MR. SILVAS: Went in the ground?

MR. HALL: Yes.

MR. SILVAS: Before we had discussions on the sampling process, you stated sampling was done after the water had been released, correct?

MR. HALL: Before and after. We had samples of water going out of the building in the effluent on the 4th -- morning of the 4th. We took samples of the influent coming in after the system was restarted on the 6th. We have both analyses. And there's not a lot of difference in the two numbers.

MR. SHENEMAN: These contaminants, PCE, what are they?

MR. HALL: The four primary concerns are TCE, PCE, the one on your list.

MR. SHENEMAN: How soluble are they in the first place? Not very, I wouldn't think.

MR. HALL: I'm not sure of the answer to that question. The solubility of the chemicals in the

water are?

MR. SHENEMAN: Yeah. I don't think they're very soluble.

MR. HALL: The key is the volatility. You'll hear that term used in a little bit when we talk about the cleanup of the building, which was a question of concern and was a good question of concern. We'll address that. The volatility is a very important part of that.

MR. SILVAS: To begin with, now, you're saying most of the water, 9,000 gallons, is contained in the facility, correct?

MR. HALL: Yes.

MR. SILVAS: Now, just looking at the photos here, you have hanger doors or garage doors that open to that facility.

MR. HALL: Uh-huh.

MR. SILVAS: Are they water-tight sealed?

MR. HALL: No. That's why we got 36,000 out the door.

MR. SILVAS: So yeah. Correct. But I'm saying there's 9,000 gallons you're claiming stayed in the building?

MR. HALL: Yes.

MR. SILVAS: Right. So you're saying

that floor -- is the floor level? Is it concrete?

MR. HALL: No. It's recessed down, and it's --

UNIDENTIFIED: It's a bathtub.

MR. HALL: Yeah. Thank you. That's the highly technical word I couldn't think of.

All right. Next slide. Here's some pictures of the actual site when we got there. These are pictures taken before I got there from the time Mr. Poole called me. One of the requirements that TCEQ has, we get pictures as soon as we can as well as all remaining numbers and stuff we provide to you. What I've done is I give you pictures of all four sides of the building showing you -- you know, here's the garage door you're talking about. It came out.

This is, you know the side -- this is the north side of the building. There's a door right over there it came out. Next slide. And the other two sides of the building. Okay. Next slide.

All right. These numbers, these are the numbers that we've been talking about. Four chemicals of concern that we're treating this water for. Now, the numbers that you see here are the influent numbers. These are the numbers of the level of contamination of the water coming into the plant before it's treated.

Okay. The numbers that you see here are the numbers that TCEQ tells us that the water has to be treated to in order to be put into six-mile -- into our outfall that goes to a six-mile radius. You'll notice that all of these numbers are smaller than these numbers. Any questions?

MR. SILVAS: Why is the water drained in the creek and not the sewer drains?

MR. HALL: Because -- that's one of questions, if you remember, you asked about that when we were on our tour. SAWS will not allow that because the water is too clean to go through their system and it'll kill their treatment. And that's a fact. I've seen it happen.

MR. SILVAS: What standards are you cleaning it to?

MR. HALL: The standards that are set by TCEQ.

MR. SILVAS: Drinking water standards?

MR. HALL: No.

MR. SILVAS: What standards?

MR. HALL: They're surface water standards, because that's where we put the water.

MS. LAGRANGE: Do you have any outside security?

MR. HALL: The base -- the base has the Triple J Security that drives around and checks all of these areas. If there's anything that goes on, to give you an example, someone ran into my fence on Military Highway during this weekend. They called me and says, Hey, they ran into your fence again. It's not open, but it's dented. I had one car that hit my fence several months back that opened it up and we had to get out and do some secure measures and re-secure these areas.

But all these areas are fenced in and locked. And Triple J Security does drive by these plants and watch them. And they -- trust me. They've me got my number.

MR. SHENEMAN: They didn't catch this?

MR. HALL: Uh-uh.

MR. SHENEMAN: This happened in their third shift?

MR. HALL: Yes. But I don't have any idea what their schedule is, and we don't depend on them to check that kind of thing. They're looking for security.

MR. SILVAS: Do you have any video surveillance or any kind of surveillance?

MR. HALL: Nope.

MR. SILVAS: Couldn't you hook up some

kind of surveillance to your computer to see actually what's going on in your site?

MR. HALL: I have not had a need for that.

MR. SILVAS: I'm asking if it's possible.

MR. HALL: Oh, sure, it's possible. But as a taxpayer, I would think you'd wonder if I was wasting your money if I did. Try to look at this both ways. I have to look at you and tell you, number one, I'm doing the best I can to treat this water and make my plant efficient. But at the same time, I have to look you in the face and tell you I'm not wasting your money. There's a line there that I have to walk, and I try very hard to do both. And I don't mean just you. I mean everybody in this room and everybody that pays taxes.

MR. PEREZ: Can you try to put it in the budget for this coming year?

MR. HALL: For what?

MR. PEREZ: Try to -- some cameras to --

MR. HALL: I don't see a need to do that.

MR. PEREZ: Really?

MR. HALL: If my plant has gone down, my plant has gone down.

MR. PEREZ: Could you --

MR. HALL: Let me finish. I'll tell you

where I'm headed.

MR. PEREZ: Go ahead.

MR. HALL: That I've been called a dozen times or more when a shutdown of the plant occurs, I've responded to come out. Since all of -- since all these mechanisms have been put in.

MR. SHENEMAN: How long does it take to get -- do you live to the plant?

MR. HALL: I can have someone at the plant --

MR. SHENEMAN: You.

MR. HALL: Well, it takes me 30 minutes.

MR. SHENEMAN: From where?

MR. HALL: From 281 and 1604. My plant goes down, I have a technician that's five minutes away. He lives right down right off of Kelly property. He's five minutes away. He can get there in five minutes. And he will do it. I sat and had a conversation with him this evening. Some of you may know him. He used to be -- when he was going through his senior in high school and the first couple of years of college, he used to sit out there and be a part of the RAB.

MR. PEREZ: If I can finish?

MR. HALL: Yeah. Go ahead.

MR. PEREZ: I cover part of the terrace part on the -- and I cover the policing and I cover the whole area. And I do mostly the air-conditioning fixing and all that. It's not that hard. It's not that expensive having cameras and keeping up to what's going on. It's not that expensive. Y'all should check it out.

MR. HALL: Okay. I'll do that.

MR. PEREZ: I check all the rooms. I carry keys -- four different areas that I carry keys.

MR. HALL: I'll look into it. You bet.

MR. PEREZ: And I know. I deal -- work around, and so I keep these cameras. It's really -- it can be done.

MR. HALL: I will look at that. But I'm not going to sit here and tell you I'm going to do it. I'll look at it, and evaluate it and I'll see if it's --

MR. PEREZ: Try to get it in the budget.

MR. HALL: -- worth the taxpayer's money to do that.

MS. PEREZ: I'll leave it to you, sir.

MS. GARCIA: Nancy Garcia, alternate for Dr. Ruben Martinez, UTSA.

I think what we need to do is think of a plan for taking corrective action. That way we have --

we can prevent this type of, you know, accidents or incidents from happening again. So if it has to take surveillance cameras or if it has to take some other form of solution, then we need to come up with that solution. Not only to give us peace of mind for the community members that live in that surrounding area, but also for you, since you're the one mainly in charge of that.

So if you can come up with some type of solution or some type of dialogue to where we can come to an agreement. Okay. This is a serious issue, and these are maybe the corrective actions that maybe you should take or maybe we should start looking into, given our perspectives, given your perspectives, your experience. And then also bring in the security people that do that -- that do the security work and see what they suggest. I mean, it's not their job basically. Maybe it's not written in their duties. But from what I hear, it's rather important for the RAB community members. I'd say we come into conversation and find -- find a solution without expensing everything on taxpayers. You know, yes, it's going to come through there.

MR. HALL: Well, the important thing --

MS. GARCIA: The solution would come

through.

MR. HALL: Everybody in this room and I have the same goal. You know, the cameras, security-wise, it's good for security. It's not going to prevent a spill. It'll tell me that I have a spill.

MS. GARCIA: Or maybe you can start looking into the equipment or the type of technology that you use, and see if maybe we can come up with something that takes those measures to prevent this type of spill or what have you. Or maybe even worse situations, you know. Something far down this year or next year, something worse can happen. And then we're going to end up in the same road, in the same path with no solutions and saying, You know what? You know mechanical errors. I'm sorry. That's not going to be -- I don't personally, not for me. That's not going to be a good enough answer. So that's what I suggest.

MR. MILLER: Why don't you explain again about the secondary system you have installed, the mechanical system shutdown, the redundant system that you installed and the mechanical switches to shut it down. You kind of lost focus a second ago.

MR. HALL: The system that we're going to be putting in as of this afternoon -- they will be installed we're hoping by Friday -- is a simple

mechanical system that works basically on electricity and nature. If the electricity goes off, the pumps shut down. If the electricity goes off, it doesn't matter. The system is not going to work because the whole system is down. So two things have to work for this new system to work. Nature, which always works, and simple electricity.

What will happen is we bypassed all the computer stuff, and we've made a simple wire connection between the flow and the shutoff valve and the electrical current that goes to the field. What happens is when this mechanism reaches a certain level, it shuts down the electricity that goes to the wells.

Now, that's the new system that will be installed that will be added to the inspection guides that we will be supplying to you, as you've requested. And that will be on there. They will be checked on a weekly basis. So that's how that mechanism is going to be set up. And that's going to be set up in not just that plant. We're setting it up in all the plants because like you said, it was a learning curve for us. We're going to make it right not only there, but in all the areas. Did I see a hand over here?

MR. QUINTANILLA: Yes. I have just -- I'm concerned there on your statement there.

groundwater influent concentrations meet the allowable discharge requirements.

MR. HALL: You should be excited about that.

MR. QUINTANILLA: Yes, I am excited about that. Why are we doing this if it's already meeting the TCEQ requirements? Why are we running it through the system?

MR. HALL: I've been waiting on that question. Who's going to field that question?

MR. WEEGAR: Well, the Kelly cleanup -- groundwater cleanup project has limits on where they're going to send the groundwater contaminants. The purpose of these systems is to clean up the groundwater. The groundwater has a much lower cleanup value than what the surface water discharge standards are.

So while they may be sending water out to the six-mile creek or the other plants, to Leon Creek, that are below what the surface water standards are, the influent that these systems, the groundwater recovery wells and whatnot are capturing still in many cases are above the drinking water standards.

So while they may be below the surface water quality standards, there's systems to recover and treat the contaminated groundwater.

MR. QUINTANILLA: In other words, you're being very strict, to make sure that you're doing the job right.

MR. WEEGAR: That's what you pay me to do, Armando.

MR. HALL: That's absolutely right.

MR. GARCIA: I want to address your question about your involvement, your representative involvement, and everything else. Let me tell you, there is bad riff between these people. That are not responsive to us. They do not let us participate in the base cleanup committee meetings and decisions and let us know about all the decisions they make.

You and other members, including your teacher, were not properly trained. When I was trained, I was trained by the previous director. His name was Patrick McCullough. We spent almost four or five days getting training. Not four hours. Four or five days. We got copies of all the zones. There's five zones that your teacher should have gotten during her training and all the massive material that were given out to board members that were here since the beginning.

These people have not been trained, and it's the AFRPA's fault. These people will not cooperate with you. You can expect that. Why do you think I

criticize them all the time? Because we don't get the material and we're not allowed to participate in cleanup issues. And there's a lot more besides the secondary system that a real engineer will tell you.

A backup system should be a system floor drain to the pump so when that seven-inch level is reached, the pump will kick on, throw all that water in a pipe, and put it in an underground storage tank. And when those tanks fill up, then you pump it out and treat it. That's one of many systems that chemical plants use for contamination. And there are other systems like that that a good mechanical engineer can tell you besides these simple little silly computer glitch secondary systems.

There are a lot of mechanical systems from mechanical engineers. I've studied a lot of mechanical engineering in my construction engineering degree. There's a lot of other alternatives.

But as for as you wanting to participate in base cleanup activities and wanting information, you're not going to get an answer because these people are not geared -- they live in their own selfish world. They are not geared to work with us. That's why I have to go to Congress and our elected officials to try to force them to deal with us and work with us.

There's a lot of people dying. How many of your students have grandparents who lived in this area that are dying from cancer because of all of this? How many of you have parents that grew up here that are developing diseases because all of this? We're not getting our full share of money. We're not getting our full share of commitment from Antwine and all of these. They live in their own little world in their locked up building over there with security and all of that. They don't come out and say, What do you want us to do? What do you want us to do?

Look at our meetings. They've driven away so much public. Look, Mr. Garcia, we complied with what the Air Force says on this, this, this, and this. But you have to have honor as a professional. When you guys graduate from college, you guys have honors as a professional, especially if you become a public employee, as I am.

I work with the State. I have to deal with people asking me, What are you doing there? What are you doing there? And I don't blow them off. I have to explain what we're going to build there. What are we doing to your freeway. What we're doing here. And anything they want, they're going to get. The first thing you do is you learn honor as a professional. And

these federal bureaucrats don't know that.

So when I die from cancer -- which I have, and I've been fighting this for a long time -- I leave it up to you people to remember your grandparents that are also dying from cancer because of Kelly. How many worked at Kelly? Look at the obituaries. How many people that worked at Kelly are now dying that were lifelong employees of Kelly? People dying in their 60s and 70s, an early death because of cancer and all of this. Just check the obituaries every day and you'll see that.

And it's going to be up to the next generation to say, I'm going fight them. I'm going to make them come to the table and deal with us. I'm going to make them face all these health issues. I'm going to make them face and come up with professional solutions like this problem, not just a secondary computer glitch backup, but professional engineering --

MS. GARCIA: And I do agree with you on that, but I think that we have to find the approach -- a right approach to where we can work with them. Now, maybe --

MR. GARCIA: I have been trying that for eight years.

MS. GARCIA: Maybe I have not been here

at the meetings as often as you have. You know, Dr. Ruben Martinez has always been. Him and I are on constant communication. But there's a serious dialogue issue now. I mean, you brought it up. And, you know, so that's the dialogue issue between --

MR. GARCIA: Professional ethics issues. Community involvement issues.

MS. GARCIA: Community involvement. All those issues that you have mentioned. But we have to -- we have to come up with a solution. All of us have to come up with a solution.

MR. GARCIA: I agree with you wholeheartedly.

MS. GARCIA: Now which this plant spill, let's -- I think that we have to come to some type of agreement and find a solution and not try to -- try to always encounter each other.

MR. GARCIA: Can we have community involvement? We could do that.

MS. GARCIA: Well, let's do it and let's move on.

MR. SHENEMAN: Let's talk about that for a second. I'm on your side. For a year I didn't know happened here because it was so complex. One night somebody brought up education. Mr. Quintanilla was

there that night. Mr. Quintanilla chimed in. Dr. Smith said it's hard to sell. Well, you're damn right it is.

And here's where you start because we created a consortium of scholars to start teaching these kinds of things. And so for those of you who want it, I've got it right here. The next meeting happens to be a week from tomorrow night. You don't have to buy anything. It's a potluck supper. But I went outside.

Now I'm ready to go into ZIP Code 78237 even though I'm not going to be accepted. I've already walked through enough that they won't know who I am, if I'm CIA, FBI. Well, I'm 1-8, and I'll tell them. And so then we move on to other resources that we have right here. So you were asking about plan of action. I think that's a plan of action. And that goes back -- we've got to try to get community involvement here.

MR. SMITH: Are we done with Bill? Do you need to talk among yourselves? What would you like?

MR. SHENEMAN: I think we'll beat up on him some more.

MR. SILVAS: As far as community concern, was there a notification in the community and the surrounding areas that there was a spill?

MR. HALL: No.

MR. SILVAS: Why not?

MR. HALL: My requirements are to report to TCEQ, and there's no one working in that area.

MR. SILVAS: All right. Secondly, who was responsible for building that facility?

MR. HALL: Who's responsible for what, sir?

MR. SILVAS: Putting the facility up, constructing it.

MR. HALL: Weston constructed it.

MR. SILVAS: Okay. Now, the actual pump itself?

MR. HALL: The pump?

MR. SILVAS: The mechanical treatment.

MR. HALL: The ones that purchased it and put it in the plant.

MR. SILVAS: Okay. The warranty on that facility, how long does it go?

MR. HALL: Normal warranty on most of the equipment that we use, maximum is a year.

MR. SILVAS: How long has this equipment been used and where?

MR. HALL: Since 2000.

MR. SILVAS: But at other sites it's being used?

MR. HALL: Yes.

MR. SILVAS: And have they encountered such ...

MR. HALL: No.

MR. SILVAS: Are you certain?

MR. HALL: Yes.

MR. SILVAS: How would you know?

MR. HALL: Because of our inspections.

MR. SILVAS: Excuse me?

MR. HALL: Because of the inspections that we do. The weekly inspections that you asked to get, because of those inspections, we check the pumps and those things every week.

MR. SILVAS: So those inspections are done at other sites you have access to?

MR. HALL: Yeah.

MR. SMITH: I think he's talking about other than yours.

MR. HALL: Oh, I'm sorry. I only have them for my sites, my three plants.

MR. SILVAS: Right. But what I'm asking, is there other Air Force bases that this cleanup process was used and this mechanical treatment type?

MR. HALL: I have no idea.

Are there pump treating systems on other

bases? Yes. Do I know that some of them are used in UV/OX? Yes. Do I know that some of them are used in GAC? Yes, I know that they're out there. Do I know what equipment they're using? No. You don't have the time to pay me to learn all that, and I don't have the time to do it. You're paying me to keep this area safe and do that. And I don't know that knowing what they have is --

MR. SILVAS: Well, knowing that they've had the same problem would help you to approach that, too.

MR. HALL: I've had one problem in that plant in five years.

MR. SILVAS: Now this makes your second one. This is your first problem ever being in the site?

MR. HALL: In that plant in that site. Inside the plant.

MR. QUINTANILLA: Which makes this question: How much longer are you going to operate these plants?

MR. HALL: I don't have the answer to that. When we get the cleanup to where the State -- we've met the State's requirements, the requirements that you've discussed many times as far as MCL and stuff

like that. When they tell us they go down, they go down. I don't have the answer to that question.

MR. QUINTANILLA: The point is I'm trying to make is get out of the box. You know, we're just here in our little house. We don't want to find out more.

MR. SHENEMAN: Contaminate the property, it's our business and we're out of business and he's out of business.

MR. QUINTANILLA: I don't have any more questions on this.

MR. SMITH: Can we let Bill off stage for a little bit.

MR. QUINTANILLA: But I do want to continue what this student was saying concerning this community involvement. Something needs to be done in order that, instead of there being confrontations, there are something else. I'm being blamed as a cause of influencing all of this. I'm not trying to do that. All I want is excellence in government. I want to do a good job in it. And it hasn't been done, and I have to agree with that.

I'm just looking at the TAPP funding summary. We had a $100,000. We got an expended 97,000 plus. We've got $2,175 left. As to what we can do, I

think if we can have some training from this $2,175, not only for the people that are here, the community, but also for the staff as to how -- what it takes to bring about what she was talking about a minute ago.

It's -- it should not be only communications down. It's got to be communications up and communications across if we were ever going to get a law. But it's not just communications down. Here it is. Shove it down your throat. Take it or leave it. You know, stamp it or we're going to not work with it. That's not what we want. We want to communicate upward just like y'all want to communicate downward, just like Kelly does. And we also want communications across. Isn't that what we're looking for, Ms. Hannapel?

MS. HANNAPEL: Absolutely,

MR. QUINTANILLA: And I think that we can get it with this $2,175, if you would look into it, please.

Also there's a question of training. Sometimes we get out of hand because of parliamentary procedures. We haven't trained the parliamentary. I think you could take some of these funds to train the parliamentary. It's only one or two hundred dollars. Why can't that be done? Why can't that be looked into? That's all I have.

MR. SMITH: Okay. Next item on the agenda is Class 3 Modification Update, Compliance Plan for Zones 4 and 5. Ms. Landez?

MR. QUINTANILLA: In fact, I would like that to be made an agenda item in the next meeting for RAB in November. January. I'm sorry.

MS. LANDEZ: I'm just going -- I did the same briefing last month at the RAB meeting. For those of you who weren't there, I'd like to just go ahead and repeat because it will be important information coming up or that you'll need in the future. We submitted a Class 3 modification to the compliance plan for the Zones 4 and 5 corrective measures implementation work plan.

Basically, in April we received approval of Zones 4 and 5 corrective measure study where the corrective measures that were chosen for each of the areas in Zones 4 and 5 that needed corrective action were approved by the State. And as required by the compliance plan, we had to submit a corrective measure implementation work plan with Class 3 modification of -- within 180 days of that approval. And we did that on October 7th of 2005. And that's required in Section 8-F of the compliance plan, if you'd like to go and check that out.

And it's also required -- the Class 2 modification is basically what we're doing is adding the corrective action program to that compliance plan. And that's under the 30 -- Texas Administrative Code, the 305.69-K. And Appendix 1 says it requires a Class 3 modification.

These are the systems that we have received approval for. In the Zone 4 CMS, Corrective Measure Study. And as noted, all of the systems have been installed to date. And the costs are included in your packet. We included the slide that has the cost for each one of the systems in the packet. And then these are the systems that have been approved for Zone 5. And again, the cost for those systems that have all been installed to date are included in your packet.

Also just to let you know, one of the other things we do identify in the Class 3 modification includes the monitoring systems that we'll be using to monitor each one of the systems that has been installed. What happens in the regulatory process for the Class 3 mod, once it's submitted, it goes to administrative review. That's where we are right now. We received a letter from the administrative section asking for additional information. We're in the process of doing that and to submit it by I think right before

Thanksgiving.

And once it's complete, we will also be receiving a letter from the State asking us to publish what is called the notice of receipt of application and intent to obtain a permit. And that will be a notice that was placed in the newspaper. And we also have to have a public meeting within 30 days of the application being declared administratively complete, and we will include that public meeting in the notice that we have to put in the paper.

MR. SILVAS: What date is that?

MS. LANDEZ: We don't know yet. Not until the admin complete review is done and she starts working on the wording. It will probably be in December. We're going to try not to get it in the holidays, but we may not have a lot of choice. But we're hoping that first week of December, if not maybe a few days later. But we're trying to keep it out of the holidays because I know that makes it difficult for people that are going on vacations with their families and want to enjoy, you know, Christmas shopping and not coming to a public meeting.

Also there's a notice that is mailed out by the chief clerk's office to the folks that are listed in the mailing list that we're required to submit to

state.

Okay. After the preliminary decision and the draft permit is filed with chief clerk's office, then a technical review is done by the TCEQ. Then TCEQ often requests us to do a second notice, and it's called the notice of application and preliminary decision. Basically, the State will say, this is what we decided for this permit and also provides a copy of the draft permit and all -- everything that's going to be in it so that you can review it yourselves. And we also put those in the library.

And also the notice will instruct you how to submit comments, when to submit comments, what the preliminary decision is, and you can also request a hearing. And it also will indicate in the second notice when the end of public comment period is. Usually it's 45 days after that second notice is published.

And that's it. As soon as we know what that public meeting date is, we will let you know in the newspaper and probably include a mailer out to the RAB members.

MR. QUINTANILLA: You recently had a Class 2 modification. You made a notice and all of that.

MS. LANDEZ: Yes.

MR. QUINTANILLA: Now we're having a Class 3 modification. What's the difference between the Class 2 and the Class 3?

MS. LANDEZ: The Class 2 is not -- you know, allows for public comment, but it does not allow for -- and I may be wrong. I'm sorry. It does not allow for a request for public hearing. Mark?

MR. WEEGAR: There are three different types of modifications. There's a Class 1, Class 2, and Class 3. Basically, the level depends upon what type of modification that are requested. Class 1 is typically just an administrative change -- change the name, change the facility description. Things like that.

The Class 2 is usually again a fairly minimal modification. But in the case of the Class 2 that was recently done, anytime a change is being proposed in a corrective action system, like wells are being removed from the system or something like that, federal regulations stipulate that is a Class 2.

Class 3 is considered to be a major modification or amendment to the permit. We require that whenever a regulated entity like Kelly or Exxon or whoever is coming before the commission and asking for approval of the final remedial action, that it be done as a Class 3. That allows for a contested case hearing,

request for hearing, and all that kind of stuff in the process.

So basically, it's just -- the differences are what is actually being requested as far as the modification, whether it's administrative change or in the case of this particular case, the request for the commission to authorize the final cleanup plan.

MS. LANDEZ: Any other questions?

MR. MILLER: Can we get corrected copies. These are missing a page. That's what people are kind of fumbling around looking for.

MR. PEREZ: Yeah, I just told Armando. This has got like one and two is missing. And it's got three and then it goes down the line. It was stapled in a sense that I saw something confusing. And I looked at it and then noticed.

MS. LANDEZ: Okay. We'll do that in the packets that go back out.

MS. LAGRANGE: I would like to make a request that yourself or somebody review this before you put it out because it is not acceptable, and I consider it poor quality, even all the printing. If that was my employee, she would no longer be my employee.

MR. QUINTANILLA: Three things to remember, Ms. Landez. This integrity, service, and

excellence, this is what we're looking for because that's where our tax dollars are going, into the work that is being put into it.

MR. WEEGAR: One thing I wanted to add to the presentation. On the -- for comments that are submitted to the agency, the only thing that we will be providing a response to are questions that relate or comments that relate to the actual application and, in this case, the CMI work plan submitted. We don't -- we don't respond to things like, you know, Kelly was a bad neighbor. Or, you know, we want -- we feel like we need compensation for, you know, property values or something like that.

The only thing -- the comments that you submit on any modification has to be directed to that particular application that is under review. Otherwise the agency -- we'll typically just say thank you for your comment, but that comment is not part of the application that's being reviewed by TCEQ. So just keep that in mind. If anyone is wanting to submit comments on this, they have to be specific to that application that is under review.

MR. SMITH: Thank you. Mr. Silvas, I think you were next.

MR. SILVAS: Go ahead.

MR. SMITH: Mr. Garcia, go ahead.

MR. GARCIA: Ms. LaGrange, you mentioned the poor quality of this work. Let me tell you, this has been in five zones. Zones 1 through 5. For the longest time, I have been telling these people that every time we get a new board member, every time we get a new alternate, that they receive revised and up-to-date copies of the cleanup plans for Zones 1 through 5. And they can't even comply with that simple request.

I want every one to have copies of that, whether you're a RAB member or alternate. Revised and updated copies of Zones 1 through 5 so you can see what those plans say. They can't even do that. So why are you expecting quality out of little presentation like that when they can't even do simple demands like giving material of information about the base cleanup committee and giving us copies of Zones 1 through 5.

MS. LAGRANGE: And I know I don't have that information.

MR. GARCIA: I know you don't have the information. There's a lot of RAB members that should have it but don't.

MR. SILVAS: Could you explain why again the State oversees that a site was qualified for a

super-fund on the EPA super-fund list?

MS. LANDEZ: It was not a -- Kelly Air Force Base has never been an NPL site.

MR. SILVAS: It was qualified. It scored high enough to qualify. Why is it --

MS. LANDEZ: My understanding is the EPA never put it on the super-fund list, and we have a corrective action permit from TCEQ that's requiring us to be clean. That's what we're doing.

MR. WEEGAR: Let me try to explain that. EPA scored Kelly and numerous other military installations, but many of them were not -- even if they scored high enough to be on the NPL, they're not placed on the NPL because the EPA has a policy of deferring listing federal facilities on the National Priority List, NPL, super-fund if there's corrective action going on under some other federal or state regulatory cleanup program.

The NPL was established primarily to address the cleanup of contaminated orphan sites. Sites where there's either nobody around anymore who can pay for the cleanup or a site where the polluters are not willing or not able to pay for the cleanup. That cleanup -- the cleanup of those sites come from federal moneys.

The Kelly cleanup is being done through federal fund. I mean, as long as the cleanup -- I mean, a cleanup under the State's regular program or cleanup under the National Priority List super-fund process will typically achieve the same goal, which is protection of human health and environment -- cleaning up the groundwater to drinking water standards, cleaning up the soil as well to protect human health and the environment.

So whether it was the NPL or whether it's being done under the State's corrective action program, the end result -- the cleanup result from that is analogous.

MR. QUINTANILLA: I would like to request for the January meeting that we -- the EPA comes in every month, you know. It comes in to our RAB meetings. That they come in and explain to us why they didn't put it into -- into Kelly super-fund site. I would like to see a presentation on that.

MR. MILLER: We have given that presentation.

MR. QUINTANILLA: I never have seen it. I never have heard the scores. What were the scores?

MR. MILLER: I don't know the scores.

MR. QUINTANILLA: Neither do I.

MR. MILLER: But the presentation has been provided to the RAB. I can provide you the letters. I think they provided that response. I'll look and see if it's still --

MR. QUINTANILLA: I would like a presentation.

MR. MILLER: I'll see if we can do it. I can't do it. It would have to come from our super-fund people to give you that presentation. They're the ones who made it. I don't work for super-fund. I work for the AFRPA side of the house.

MR. QUINTANILLA: That's what I'm asking. Go to the right person that can do it for us. It shouldn't be no, no, no all the time. It's a legitimate question. We would like to know. We've been at this business since 1992 -- or '82, and we still don't know why EPA did not -- you know, although they rated Kelly as an NPL site, they never did make it a surplus site. Why?

MR. SMITH: Mr. Silvas?

MR. SILVAS: No. I'm through.

MS. HANNAPEL: I just want to make a comment. We all talked -- some of us talked about what we can do. One of the things that I think we can do, all of us, RAB members, community members, is advertise

what goes on in these meetings. These are closed meetings. Does anybody know about the spill? Does anybody outside this group know about the spill? Was it in the newspaper? Was it sent out to these people in the community that it affected? Who else knows?

And as long as nobody else knows what goes on in these proceedings, we're not going to get any place. We need to notify our congress people. We need to notify chambers of commerce. Even though they're not in the affected community, they really are the community because they're paying the bill.

So until we start doing that, I don't think we're going to get any place. This is not the place for change. Mr. Weegar, I thank you for telling me that. Mr. Weegar is the one who said that. And it's not.

MR. WEEGAR: When did I say that?

MS. HANNAPEL: In a RAB meeting. And I thanked you at the time.

MR. SMITH: Let me see if I can bring us back to the agenda and work our way through that.

MS. CODERRE: In your packets this evening, just a little bit over half way through is a TAPP funding summary. And what we did to prepare this summary is bring you up to date. And so we've included

information on the year of the award going back to the first TAPP contract and what fiscal year that fell under as well as the date of the award and also the date the presentation was made to the RAB.

It includes information about what company was hired, and how much the TAPP contract was worth. And if you'll notice on there, the original amount for the 2005 semiannual compliance plan report review -- that's a mouthful -- was over 7,000. And we discussed it the last meeting, that we were going to go back to the contractor and ask for a best and final offer, the Air Force way of making sure we get the best product for the least amount of money. And he did revise his slightly to $6,625. That contract has been awarded.

So we will be talking with that contractor in the next week, making sure that he has the materials that he needs, and setting up the schedule for him to make the initial presentation. Historically, the way this has worked is the initial presentation is given to the TRS, this meeting that we have here this evening. And then the final presentation, he'll take questions and also some concerns, things that y'all key in on. And then he'll revise, if necessary, his presentation and make that final presentation to the

RAB.

It's important to remember that when your contractor makes their final presentation to the RAB, you guys have to okay that they have met the terms of what you asked for. Did they present it in terms that you understand? Did they cover the material that you asked for them to cover? Was it the 2005 semiannual compliance plan report? Did they explain it to you in a way that you understood it, and did they answer your questions? So those are the things that you're going to be looking for when that contractor comes in to make those two presentations.

Okay. So that's the update we have. And that's it. Are there any questions?

MR. QUINTANILLA: It shows that we still have a balance there of how much?

MS. CODERRE: $2,175.

MR. QUINTANILLA: Can that be used for training of the RAB and the staff on communicating?

MS. CODERRE: When you say training of the RAB and the staff, I need to understand what you're asking for.

MR. QUINTANILLA: Communications. Training them in communications and perhaps training Ms. LaGrange on parliamentary procedures. Can we ask

that to the con -- not to the contractor, but to the contracting office?

MS. CODERRE: I'm just grabbing a reference binder real quick. Each member of this Kelly RAB was provided a binder. Not like this. I think we gave it to you spiral bound. In here is a section that was tabbed out called TAPP. TAPP stands for Technical Assistance For Public Participation. And what's behind that is the final rule that was published regarding how this funding can get spent. This funding is not permitted to take one member of a RAB and provide them specialized training.

MR. QUINTANILLA: Does it say that in there? Because I cannot find it in there, what you just said. It does not say it in there.

MS. CODERRE: It does say it in there.

MR. QUINTANILLA: That you cannot take one member and train that member?

MS. CODERRE: I'll be happy to provide that in our after-action item report. What I don't want to do is take time now as I skim through this to find chapter and verse of that specific. What I would encourage you to do is take a few minutes to go through this. And let me explain briefly how it's laid out.

This is a final rule. Anytime the

federal government makes a rule, first we have to say we would like to make a rule. And we put that out as a proposed rule. And we explain what we want to do with the rule. Then we kind of do a section summarizing the rule. Then we analyze the rule. And then we actually give you the rule. So it's repeated basically four times. This now -- and it's open for public comment.

Okay. So then they get all those comments in, and then they propose -- they publish a final rule. And in this final rule they say, hey, here are all the comments that we received and here's our response. We might have changed this about the rule based on this comment. These comments didn't necessarily apply. However, that is now explained in the final rule.

And so this document is not as thick as it seems when you go through it. But if you read the beginning sections, it gives you a little bit of the history behind and what the reason was for setting the rule up the way it was set up. And so back here --

MR. QUINTANILLA: It was set up by Congress.

MS. CODERRE: -- it talks about -- when you see the Section Title 32 of the Code of Federal Regulation, Chapter I, Subchapter M, and then it goes

in, that's where the rule actually begins. And in here is where it lays out what we can spend the money on and what we can't. And there are specific rules about what we can and can't spend the money on.

So if you'll familiarize yourself with that document that we've provided you, that might help you to be able to come to us with a request for what you would like to review and be able to give us your reasoning based on this document which tells us how we can spend that money.

Mr. Quintanilla, I think I answered your question. Was there --

MR. QUINTANILLA: No, you didn't. My question was: Where does it say that you cannot provide training to an individual, to one individual or to a group of people, like we have here, on communications? On communicating with each other?

MS. CODERRE: Remember, TAPP itself is called Technical Assistance For Public Participation. This -- this funding source -- this funding process was set up so that lay people could have the resources necessary to explain highly technical documents involved in the environmental cleanup process at BRAC bases. It was not intended to supply continuing education in communications.

MR. QUINTANILLA: Let me read to you what I'm reading.

MS. CODERRE: Okay.

MR. QUINTANILLA: TAPP objectives are that the technical assistance funds will, one, contribute to the efficiency, effectiveness, or timeliness of the restoration activated; and, two, contribute to the community awareness and acceptance of the restoration activities.

And that's what I'm trying to get at. And you argue against us. We want you to argue with us and for us. And you're not doing it.

MR. GARCIA: They're on the Air Force side, not ours. I told you that.

MR. WEEGAR: What I would suggest maybe is -- I don't know what the process is, but if you could at least, Sonja, make that inquiry to whoever the people -- the contracting officer and ask how this process runs. But it just seems to me rather than you and Mr. Quintanilla having a debate over what the intent of the RAB rule is, is to bring that request from the RAB to the contracting officers and let them provide a response.

MR. QUINTANILLA: Or better yet, bring the contracting officer here and let him explain it to

us.

MS. CODERRE: Are there any other question? Mr. Silvas?

MR. SILVAS: Well, it's a comment regarding the latest information regarding Wilma Subra, that we have acquired her to give a presentation.

MR. SHENEMAN: We have? When?

MS. CODERRE: We're looking at the January 10th RAB meeting for that presentation. That meeting is filling up. And we talked about that. Part of what we need to make sure that we iron out, were you going to speak with Ms. Subra about being available for the January 10th meeting?

MR. SILVAS: Yes.

MS. CODERRE: Okay. And so right now -- I was going to say what's on tap for that agenda. It's a horrible pun, and I don't mean it that way. Right now the draft agenda for January 10th is the election of the new RAB community co-chair, the briefing on the community relations plan, the -- if the timing works out, the TAPP presentation, the final one to the RAB. But we're negotiating that in the coming days with the contractor. And Wilma Subra's presentation that's been requested on behalf of the community or by the community.

MR. WEEGAR: What is Ms. Subra going to be making her presentation on?

MR. SILVAS: The CMS corrective study reports, January 2005.

MR. WEEGAR: The semiannual compliance plan report?

MR. SILVAS: Yes, sir.

MR. WEEGAR: So the RAB is going to be spending what little TAPP --

MR. SILVAS: We don't have any money it's a free --.

MR. WEEGAR: No. That's not -- my question is you're going to be spending $6,600 of the roughly 8 or $9,000 TAPP money left to have Clearwater Revival review the semiannual compliance plan report and have Ms. Subra do the same thing?

MR. SILVAS: Do you have a problem with that?

MR. WEEGAR: I'm just asking.

MR. SILVAS: We're getting the biggest bang for our buck. And a presentation by Wilma Subra, that's what we agreed on. Secondly, Patrick Lynch has done an outstanding job, more than these other contractors. And if you think that we're doing this just to get a repeat of the same information, we're

trying to catch information that has gone by your agency's wayside and this agency's wayside. You should be there along with everybody else to catch that. Maybe you'll learn something.

MR. WEEGAR: Thank you, Robert.

MR. SILVAS: I'd like to have it returned too, please.

MS. CODERRE: Absolutely, Mr. Silvas. The packet of information you just gave us, we'll make sure we get it back to you. And I remember you've been given this. We were still looking to get those documents. My understanding was those came from the Zones 2-3 CMS. Did I misunderstand that, because I thought that was what Ms. Subra was going to talk about?

MR. SMITH: Yeah. Let me double-check. I'll get back to you tomorrow.

MS. CODERRE: Okay. So there might be a bit of discrepancy.

MR. WEEGAR: I was not trying to say don't do this. I'm just saying, if you're getting somebody who is going to be providing a technical review of a document gratis and we have -- the RAB has limited TAPP funding, I'm just concerned that we're spending TAPP money for a review by one contractor, and we've got another contractor that's going to be doing it free of

charge, is that the best way the RAB can spend their limited TAPP dollars? That's all I was saying.

MR. SILVAS: Well, excuse me. Just to make one last comment, when you have your BCT meetings and we're not included to make those decisions along with you, we make these decision on our community standpoint.

MR. WEEGAR: That's fine.

MS. CODERRE: Mr. Silvas, I'm sorry. I really think Mr. Weegar is looking out for the best interests of the community --

MR. SILVAS: I'm sure you do. I know you believe that, too.

MS. CODERRE: -- and was not raising this issue as a way to cause an argument. His question was, if Ms. Subra is going to review the semiannual compliance plan report for free, then would the RAB rather consider having the contractor that they're paying look at another document? If I am not misunderstanding you.

MR. WEEGAR: Yeah. We've got roughly $9,000 left. I'm just saying, if we're getting a review for free, doesn't it make sense? That's all I'm saying.

MS. CODERRE: And I hardly feel that he was trying to cause an argument here.

MR. QUINTANILLA: I see nothing wrong with this at all. We've got two different sources of technical information being provided for us, one from the community for free and one for $6,000, and I think we will present this to you Mr. Weegar whatever the findings are --

MR. WEEGAR: Weegar

MR. QUINTANILLA: I'm sorry?

MR. WEEGAR: Weegar.

MR. QUINTANILLA: Weegar.

MR. WEEGAR: Thank you.

MR. QUINTANILLA: We will provide this information to you, sir, as result of these two people. And you can comment on it, and we will comment also on it and send you a copy to make sure Kelly does whatever is overlooked.

MS. CODERRE: Thank you for allowing me to possibly clarify that question. Mr. Garcia?

MR. GARCIA: Let me further clarify this issue. We chose Patrick Lynch and Clearwater Revival. He has done work for us in the past, and we're satisfied with it. For the past seven, eight, nine, times that that semiannual compliance plan has been done by CH2M Hill, we're paying hundreds and hundreds of thousands of dollars for them do that work. And I have

to be telling these people at AFRPA to write all the requirements for that report. And because I write all the requirements for my construction reports, the AFRPA should be writing all the requirements for CH2M Hill.

We're not wasting our money. AFRPA is wasting two or three hundred thousand dollars every six months for a report that doesn't relate to the community or explain to the community what's being done. And people are complaining over 6,625. We even have the poor man reduce it while we're paying two, three, four, five hundred thousand dollars to CH2M Hill to do a report that they can't even come and make a decent presentation or present it to us in laymen's terms so people can understand.

And they're complaining about 6,625 from a real professional? It doesn't work that way. This is another issue going to come up in the congressional hearing. What's the deal with CH2M Hill and AFRPA, that they're allowed to do the report and it's not done in laymen's terms? They don't meet these requirements that the RAB presents for that, and the AFRPA does not write requirements for them to present their report to us. They don't even want to come to our meetings anymore because we ask too many questions and we tell them we don't understand it.

What's the sweetheart deal with CH2M Hill and AFRPA that they're not allowed -- they got to go scot-free without making presentations to RAB and to the community. And then everybody is trying to spend $6225 to have Patrick Lynch do it, but CH2M Hill gets away with half a million dollars every six months to do a report that we can't understand. What's the deal here? That's why we have this.

And this is going to come up in the congressional hearing, about what's going on between CH2M Hill and the AFRPA, that they can't even make a report presentable to the community and the RAB members, that they can understand all the scientific jargon they throw at us. They don't even come make the presentation to us anymore.

MR. SMITH: Excuse me, guys. Hold on just a minute. Kyle's next. And we'll get this thing four times, and I wonder how much light we're adding to the topic.

MS. CUNNINGHAM: I'm just confused as to which report Subra is going to brief us.

MR. SILVAS: That was the last January disk that was released

MR. SMITH: But you're going to check that?

MR. SILVAS: I'm going to double-check on it.

MR. SMITH: When's the next disk coming out for the plan? In January?

MS. CODERRE: The report is called January. I think it's not available 'til February.

MR. SILVAS: And that's on the way?

MS. CODERRE: Is it January? Okay.

MR. SILVAS: What zones?

MS. CODERRE: The semiannual compliance plan report is the whole thing. The whole shebang.

MR. WEEGAR: I want to try to -- I think this has been briefed on numerous occasions; but, Rodrigo, the requirements that are addressed by the semiannual groundwater compliance plan were established by TCEQ. It is in the Kelly groundwater compliance plan report. That document is written to address a report to TCEQ. It's not a report that is written to the community. It is a report on specific items laid out in their permit. It's a semiannual report to TCEQ addressing specific requirements in TCEQ's permits that was issued to Kelly Air Force Base.

That is what that document is designed to do. That and that alone. It is a very good snapshot overall summary of what is going on base-wide and

offsite as far as the Kelly restoration program and things of that nature. But that document is -- is designed to be addressed to TCEQ and addressed our specific requirements in the compliance packet. That is all that document is designed to do.

And I'm sorry if that has not been -- if the presentations in the past have not made that clear, but that is what that document that comes out in July and January of every year is addressed to. Nothing else but the reporting requirements we the TCEQ have placed on the Air Force to report back to us.

MS. HANNAPEL: Just one comment on these reports. Now that we have them on disk for about the last year. $350,000 for a copy and paste job, which basically they're all almost exactly the same, with a little bits of information thrown in here and there, I think that should be examined. I mean, if they're not doing it as a copy and paste job, they're wasting a lot of time. It's like one of those $12,000 toilet seats.

MR. GARCIA: I understand your comment. But let me tell you this: You as a public official and these AFRPA people should know you have responsibility to all the community RAB, to the community, and all the people you're killing with all this contamination.

You should and they should realize that

you have responsibility not only to put it in scientific jargon, but put it in language and present it to the community, you and AFRPA, because we are the ones that are affected by all of this.

And, furthermore, you're not paying for it. You're not paying for it. The taxpayers are paying for it, and the taxpayers should know what's going in that report. And we should not be having to spend a measly sixty-six hundred thousand dollars while they're wasting half a million dollars every six months for CH2M Hill, and they complain about a lousy sixty-six hundred dollars.

You and you have the responsibility. Yes, we're going to prepare a technical report. We also have the responsibility to the public and taxpayers that are paying this report to make the CH2M Hill responsible. You as professionals need to interpret this report and put it in laymen's terms so the public can understand it. That's why you're getting paid so much money. And they're getting paid so much money to do nothing but provide egghead jargon for one government agency for another ineffective government agency and without any regards to the public. And it should not be that way.

MR. SMITH: We are a bit past the meeting

lineup that we had. We are at the meeting wrap-up phase, which reminds us that the next TRS meeting is currently scheduled for December 13th at 6:30 right here. And the next RAB meeting scheduled for January 10th at 6:30. An agenda for that is somewhat to be determined. One of the things that has to occur is the election of a new committee co-chair. Final comments? Motions?

MR. SHENEMAN: Who's running for committee co-chair?

MR. QUINTANILLA: Let me just say something. I have been accused of being very disruptive in these meetings. The people who do not come, the community doesn't come in because of me, I think that the people that are accusing me ought to look at themselves. I think they're the ones that are being disruptive because they just want to communicate down. They don't want to hear what the people have to say. And if the people do say something, we don't want to hear about it.

MR. SHENEMAN: Who says that about you?

MR. QUINTANILLA: The AFRPA. When the time comes, I will name the people.

MR. SHENEMAN: With each other? Are they going to the community saying this.

MR. QUINTANILLA: No. They said it to me.

MS. LAGRANGE: Mr. Quintanilla. If I may say, sir, you have been the person that has more information than all of us here besides Rodrigo. If we're not complaining and we keep repeatedly voting you in because we want you in this board, I would not be offended. Now, who are they? Nobody. We still want to keep you here because you have a role with knowledge, and I thank you for that.

MR. GARCIA: Don't let this get to you. You're a fighter. You're from my generation. Don't let any of this nitpicking crap get to you. We're here to fight for the community, fight for all the citizens that are dying because of this. And we're going to make a difference whether we fight them here or we fight them in congressional hearings or whether we get these people fired or whether we bring other types of criminal investigations in. We have to fight, and you're part -- a main part of this fight.

Because these people are not going to change. They're not going to change their attitudes. They're not going to work with us. They're not going to tell us what's going on unless we fight. And it's going to take public advisement, congressional action, or

whatever it takes, it's going to have to happen because things have got to change.

And the first thing we need to do is get a leader to replace Antwine, who is going to have an open mind to us like Patrick McCullough did and work with us and listen to all our comments and provide us information and make us part of planning a future to get rid of all of this and provide federal funding for all of this.

Once we remove the big headache, hopefully the rest of his gang will start quitting and then maybe then we can start changing. But don't give up. We have to keep up our fight because we have people dying because of this. And all of these people in the AFRPA don't live in a contaminated neighborhood like I do. They do not care. And that's the thing. We care. Just remember that we care.

MR. QUINTANILLA: Thank you.

MS. HANNAPEL: I would like to second what Henrietta just said. Armando, you're the soul of this RAB. And I would also like to move that we adjourn.

MR. QUINTANILLA: Second that. Meeting adjourned.

(Proceedings concluded at 8:52 p.m.)

COURT REPORTER CERTIFICATE

COUNTY OF BEXAR

STATE OF TEXAS

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

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

In witness whereof, I do hereunto set my hand on this 28th day of November 2005.

A Rodriguez

Arlinda Rodriguez, Texas CSR 7753
Expiration Date: 12/01/06
In the State of Texas, County of Bexar
Firm Registration No. 79
10100 Reunion Place, Ste. 660
San Antonio, Texas 78216
(210) 340-6464

FINAL PAGE

ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD

FINAL PAGE