



KELLY AFB
TEXAS

ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD
COVER SHEET

AR File Number 3223.1

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

KELLY RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD

RAB MEETING

DATE: May 10, 2005

TIME: 6:30 p.m. to 9:17 p.m.

PLACE: Environmental Health & Wellness Center
911 Castrovilla Road
San Antonio, Texas

PRESENT:

Dr. David Smith, TRF Facilitator

PRESENTATIONS GIVEN BY:

Ms. Norma Landez, AFRPA

Mr. Don Buelter, AFRPA

MR. Jack Shipman, AFRPA

REPORTED BY:

Randall E. Simpson, CSR
Federal Court Reporters of San Antonio, Inc.
10100 Reunion Place, Suite 310
San Antonio, Texas 78216
(210) 340-6464

COPY

1 PROCEEDINGS

2 DR. SMITH: Okay. It's about 6:35. If
3 you'll settle in, we'll get started in just a minute.
4 Okay. How about if we go ahead and start. My name is
5 David Smith. I'm the TRF facilitator. Let me take a
6 moment to walk you through the agenda. I think everyone
7 has a copy of that. The agenda review, packet review;
8 and then move to the administrative components, approval
9 of minutes and summaries; the BRAC clean up team report;
10 the spill summary report. The documents for TRS and RAB
11 and the RFI responses and any action items from the
12 previous meeting.

13 The presentations tonight, and there are
14 two of them, are both updates. You'll recall the RAB,
15 and I believe TRS received formal presentations on both
16 zone 2 and 3 and on building 361 sometime ago -- more
17 than a year ago. At that time, you asked if
18 periodically people would come back and update you on
19 what had happened since that original report. That's
20 what these two presentations are tonight. Question and
21 answer sessions associated with both of those, and we'll
22 try to give you as much room as you need to ask those
23 kinds of questions.

24 I would point out to you that Mr. Simpson
25 is with us tonight, who is taking the role of the

1 reporter for this meeting. He knows none of us, so
2 we're going to have to do a real good job giving him
3 names as we stand up and speak, or as we ask questions
4 so he can identify who the speakers are. I will remind
5 us all that we need to be doing that. If I don't do it,
6 Mr. Simpson, I think will. So if you'll try to work on
7 that with me, we'll be in good shape.

8 In your packets, TRS members, you'll find
9 an agenda, a listing of the documents that went to the
10 TRS or to the RAB, the RFI responses that have been
11 delivered between last meeting and this one, the slides
12 for both presentations, zone 2/3 update and building 361
13 updates.

14 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Can you please
15 define a RFI for those of us that don't understand what
16 that is?

17 DR. SMITH: Request for information. If
18 you filled out one of these, or something similar,
19 whatever, asking for information on a particular topic,
20 these are the responses that come out to those that were
21 submitted. Is that clear enough?

22 Okay. To move into the administrative
23 part of the agenda, we have a backlog on meeting
24 summaries and meeting minutes. You will recall that in
25 December and in February, we used meeting summaries,

1 which proved to not be the satisfactory way to go; and
2 in March, we switched over to minutes. You received
3 those in your packets before. This is a matter of
4 trying to go back and pick up that backlog and see if we
5 can now move on ahead with those. I'm wondering if you
6 are, at this point, ready to move some approval on those
7 meeting summaries and meeting minutes? Yes, sir?

8 MR. QUINTANILLA: I'm going to move that
9 we do not approve the minutes or the two summaries that
10 are in there for the following reasons: Roberts Rules
11 of Order, Paragraph 60 states that there must be -- that
12 you must state in the minutes the presence of the
13 regular chairman and a secretary - in this case, it
14 would be the co-chairman from Kelly Air Force Base - or
15 in their absence, the name of their substitutes. This
16 is nowhere in the minutes nor in the summaries.

17 Item number two, whether the minutes of
18 the previous meetings were approved or their reading
19 dispensed with. Nothing is in there about that.

20 Item number three, all the main motions,
21 except those that were withdrawn, should be included in
22 the minutes. Any points of orders or appeals, whether
23 sustained or lost, should also be included in the
24 minutes. The hours of the meeting, what time it started
25 and what was the hour of the adjournment, it's not

1 there. The name of the member who introduced the main
2 motions, or the name of the members who introduced the
3 main motions. Last item, the minutes must be signed by
4 the secretary, or whoever is in charge. This is not in
5 there.

6 So I have to move -- this work is not
7 good government work, to be honest with you. It lacks
8 professionalism. So I move that we do not accept them.

9 MS. HANNAPEL: I second.

10 MR. GARCIA: Third.

11 DR. SMITH: Discussion?

12 MR. SILVAS: I agree.

13 DR. SMITH: My understanding of the TRS -
14 and these are TRS minutes - is that there is not a TRS
15 chairman at this point, nor is there a TRS secretary.

16 MR. QUINTANILLA: Roberts Rules of Order
17 say in case that is the case, you're supposed to appoint
18 an acting chairman.

19 MR. SILVAS: This would be a good time to
20 you appoint one.

21 MR. QUINTANILLA: And the same way -- you
22 know, we need two of them in this case, which is the Air
23 Force co-chairman, who is also responsible for getting
24 the minutes out, and the community co-chair. Those are
25 the rules as established in Roberts Rules of Order

1 paragraph 60. In case anybody wants to look at it, I
2 have it right here.

3 DR. SMITH: I have no doubt that that is
4 true. That has historically never been the way this
5 organization has worked.

6 MR. QUINTANILLA: I know, and it's always
7 been Mickey Mouse, and that's not good government work.
8 We've got to turn this thing around. And --

9 MR. SILVAS: I guess to begin with, maybe
10 we ought to start making those -- those people
11 appointed.

12 DR. SMITH: Those are your appointments
13 to make, sir.

14 MR. SILVAS: I guess we can do that here
15 today, if you agree on it.

16 DR. SMITH: What are were we going to do
17 about the back meetings where they were not appointed?

18 MR. SILVAS: What are we going to do
19 about what?

20 DR. SMITH: What are we going to do about
21 those meetings where you didn't have those appointed?

22 MR. SILVAS: Well, we can move to a
23 advisory board and discuss it at a full board.

24 DR. SMITH: Let the full board discuss
25 the TRS activity?

1 MR. SILVAS: Well, like you say, we
2 didn't have any appointed back then. How are we going
3 to solve that?

4 DR. SMITH: That's my question.

5 MR. SILVAS: Right. So we can't solve it
6 here now; then maybe we can wait until we'll have a full
7 RAB.

8 DR. SMITH: My job is to try to help you
9 get over these hurdles and get through these meetings.
10 You're the ones who call the shots on that. If that's
11 where you choose to go, all I can do is tell you that
12 this doesn't move you along to get --

13 MR. QUINTANILLA: I think my motion says
14 that they be returned and redone.

15 MR. SHENEMAN: Let's look at what our
16 name is. Is says technical subcommittee. Does a
17 subcommittee fall under those guidelines, and also we
18 need a parliamentarian every time we meet, either RAB or
19 here, it seems to me.

20 DR. SMITH: Once again, I think there is
21 every room to have a parliamentarian appointed.

22 MR. SILVAS: And we are in need of a
23 parliamentarian now, because the other one has not come
24 back to take his position as far as I understand.

25 MR. SHENEMAN: Who is the

1 parliamentary?

2 DR. SMITH: Mr. Dilucio is the
3 parliamentary.

4 MR. SHENEMAN: Is he still with us? I
5 haven't seen him lately.

6 DR. SMITH: He was not here the last
7 meeting. I don't know the answer.

8 MR. SHENEMAN: The question is we're a
9 subcommittee and what you all are saying makes sense to
10 me.

11 MR. SILVAS: Right now I don't think we
12 have a full --

13 MR. SHENEMAN: We don't have a quorum, I
14 don't believe.

15 MR. SILVAS: That's what I'm saying.

16 DR. SMITH: Let me point out to you
17 again, I can only help you get through this. You don't
18 have a formal subcommittee, you have a committee of the
19 whole. You have never appointed a TRS subcommittee
20 period.

21 MR. QUINTANILLA: We did have a chairman
22 of the TRS previously.

23 MR. SILVAŞ: I held that position
24 temporarily.

25 MR. SHENEMAN: Do you want to do it

1 again?

2 MR. SILVAS: I certainly would.

3 MR. SHENEMAN: Well, let's back out and
4 get -- well, we've got a motion on the floor.

5 MR. QUINTANILLA: We have a motion on the
6 floor. He put up the minutes. I don't want to approve
7 them the way they are, because it's not good government
8 work.

9 MR. MILLER: But Armando, what good is it
10 going to do -- I'm Gary Miller, by the way, EPA. What
11 good is it going to do to go back and change the
12 minutes?

13 MR. QUINTANILLA: Wait a minute. Let me
14 tell you --

15 MR. MILLER: You don't have a
16 subcommittee chairman. You don't have a subcommittee.
17 What good does it do to go back and say hey, the minutes
18 are all wrong. That's what you're saying is wrong, the
19 minutes. What you need to do is move forward. Say
20 okay, yeah, we did this wrong in the past. Now we're
21 going to go back to a full RAB. We're going to appoint
22 a subcommittee. This is our TRS subcommittee. These
23 people we expect you to be at each meeting. You're the
24 chairman of this subcommittee. You show up at each
25 meeting and help get the meeting organized and moving

1 forward. That's what he's trying to tell you is what
2 good does it do now to go back to all the old minutes
3 just because we didn't have a subcommittee chairman? We
4 still had presentations that were done, and things
5 happened at the meeting. Yeah, there were some
6 formalities that were not followed; but that's because
7 the RAB has not appointed its TRS subcommittee for a
8 year or more. So it does no good. I mean, you can go
9 ahead and have your motion and say yeah, we're not going
10 to approve the minutes, that's fine; but move forward.
11 Go ahead.

12 MR. QUINTANILLA: I agree with you that
13 we have to move forward. Let's make this -- put it on
14 the record, you know, that the members here of this
15 subcommittee, the community members, which are the only
16 ones allowed to vote in accordance with the charter,
17 approve or disapprove my motion and we move forward.
18 That's all that I'm asking.

19 DR. SMITH: Call for the question?

20 MR. QUINTANILLA: I call for the
21 question.

22 DR. SMITH: Objections to the call?

23 MR. SILVAŞ: Discussion.

24 MR. SHENEMAN: That's what we're doing is
25 discussion.

1 MR. QUINTANILLA: Now I've called for the
2 question, which means that all the discussion stops, and
3 we either vote this up or down.

4 DR. SMITH: Okay. Motion to disapprove.

5 MR. QUINTANILLA: Yes. All those in
6 favor say aye.

7 DR. SMITH: Opposed?

8 MR. QUINTANILLA: All those opposed?

9 DR. SMITH: Motion carries.

10 MR. QUINTANILLA: It should be made part
11 of the record.

12 MR. GARCIA: But we're moving it for
13 discussion to that correction?

14 DR. SMITH: Mr. Silvas will carry that to
15 the RAB.

16 MR. GARCIA: If we need to correct it,
17 we'll correct it and get going.

18 DR. SMITH: Okay. The next item is the
19 BRAC clean up team update. Norma Landez.

20 MS. LANDEZ: We have -- I'm sorry, Norma
21 Landez. I'm the BRAC Environmental Coordinator, BRAC
22 clean up team. Today we discussed -- we had a meeting
23 today. We discussed the guidelines for early transfer
24 of property from the Air Force to the PDA, between all
25 the members, and PDA came over and asked questions of

1 TCEQ and EPA and the Air Force.

2 We had updates of all the projects going
3 on in the different zones. We discussed the remedial
4 action that Lackland Air Force Base has proposed for
5 zone 1. We discussed completion of the site 1 remedial
6 action removal that was to be done. We're doing site
7 restoration at this point in time. For site 10,
8 remediation is complete and we're in the process of
9 putting together a closure report. A draft final
10 investigation is being prepared for submittal to the
11 regulators next month, and we also discussed -- sat down
12 and discussed some proposals we have for zone 4 and 5
13 ground water monitoring networks, that we'll be putting
14 into our corrective measure and implementation work
15 plan. That will be submitted in September.

16 And we also discussed some property
17 transfer that we're looking at doing this calendar year.
18 One is the CER -- what was the former CE area, civil
19 engineering area at Kelly Air Force Base, building 43
20 and some of the buildings where the CE complex was, and
21 transferring that area, and also transferring the area
22 down where the test sites are. We put some data on the
23 table for the regulators, It looks like the CER will
24 not be able to be transferred until later in the year.

25 Then we also talked about the documents

1 that we're going to be submitting to the regulators in
2 the next 90 days. One of them is the soil seasonal
3 variation report that we'll be submitting this month.
4 The other, as I just stated, the draft final EPCF arc
5 firing report in June, some visual site inspections that
6 we did on above ground storage tanks that will be going
7 in in June, and also the final (inaudible) eco risk
8 assessment will be submitted in June. That's all we
9 discussed today.

10 MR. GARCIA: Did you put some material
11 on -- Rodrigo Garcia. Did you put some executive
12 summaries or some material on those discussions you just
13 told us about?

14 MS. LANDEZ: We had the meeting -- no.
15 We had the meeting today. We will then prepare minutes
16 for the meeting.

17 MR. GARCIA: Do you give us those forms?

18 MS. LANDEZ: Then we send it out to all
19 the participants of the meeting. Once those are
20 approved, then we submit and provide them to the RAB in
21 RAB packets.

22 MR. GARCIA: As long as we get the
23 information.

24 MS. HANNAPEL: I've got a question.
25 Coriene Hannapel, RAB member. Are RAB members allowed

1 to go to the BCT meetings; and if not, why not?

2 MS. LANDEZ: No. The RAB members are not
3 allowed to attend.

4 MS. HANNAPEL: Why not?

5 MS. LANDEZ: Because it's a forum for the
6 TCEQ, EPA and the Air Force to discuss issues, and we
7 bring the issues here to the RAB meetings and TRS
8 meetings to discuss with you.

9 MS. HANNAPEL: It seems that those
10 issues, you know, apply to the people that live in this
11 community, and those people are concerned about the
12 community.

13 MS. LANDEZ: We do bring them to the TRS
14 meetings and the RAB meetings.

15 MS. HANNAPEL: Why would not the meetings
16 be open? What law? Is this a law?

17 MS. LANDEZ: I don't know if it's a law.

18 MS. HANNAPEL: Could somebody check that?

19 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We've already --
20 we've already answered that question.

21 MR. MILLER: It's in the RAB packet.

22 MS. LANDEZ: Is it in the RAB packet?

23 MR. WEEGAR: April 27th handout in the
24 RAB packet, question 12. Basically, DOD guidance --
25 Mark Weegar TECQ, the guidance from the Department of

1 Defense established the formation of the Restoration
2 Advisory Board, identified who makes up those teams --
3 those groups. The RAB is the community's forum for
4 providing advice and exchanging information with --
5 basically with the Air Force and the regulators. The
6 BCT is composed of the DOD component, state
7 representative, and where appropriate, EPA
8 representative, and it's the internal meeting held
9 between the Air Force, the state and the EPA.

10 MR. QUINTANILLA: No one from the city is
11 there?

12 MR. WEEGAR: There was a representative
13 from GKDA today, because they were talking about
14 property transfer.

15 MR. SILVAS: Are there any contractors
16 that go?

17 MR. WEEGAR: There are contractors there,
18 when it's appropriate for them to discuss what they're
19 doing as far as scoping the projects.

20 MS. HANNAPEL: In this RAB packet? I'm
21 sorry.

22 MR. WEEGAR: Yeah. It's the one page
23 dated April 27, 2005. It's like the first or second
24 page of that RAB packet.

25 (Inaudible discussion, baby crying.)

1 MR. WEEGAR: Question 12 on the back. I
2 mean, the TCEQ meets fairly regularly with entities that
3 we regulate. That happens all the time.

4 MS. HANNAPEL: That's fine, but -- well,
5 I guess this is not the appropriate place to ask that,
6 but why would they be closed to the public?

7 MR. WEEGAR: Again, the guides
8 established a forum for the community to participate in
9 the cleanup process and the restoration.

10 MR. SILVAS: Where advice is given.

11 MS. HANNAPEL: Where advice is given.
12 But I mean, that's not acceptable.

13 MR. WEEGAR: Well, I mean that is --
14 ultimately that is the process; the community provides
15 advice to the folks who are charged by statute with
16 making cleanup decisions, and that's the Air Force, TCEQ
17 and EPA. There is no mechanism for the community to
18 make decisions when it relates to environmental cleanup.

19 MS. HANNAPEL: Well, not make decisions;
20 but be in on the process.

21 MR. WEEGAR: Well, that's what the
22 Restoration Advisory Board is all about.

23 MS. HANNAPEL: No. The Restoration
24 Advisory Board does not get to hear all of these
25 meetings. We don't get to hear that. That's not right.

1 MR. WEEGAR: Well, ultimately the issues
2 that are of concern to the cleanup of Kelly Air Force
3 Base are open and are a public forum through the
4 Restoration Advisory Board. And it's -- I mean, the
5 bottom line is the RAB is for the RAB to use as it sees
6 fit, and those -- the RAB is the mechanism, and it's up
7 to the RAB to use that to its best interest.

8 MR. QUINTANILLA: Is that in accordance
9 with the circa law?

10 MR. WEEGAR: Pardon me?

11 MR. QUINTANILLA: Is that in accordance
12 with the circa law what you just stated about the DOD --
13 will you explain that again, that DOD states what?

14 MR. WEEGAR: What I'm saying is the
15 guidance from the Department of Defense that established
16 the formation of the Restoration Advisory Board and the
17 BRAC cleanup teams identifies who is to participate on
18 those various groups and what the function of those
19 groups are. And I think this was -- this was a question
20 that was brought by the, I believe, the Southwest
21 Workers' Union in a Title 6 complaint against TCEQ; that
22 the community was being excluded from BCTs and wanted to
23 be a part of that. That was responded to by TCEQ, again
24 citing the founding guidance from DOD on establishing
25 these. It was investigated by EPA's folks in

1 Washington, and we can provide the results of their
2 investigation. Basically, their findings of that were
3 that the Restoration Advisory Board is the community's
4 forum for having participation in the environmental
5 cleanup process, and BCT is clearly defined in guidance
6 as being basically an internal meeting of the regulatory
7 agencies involved with the cleanup decision making
8 process, and its established who participates in those
9 groups.

10 MR. GARCIA: Rodrigo Garcia. Norma, I
11 ask you this question: In the past and in the future
12 are you going to give us reports on the issues and
13 discussions that go on in the BCT meetings?

14 MS. LANDEZ: I just said that we provide
15 the BCT meeting minutes to the RAB.

16 MR. SHENEMAN: As a summary or verbatim?

17 MS. LANDEZ: No, it's just a summary.

18 MR. GARCIA: Do they mention all the
19 issues, the proposed actions and the --

20 MS. LANDEZ: We basically have an agenda,
21 and we've been doing this since -- it's been several
22 years now. We have the discussion topic, what we're
23 going to discuss, and then at the end, we put in
24 basically what was discussed and if there's a
25 resolution, or if we're going to submit a letter, we're

1 going to do this, or we're going to do that, or not.

2 MS. HANNAPEL: What about these reports;
3 do we get to see those reports?

4 MS. LANDEZ: What reports?

5 MS. HANNAPEL: You were talking about the
6 reports.

7 MS. LANDEZ: When documents are submitted
8 to the regulators, we provide those documents to the RAB
9 every month when we come to the TRS meeting, and we do
10 give you a list. I think we have four or five letters
11 that we submitted to you, including the Leon Creek fish
12 kill letter that came to us from TCEQ. So we're also --
13 some of those letters are provided to Mr. Silvas, as the
14 co-chair by the TCEQ. Any time a document comes into us
15 from the state or EPA and/or we're submitting a document
16 to the state or EPA, those documents come to the RAB
17 co-chair library and are provided to you. We also put
18 them in the packet.

19 DR. SMITH: Mr. Silvas, you had your hand
20 up?

21 MR. SILVAS: Yes. On the next base
22 closure meeting, I would like to put in a request for
23 sort of a learning -- a sit down with the community to
24 sit in and see how it functions, not so much as an input
25 or a part of it, but just to get to see how your

1 operations are and take that up with Adam also. We've
2 been requesting this for a number of times.
3 Furthermore, you know, in the future, I'm hoping to have
4 this changed because the three agencies that are on that
5 base closure team need more oversight, and I think the
6 step forward to that is to get the community involved.
7 So I would like to have the next date that you all are
8 going to have a BCT meeting, I would like it forwarded
9 to the community.

10 MS. LANDEZ: The next date of the BCT
11 will be June 14th, 2005.

12 MR. SILVAS: At what time?

13 MS. LANDEZ: That's dependent on the
14 agenda items that we have, that we decide on between now
15 and usually the week before.

16 MR. SILVAS: Those are held at AFRPA?

17 MS. LANDEZ: Yes.

18 MR. SILVAS: There's one other thing I
19 want to touch on, too. The agency's representatives
20 from EPA, TCEQ and the Air Force, if they don't have
21 designated alternates, that's something that they need
22 to consider to start looking into.

23 MS. LANDEZ: Designated alternates for
24 what?

25 MR. SILVAS: Well, the community has

1 designated alternates for --

2 MS. LANDEZ: Are you talking about when
3 we attend a RAB meeting; or are you talking about when
4 we attend a BCT meeting?

5 MR. SILVAS: No. I'm talking about
6 meetings in general as part of this Kelly cleanup.

7 MS. LANDEZ: As a BCT, what we've done in
8 the past, if one of us three cannot meet, then we don't
9 meet.

10 MR. SILVAS: That's the problem, because
11 you're delaying a lot of information that needs to be
12 put out there. I'd like to just keep this opened up for
13 further discussion.

14 MR. WEEGAR: Mark Weegar, TCEQ. Abbi
15 Power is my alternate for attending RAB meetings. I
16 believe Gary Miller has an alternate. As far as how the
17 BCT functions, and things, that is not the purview of
18 the Restoration Advisory Board to establish what our
19 process is.

20 MR. QUINTANILLA: You keep saying that,
21 and that is not what circa says, the law says. In a
22 month or two, 30, 60, maybe 90 days, you may be eating
23 those words.

24 MR. WEEGAR: Very good. If you want to
25 provide me the circa statute that you're referencing,

1 I'll be more than happy to look at it; but the BCT is
2 something that was established in guidance. TCEQ and
3 EPA serve on this as a voluntary function.

4 MR. QUINTANILLA: Reimbursed by the Air
5 Force.

6 MR. WEEGAR: Our time overseeing the
7 cleanup of Kelly Air Force Base Cleanup Project is
8 reimbursed by the Air Force, no doubt about it. If we
9 decide -- and again, our function -- our participation
10 on BCTs, our participation in the Restoration Advisory
11 Board are strictly voluntary. If we decide not to
12 participate in BCTs or the Restoration Advisory Board,
13 we simply don't seek reimbursement.

14 MR. GARCIA: One more question, Norma.
15 Before all this arguments continues, we need to clear
16 that up. Also how --

17 MS. LANDEZ: I'm sorry, clear what up?

18 MR. GARCIA: How serious do you take our
19 issues? I've been screaming and hollering until I
20 turned blue in the face over health issues, over past
21 air emissions. I want to know when the BCT is going to
22 take me seriously in all these things that I have been
23 bringing up and bring up more studies on health issues,
24 bring up more studies on past air emissions? When are
25 we going to move into the next stages, and how seriously

1 does the BCT take our comments, and the BCT say hey, the
2 RAB members are taking past air emissions and health
3 issues and health studies, workers studies and other
4 things that are mentioned in our process. How serious
5 are you going to take us and when are you going to start
6 addressing some of the issues? You need to start
7 addressing some of the issues that keep coming up over
8 and over and over again like those.

9 MS. LANDEZ: Do you want an answer from
10 me?

11 MR. GARCIA: Yeah.

12 MR. RYAN: This is William Ryan from Air
13 Force Property Agency. Rodrigo, the health issues and
14 the air emission issues, the Air Force has taken you
15 extremely -- the community in general extremely
16 seriously. When you think about it, we're the only
17 entity that I can think of - and I don't think anybody
18 else can think of - that has developed a program in
19 cooperation with the local health department to the tune
20 of \$5 million over ten years to study health effects in
21 the surrounding community. That's a unique program to
22 this community.

23 The historical air emissions, that's one
24 component of the involvement from the Agency of Toxic
25 Substance and Disease, both historical and current air

1 emissions, along with numerous other health concerns
2 that the community has raised since what, 1996 maybe,
3 ATS got our involvement? So the resources and
4 dedication of Federal resources, local resources, state
5 resources towards health issues is well documented.

6 The BCT, on the other hand, has -- their
7 role is to make cleanup decisions, environmental
8 restoration cleanup decisions. You know, do I put a
9 pump and treat system here, do I do soil vapor
10 extraction, they're targeted at specific sites to
11 achieve specific results at that site. Some of these
12 water issues where they intersect, we consider.
13 Obviously, every cleanup decision is based on protection
14 of human health and the environment. Some of the
15 issues --

16 MR. GARCIA: They interact and they
17 combine with each other. Let me clear up another point.
18 What I'm trying to say is what's our future? I
19 recognize the past what we're doing right now, and I'm
20 very happy for all of this; but the BCT discusses our
21 future for say air emissions and health and how they
22 interact with stuff on there. And how do we plan -- are
23 they going to take up the interaction and plan our
24 future from that, or are you guys going to do that?

25 MR. RYAN: Well, I'll try to address

1 that, and the BCT guys can throw me out if they don't
2 like the answer. Really, I think the answer is probably
3 no. Once the environmental restoration projects are in
4 place and cleanup decisions have been made, BCT will no
5 longer be required. That's sort of where they stop.
6 Now, will some issues related to health effects go
7 beyond the existence of the BCT? Yes.

8 MR. GARCIA: Maybe what I'm trying to say
9 is what is the future of these issues, and what are some
10 of the future goings on of the BCT? Like can you tell
11 me what's the future of health and air emission issues?
12 What are we planning for the next ten or 20 years to do
13 that? Norma says we're going to get a report on what
14 the BCT discussions are, but can we get the BCT to look
15 at all the serious issues and make some proposed
16 long-term plans on all of this?

17 MR. RYAN: As it relates to their
18 charter -- I don't want to say charter, as it relates to
19 their mission, really some of these longer term health
20 issues, I'm hoping that the health department will help
21 us in that area.

22 MR WEEGAR: Mark Weegar with TCEQ. I
23 mean, I guess to kind of, build on what William is
24 saying, the BCT, our function is to ensure that Kelly
25 Air Force Base does what they need to address soil

1 contamination and ground water contamination that Air
2 Force -- past Air Force activities have caused. If
3 there was an indication that, let's say, that the ground
4 water that was contaminated was being used as the source
5 of drinking water for San Antonio, we would be directing
6 the Air Force to provide an alternate source of drinking
7 water, either through some water lines or doing carbon
8 filtration units on individual wells, things like that,
9 which is what we've done at Reese Air Force base in
10 Lubbock.

11 But the health issues that are related to
12 past air emissions or other concerns that the community
13 has over, you know, potential health impacts from Kelly
14 Air Force Base, that is outside of the function of the
15 BCT.

16 MR. GARCIA: I understand that.

17 MR. WEEGAR: And no, we are focused on
18 cleaning up the environmental contamination. Now I,
19 following the last RAB meeting, I - and I don't remember
20 whether I talked with William or I talked to Adam - but
21 I mean clearly there is a great deal of concern, you
22 know, on the part of the community about potential
23 health issues and past air emissions, things of that
24 nature that clearly, in my opinion, neither the RAB or
25 the BCT, or anybody like that, is equipped to deal with.

1 I had recommended that, you know, the AFBCA needs to
2 look at working with the Metro Health folks, perhaps
3 bring in other health officials in establishing, you
4 know, a forum, an advisory board, whatever you want to
5 call it, that actually looks at health issues where you
6 have people who are there who are qualified, who are
7 medical professionals, who are toxicologists, or things
8 like that, and can properly address the concerns that
9 clearly the community has, and that ATSAR and I think
10 Dr. Squib, in her analysis or evaluation of ATSAR past
11 air emissions study has indicated there are issues that
12 need to be carried forward and be evaluated; and I think
13 that trying to do that through the RAB and through the
14 BCT, which was never established to address those
15 issues, is kind of, to my mind, taking away some of the
16 real focus that could be placed on this issue by getting
17 the right people involved in addressing those issues.

18 MR. GARCIA: Rodrigo Garcia. What I want
19 to see is more input and proceedings from the BCT come
20 to RAB members. Maybe you guys can give us more input
21 on something like this. This is the third issue we
22 discussed at the BCT, and like kind of rank them; these
23 are the most important, this is our number one issue we
24 discussed. We're going to make some long-range plans to
25 deal with this over say ten years. This is the second

1 most. This minor issue we're going to resolve within a
2 year or something. Kind of tell us what's going on,
3 what you discussed and the severity of the issue and how
4 long it's going to take to clean up, and stuff like
5 that.

6 MR. WEEGAR: I think that has been -- I
7 mean, that is what the focus of the BCT is to do is to
8 get the cleanup moving forward. That is what we've been
9 working on for years, and that is -- you know, that is
10 what we have, quite honestly, tried to get the RAB to
11 focus on is what are those cleanup issues that we, the
12 BCT, the RAB, are charged with focusing on and not
13 trying to take in anyway shape or form away from the
14 seriousness and the concerns the community has on health
15 issues. Those are clearly issues that the community
16 feels very strongly about, and I think they should; but
17 at the same time, I think quite honestly, a concern I
18 have is we're moving forward very rapidly with getting
19 to the stages where all the cleanup decisions for Kelly
20 Air Force Base are about to be made probably within the
21 next year or so. Probably a year.

22 MR. SILVAS: I wouldn't count on that.

23 MR. WEEGAR: And, you know, it's
24 important for the community to be, you know, focused and
25 aware of where that process is going. I guess I have

1 some concern that by getting more focused on issues that
2 the BCT has no control over, and really the RAB has
3 not -- is not part of the RAB's charter, that the RAB is
4 going to miss that opportunity to provide valuable input
5 into those cleanup decisions.

6 MR. QUINTANILLA: We have never been able
7 to provide input, and that's what rubs us wrong. The
8 community, you know, 20,000 homes up in there, they have
9 never participated in any decisions made to clean up on-
10 base or off base. You have rubbed them wrong by
11 cleaning up the golf course, having a higher priority on
12 the clean up of the gulf course ahead of those 18,000 to
13 20,000 homes. That's what's wrong. You're making
14 decisions for people that have been affected by the
15 contamination by the Federal Government. You're making
16 decisions for people that are paying taxes that were
17 contaminated by our Federal Government, and the Air
18 Force comes out and also the BCT as a virgin, you know,
19 pure. We're doing the best we can with what we've got.

20 MR. WEEGAR: We are doing the best we
21 can. We welcome -- Armando, we welcome input in the
22 community.

23 MR. QUINTANILLA: Wait a minute. Let me
24 finish. I let you finish a few minutes ago. Everything
25 that you wanted to say, you said. You have never given

1 the community an opportunity to participate in the
2 priority decision making, what are we going to clean up
3 first. You left the community to the last. You and EPA
4 and also the Air Force Base Cleanup Services, or
5 whatever it is that they have here.

6 MR. WEEGAR: I mean, that's clearly a
7 perception of yours.

8 MR. QUINTANILLA: No, it's not a
9 perception.

10 MR. WEEGAR: I don't share your --

11 MR. QUINTANILLA: When will our community
12 of 20,000 homes be cleaned and restored? That's what's
13 rubbing the union wrong; that's what's rubbing the
14 people wrong.

15 MR. WEEGAR: Let me ask you a question,
16 Armando. Do you have -- as one of the long-term members
17 of the Restoration Advisory Board, and obviously a very
18 knowledgeable, vocal and impassioned member of the
19 Restoration Advisory Board, where do you think the
20 cleanup process for Kelly Air Force Base is in
21 addressing the off site ground water at this point in
22 time?

23 MR. QUINTANILLA: I have no idea. I have
24 no idea. I do know this: That the Air Force denied
25 that my properties outside the baseline was

1 contaminated. I had to dig a well out of my own pocket,
2 and I got a court order to do it, to prove that the
3 contamination was beyond that; and it was Air Force --
4 some of the top scientists working for Kelly Air Force
5 Base made a document and gave it to the Judge and said
6 it will take 100 years before the contamination reaches
7 Mr. Quintanilla's property. They were lying, and that
8 rubs me wrong.

9 DR. SMITH: I've got to interrupt. This
10 is the TRS. This is the Technical Review Subcommittee.
11 We have an agenda in front of us. It seems to me like
12 you're well off the agenda. It's not my job to chair
13 the meeting, but I do have --

14 MR. SHENEMAN: Let's go back to that --
15 on this organizational thing on the chair, let's get
16 that resolved while we're here.

17 MR. SILVAS: We need to bring a chair
18 from the TRS and a co-chair, second chair.

19 MR. SHENEMAN: Let's get that resolved so
20 we can go on.

21 MR. QUINTANILLA: I think we can do it
22 now, if Ryan can speak for Antwine.

23 MR. SHENEMAN: Where is Adam?

24 MR. WEEGAR: Don't you need to do that in
25 a RAB?

1 DR. SMITH: I think so, too.

2 MR. QUINTANILLA: We can do that.

3 DR. SMITH: I'm just trying to bring you
4 back to the purpose of the meeting and the agenda.

5 MR. SILVAS: We'll put that for an action
6 item.

7 MR. QUINTANILLA: Okay. That should be
8 an action item on the board.

9 DR. SMITH: The next item, if we can go
10 back to the agenda, is the spill summary report. Norma,
11 is there anything you want to say?

12 MS. LANDEZ: Yeah, two things: We had a
13 spill of 400 gallons of ground water at site S-1 last
14 week. We called Abbi and reported the spill to her.
15 Basically, one of the well heads in the system broke,
16 and it's been repaired and the ground water basically --
17 basically, it's back in the soil, and the ground water
18 is continuing to get cleaned up by the system. So we
19 didn't do anything further. And we're in the process of
20 putting a report together to submit to Abbi or to
21 Region.

22 Also, we did receive the letter, and it's
23 in your packet under the documents that we're submitting
24 to the PRC on that. It's the TCEQ letter Notice of
25 Enforcement for Emergency Response, and that's on Leon

1 Creek fish kill. It's dated April 20th, and on the
2 25th.

3 MR. SILVAS: Are you currently still
4 pumping treated water into Leon Creek?

5 MS. LANDEZ: Yes. Discharging, yes.

6 MR. SILVAS: And has the amount increased
7 or decreased?

8 MR. (blue): Probably decreased with this
9 dry spell.

10 MS. LANDEZ: We haven't exceeded our
11 permit limits; but I think it's probably decreased. I
12 would have to check.

13 MR. SILVAS: Would you look into that and
14 see what the last -- you know, last readings were going
15 back to the last report you gave us?

16 MS. LANDEZ: I don't think -- I don't
17 think we've given a report on discharging into the
18 creek.

19 MR. SILVAS: Could you maybe do that?
20 Could that be possible?

21 MS. LANDEZ: Do you want something for a
22 year?

23 MR. SILVAŞ: A year would be good, yes.

24 MS. LANDEZ: Okay.

25 MS. KIRKPATRICK: I have a question. May

1 I ask a question here? I'm sorry to interrupt.
2 Mr. Silvas, we just need that written clearly concerning
3 what you want. If you can write it down for us, we'll
4 be happy to take care of it.

5 DR. SMITH: Ms. Hannapel?

6 MS. HANNAPEL: I have a question on this
7 spill. What was in the ground water? Where did it
8 spill? What was done to clean it up?

9 MS. LANDEZ: Site S-1 is on the north end
10 of Kelly Air Force Base. There's a soil vapor
11 extraction system at site S-1, and one of the pump heads
12 broke off, spilled the ground water up on top of the
13 site. Because it was within the area that's being
14 cleaned up, the water was just allowed to seep back into
15 the ground.

16 MR. SILVAS: How do you know it was --

17 MS. LANDEZ: That soil is being removed.
18 I mean, the soil and the ground water are being
19 remediated in that area.

20 MS. HANNAPEL: What was in that
21 particular spill, do you know yet?

22 MS. LANDEZ: In the ground water?

23 MS. HANNAPEL: Yeah, in the ground water
24 that was spilled.

25 MS. LANDEZ: It's just the contamination

1 at site S-1, which is where there's basically
2 contamination in that area.

3 MS. HANNAPEL: I guess I don't understand
4 what you're saying. Are you saying that no further
5 action is going to be taken on that spill; it's just
6 going to be --

7 MS. LANDEZ: Correct.

8 MS. POWER: The agency looks at the
9 spill -- Abbi Power, TCEQ. The spill occurred within
10 the existing boundaries of that designated site, which
11 is currently undergoing cleanup; and what actually
12 occurred was the remediation system addressing the
13 cleanup for that particular defined site had a breakage,
14 or something, of some piping or whatever. So it's
15 already within a defined area that's being cleaned up by
16 the system that had the broken pipe. So the pipe had to
17 be replaced. It's already being addressed. So it's
18 kind of like -- to say it rather simply, you can't do
19 the same thing in the place where you're already doing
20 the same thing, where you're doing the thing to clean up
21 the thing that was there in the first place.

22 MR. SHENEMAN: Let's go back and look at
23 something else. You say, 400 gallons. How do you know
24 it's 400 gallons?

25 MS. POWER: The system operates on a

1 known volume; in other words, it pumps X number of
2 gallons per minute.

3 MR. SHENEMAN: You've got an in-line flow
4 meter.

5 MS. POWER: Yes, there's flow meters on
6 the site, yes, sir.

7 MR. SHENEMAN: Now, when that pipe broke
8 there's no resistance, so the flow meter just really
9 went to zinging, I guess, and is that monitored in some
10 way?

11 MS. LANDEZ: We estimated it. It was
12 about 400 gallons.

13 MR. SHENEMAN: In this area, I'm
14 reasonably familiar with, because I've been on two and
15 what not --

16 MS. LANDEZ: You know where the ground
17 water treatment plant is on the northern end of Kelly?

18 MR. SHENEMAN: I call them the swimming
19 pools, the two concrete bunkers.

20 MS. LANDEZ: You know where Growdon Road
21 is and 36th Street, northern Kelly, main Kelly, and
22 there's a ground water treatment plant up there. It's
23 right there.

24 MR. SHENEMAN: I've never been up to that
25 one, I don't think.

1 MS. POWER: It's very, very small. I
2 mean the whole plant would fit in this room.

3 MR. SHENEMAN: About what area do you
4 figure this 400 gallons covered? 400 gallons is not a
5 lot of water, unless it's on a flat surface, non-porous
6 service. What kind of area do you think it covered?

7 MS. LANDEZ: I'm not sure, to be honest
8 with you.

9 MS. POWER: I think that will be
10 addressed -- the agency, when this type of thing
11 happens, they're required to notify our agency at the
12 regional level, and I received a call from Phil Hall,
13 who works with the AFRPA within an hour, I believe it
14 was. I actually have when the spill was identified. We
15 will send them what we call a ten point letter. In the
16 ten point letter, it asks for things such as when was
17 the spill discovered, what did you do to stop the spill,
18 what are you going to do to fix the problem, what area
19 was affected, was it soil, was it surface water, was
20 it -- you know, whatever. It asks those type of
21 details. They'll have to send a response for our
22 agency, which is an open record -- I mean, a public
23 record. I don't know if you all want to make a copy of
24 that response when you send it to us and provide it to
25 you all. If the response is inadequate, we'll address

1 it at that time.

2 MS. HANNAPEL: I have one more question.
3 How did you verify that did not go out of that area?

4 MS. LANDEZ: Because the person that
5 discovered the spill, Mr. Hall, was the one that knows
6 the site and that's his area and he knows.

7 MS. HANNAPEL: How did he verify that?

8 MS. POWER: He physically was at the site
9 and walked around and looked at everything and
10 documented - I don't know - did he take photographs?

11 MS. LANDEZ: What was wet versus not wet.

12 MS. POWER: It had been relatively dry.
13 You could see water stain on the dry soil. I mean, It's
14 a grassy field.

15 DR. SMITH: Mr. Silvas?

16 MR. SILVAS: This problem with this one
17 plant here that we had was a problem that maybe we can
18 see at other plants? Is this going to be something --

19 MS. POWER: It wasn't at the plant. It
20 was the piping that leads to the plant.

21 MR. SILVAS: So it was actually the pipe
22 that gave out?

23 MS. POWER; Yeah.

24 MS. LANDEZ: It was a connection.

25 MR. SILVAS: Connections? So what I'm

1 getting at are there other connections that could
2 experience that problem?

3 MR. SHENEMAN: Sure there are.

4 MS. LANDEZ: At your home at a pipe
5 connection in the toilet, in your drinking water
6 system -- I mean, it could happen. I mean, that's why
7 we have an operation and maintenance program where we go
8 out and check each site so often and make sure.

9 MR. SILVAS: How relatively old was this
10 pipe, this --

11 MS. LANDEZ: I'm sorry?

12 MR. SILVAS: This section here, how
13 relatively old was it? How long has it been in
14 function?

15 MS. LANDEZ: That, I don't know.

16 MS. POWER: Probably more than a year and
17 less than ten, something like that, you know.

18 DR. SMITH: Okay. The next item on the
19 agenda is the documents that have been forwarded to the
20 TRS and the RAB. Those are in your packet. I believe
21 that looks like that, and those are -- yes?

22 MS. KIRKPATRICK: Dr. Smith, just for
23 procedural reasons, we'd like to ensure that those
24 documents are placed in the environmental library here.
25 We just would like Mr. Silvas to sign stating that we

1 can have those here, so -- Mr. Antwine will also sign
2 it.

3 DR. SMITH: Okay. These are the
4 documents that you've asked to --

5 MS. KIRKPATRICK: There are copies in the
6 packets.

7 DR. SMITH: There are copies in the
8 packets for you. The other packet -- the other element
9 that's in that packet are RFI responses. You'll recall
10 RAB and TRS asked that when people submitted requests
11 for information, that not only the person who requested
12 it receive the response, but that also the TRS and other
13 RAB members receive that response. So what you have in
14 your packet is the compilation of the responses to the
15 requests for information that have been gathered.

16 MS. KIRKPATRICK: It's just from the last
17 RAB until now, from April until May.

18 DR. SMITH: During this period?

19 MS. KIRKPATRICK: Yes, sir.

20 MR. WEEGAR: Mark Weegar, TCEQ. I just
21 want to -- on the document list, I think it's important
22 for the TRS to know that the first two items listed
23 there, the zone 5 corrective measure study approval, and
24 zone 4 corrective measure study, those are our very
25 important landmarks, I guess, in the environmental

1 restoration of Kelly Air Force Base. Those two
2 corrective measure studies, in and of themselves,
3 basically address the evaluation and selection of a
4 proposed remedy for all of the off site ground water
5 related to Kelly Air Force Base.

6 MR. SILVAS: Who is the contractor who
7 did those?

8 MR. WEEGAR: I don't know. Basically,
9 what this does, by the TCEQ approving those two
10 documents, it starts the process of Kelly Air Force Base
11 or AFRPA developing and submitting their corrective
12 measures, implementation, work plans, along with their
13 application for a major modification to basically seek
14 approval from the commissioners of TCEQ to implement the
15 selected remedies as the final cleanup for Kelly Air
16 Force Base for all the outside ground water. I have
17 been involved on this project since '97, or something
18 like that, and this has been a long running issue.
19 We've got to get a remedy selected for cleaning up the
20 ground water, especially off site. Well, this is the
21 process that is going to select those remedies and get
22 that cleanup authorized by the commissioners of TCEQ. I
23 believe the work plans and application for permit
24 modification has to be submitted, I think by maybe the
25 first part of October of this year. So in my mind, this

1 is -- this is something that the community should be
2 happy about, should be proud of is the fact that this
3 cleanup is going forward, the remedies are being
4 selected or are being implemented, and the cleanup is
5 well on its way to being in its final stages.

6 MR. QUINTANILLA: Since 1982.

7 MR. WEEGAR: Pardon me?

8 MR. QUINTANILLA: Since 1982 we've been
9 waiting for this.

10 MR. WEEGAR: I've only been involved
11 since 1997 or '98, Armando. But to my mind, and I would
12 hope the community would think this is the beginning of
13 what is a major milestone for the community's concerns
14 about getting their ground water cleaned up. I just
15 wanted to note the importance of what those two things
16 are.

17 MR. QUINTANILLA: As an action item, Dr.
18 Smith, I would like to have a briefing on that, on what
19 he just discussed on that particular study.

20 MR. WEEGAR: On the corrective measure
21 studies? You guys have had a TAPP contractor review
22 both of those CMSs before they ever came to me.

23 MR. QUINTANILLA: But still we want that
24 particular briefing that you're talking about on the --
25 that you just mentioned about the cleanup of the ground

1 water, or whatever it is that you think you do, we would
2 like a briefing on that.

3 DR. SMITH: Are you saying --

4 MR. WEEGAR: I guess what I'm saying is
5 the RAB funded a TAPP contractor to actually evaluate
6 the remedies that were evaluated and were selected and
7 made those presentations to the RAB.

8 MR. QUINTANILLA: They've already been
9 made?

10 MR. WEEGAR: Yeah. Geomatrix, I think
11 was --

12 MR. QUINTANILLA: Now, what's going on in
13 the procedure, the process is that perhaps the
14 commission will hold a hearing on this final cleanup, or
15 what?

16 MR. WEEGAR: If that's what you're asking
17 what the process is, with the approval of the CMS, the
18 corrective measure studies for these two zones, and as
19 agreed by the Air Force with the lead representatives
20 for the Southwest Workers' Union, they're submitting
21 both the zone 4 and zone 5, the actual 100 percent
22 design document, if you will, the CMI work plan along
23 with an application for a major modification of their
24 ground water compliance plan. That will be submitted
25 by, like I say, the first weekend in October to TCEQ.

1 It will go through our technical review process. Once
2 we have done our preliminary review, there will be
3 opportunity for public comment. There will be response
4 from TCEQ to public comment. When the application is
5 submitted, I believe the Air Force has to hold a public
6 meeting on that; but ultimately through the review
7 process by TCEQ, there will be an opportunity for public
8 comment.

9 During that public comment period --
10 actually the way the process works, following public
11 comment and our response to public comment, if one of
12 the commenters doesn't believe that their comment was
13 adequately responded to, or whatever, they can request
14 that the commission hold a contested case hearing. The
15 contested case hearing decision will be made by our
16 commissioners based on whether or not -- I mean, there's
17 a very restricted set of things that that individual has
18 to qualify for in order to be considered an affected
19 person. If they meet those criteria, and a contested
20 case hearing is granted by the commission, that permit
21 modification is remanded to the State Office of
22 Administrative Hearings, and basically there is -- it's
23 a trial. Whoever the hearing requester is, they and
24 their legal representatives are allowed to make
25 depositions -- take depositions, provide their

1 information, what not. It's basically a trial; and
2 again, it would be -- it's the Air Force versus whoever
3 the person granted the hearing is. And it's just the
4 two attorneys do whatever they do in a normal hearing
5 process, and then based upon how the trial hearing goes,
6 then the administrative law judge will recommend to
7 TCEQ, to our commissioners either to go ahead and grant
8 the permit modification, or will make recommendations
9 for changes to it, or what have you. In a nutshell,
10 that's how that process works.

11 MR. QUINTANILLA: What is included in the
12 modification? What modifications are included?

13 MR. WEEGAR: What they'll do is the
14 modification basically will approve by reference
15 whatever the 100 percent design is that's in the work
16 plans, two 100 percent design documents, which will
17 layout the remediation system, where the piping goes,
18 where the monitoring wells go; will approve the
19 monitoring well network, the contaminants that are being
20 sampled at the monitoring wells.

21 MR. QUINTANILLA: It affects the
22 community, zone 4 and 5?

23 MR. WEEGAR: Well, the majority of zone 4
24 and zone 5 ground water is off site. That's if you look
25 at the maps that are --

1 MS. POWER: Over there.

2 MR. QUINTANILLA: That's the reason I
3 would like to see that process, you know, before the
4 RAB -- or this committee and then the RAB, and then
5 before the community.

6 DR. SMITH: Mr. Garcia?

7 MR. GARCIA: I need to put an action item
8 up there, up on the board that all RAB members receive
9 copies of the zone 4 and 5 study. Attached to that zone
10 4 and 5 study copies, that they attach information on
11 the cost for zone 4 and 5, the time lines for zone 4 and
12 5 and a brief explanation of all the processes that he
13 just explained to us be put down on paper, so we can
14 have a complete package of zone 4 and 5 for review and
15 possible input to the --

16 MR. WEEGAR: Rodrigo, again, the RAB has
17 already paid previously one of your TAPP contractors to
18 review both the zone 4 and zone 5.

19 MR. GARCIA: I'm talking about the RAB
20 members. We have a lot of new RAB members, and I want
21 them to study the zone 4 report so they can get familiar
22 with what's going on, and to further clarify -- I know
23 that those reports have been done, but I want them to
24 get familiar with zone 4 and 5, and also we need some
25 additional information on time lines, cost and

1 explanations on some of these processes that you just
2 told us. That's all I called for. I know about the
3 reviews. I'm not contradicting the studies, or
4 anything. I'm just saying that for the benefit of the
5 new members and us old members, I know there's a study
6 in staple form for zone 4 and 5; I just want the action
7 item that all RAB members receive that, so they can get
8 familiar with what's going to happen, and accompany that
9 with a little letter that tells us the time lines for
10 the cleanup for zone 4 and 5 and the cost for cleanup of
11 zone 4 and 5, and some brief one-page or two-page
12 explanation of what he just told us. I can't remember
13 everything he just told us. Just so we can get
14 acquainted with that.

15 DR. SMITH: I don't think there's going
16 to be too much trouble with that, with the exception of
17 copies -- my recollection is that's not --

18 MR. WEEGAR: Each corrective measure
19 studies is a document about that thick.

20 MR. GARCIA: Didn't they have one, a
21 little one about 20 something pages.

22 MS. POWER: The copies -- Abbi Power.
23 The copies of the TAPP contract -- the review that the
24 TAPP contractor performed are available here in this
25 library. I don't know if there's a list or a key to the

1 documents in the library, but -- Kyle Cunningham with
2 the Health Department is shaking her yes, that there's a
3 key in there. All that stuff is here. It's available.

4 MR. GARCIA: I remember seeing it
5 somewhere in the office, the little books like that.

6 MS. POWER: The summary document that
7 you're talking about is available. It's already here.

8 MR. QUINTANILLA: Ryan, what do you think
9 about the TRS committee being briefed on what Weegar
10 said, the time lines and everything else that Rodrigo
11 has mentioned also, and also the RAB? Is that a good
12 idea for the RAB?

13 MR. RYAN: We've done that. This is
14 William Ryan with the AFRPA. We've done this before.
15 We've given it I think mainly to the TRS though. On the
16 process, basically, it was the opportunities for
17 community involvement in the decision making process,
18 how it relates to the state rules and the circa. We've
19 given that. We can do that again.

20 MR. QUINTANILLA: Shouldn't the community
21 know more or less where you're going to place these so
22 called monitoring wells and all of that?

23 MR. RYAN: Mr. Quintanilla, that was
24 described in the CMS study.

25 MR. QUINTANILLA: You have never told the

1 community this plan says we're going to put ten, 100,
2 1,000 monitoring wells in zone 4 and 5 out in the
3 community and what streets.

4 MR. RYAN: That's what the corrective
5 measure study does. It doesn't do it to the same detail
6 where you have the corrective measure implementation
7 work plan where you have exactly where they are; but it
8 does describe the locations -- the proposed locations of
9 well barriers --

10 MR. QUINTANILLA: How long these
11 monitoring wells are going to last, how often you're
12 going to monitor them; all that information should be
13 briefed.

14 MR. RYAN: We can do that. We've done
15 it.

16 MR. QUINTANILLA: When will you do that?

17 MR. RYAN: Well, we're going to have a
18 zone 4/5 update at some point.

19 MS. LANDEZ: If we're going to go into
20 that kind of detail and information, we probably need to
21 do that as we get closer -- you know, we're in the
22 process right now of developing our monitoring networks.

23 MR. RYAN: How much detail -- I mean, we
24 ought to wait for that, because I think what you're
25 saying is because there's new RAB members who want to

1 know what's already been proposed, a summary of what's
2 already been proposed and what's been approved?

3 MR. QUINTANILLA: Yeah. You modified the
4 plan and the modified plan has been approved by the BCT.
5 Now what? We don't know what the modifications are.

6 MR. WEEGAR: Mark Weegar with TCEQ.
7 Nothing -- all I have done, and I am the state decision
8 maker until it gets to selecting a final remedy. All I
9 have approved is the evaluation of a number of potential
10 options for cleaning up the ground water, which was
11 commented on by the Restoration Advisory Board through
12 your TAPP contractor. We have not -- nothing has been
13 submitted to TCEQ that in anyway proposes a detailed
14 modification of the existing permit, nor does it lay out
15 the specifics of what you're asking for, or where
16 individual wells are.

17 MR. QUINTANILLA: Or will be.

18 MR. WEEGAR: Pardon me?

19 MR. QUINTANILLA: Or will be.

20 MR. WEEGAR: Well, when the application
21 for modifying the permit is submitted along with the
22 design build of the selected or proposed remedial action
23 for the two areas, that modification will spell out the
24 number of wells. I mean, the monitoring frequency is
25 already established. It's semi-annually. That's why

1 the Air Force submits theirs annually.

2 MS. LANDEZ: For those sites.

3 MR. WEEGAR: Right. That's why the
4 semi-annual compliance plan is submitted. That's a
5 document committed to the TCEQ by the Air Force as a
6 requirement of -- it's a requirement of the -- I'm
7 watching Robert do his dance, and I'm getting distracted
8 here. I'm supposed to continue after that? But that's
9 all part of what that public participation process for
10 the permit modification is.

11 MR. QUINTANILLA: You think we're kicking
12 this dead horse to death?

13 MR. RYAN: This is William Ryan again.
14 I'm sorry. Let me give it a shot. See how Don is going
15 to do a zone 2/3 update for some of the remedies that
16 have been installed and are planned to be installed?
17 We're going to do the same thing for zone 4. I don't
18 know if it's planned zone 4 and 5, I don't know if it's
19 for the next RAB or some --

20 MS. LANDEZ: We were going to do it for
21 the June TRS meeting. That was our original plan.

22 MR. RYAN: Okay. So we already have that
23 planned. We can -- here's a suggestion: Subcommittee,
24 executive subcommittee meetings, we can bring that up
25 and figure out where it's most appropriate --

1 MR. QUINTANILLA: I'm basing all of this
2 because he said what is being done right now was very
3 meaningful and very important. Those were his words.

4 MR. RYAN: He's right.

5 MR. QUINTANILLA: He's right. So we
6 ought to be briefed on the dang thing.

7 MR. RYAN: Done.

8 MR. GARCIA: Rodrigo Garcia. Not only
9 briefed, but like I said, if those reports don't
10 exist -- I'll see if I have one on zone 4 and 5. If I
11 find them, I'll take them to you. But we have a lot of
12 new members. They need to be briefed. A lot of them
13 don't know there's zone 1 through 5. When we had the
14 orientation, somebody had to prepare an agenda, and she
15 had her own agenda and her own thing. We didn't get a
16 lot of input as far as asking questions and discussing
17 what needed to go into that orientation session. It was
18 just a bunch of bologna. We didn't cover hard core
19 stuff like zone 1 through 5. So we need to figure out
20 someone who has the qualifications to do an orientation,
21 and provide information to the new board members on some
22 of the more critical documents, like zone 1 through 5 of
23 the semi-annual compliance report. That's some of our
24 most critical documents that need to have critical
25 information funneled down to the new board members and

1 provide an update to the old board members. Not only
2 that, but also include time lines, projected costs and
3 community effects on all of this stuff. That needs to
4 be done.

5 DR. SMITH: Once again, I'll do my
6 facilitator thing. We're an hour behind agenda and have
7 not yet moved out of the administrative items. I would
8 encourage you to accept the zone 4/5 briefing, exactly
9 the makeup of it discussed by the executive committee,
10 and encourage us to move on. Would you be willing to
11 let me -- willing to go ahead and let me move with that?
12 We had no action items from the past TRS meeting that
13 needed addressing at this one. That would bring us to
14 seven o'clock on our agenda. Mr. Buelter has a zone 2/3
15 update. Don, are you ready?

16 MR. BUELTER: Yeah. Good evening. My
17 name is Don Buelter. I'm the Restoration --
18 Environmental Restoration Chief for Air Force Real
19 Property Agency. I deal primarily with Kelly and offer
20 technical support for some of the bases in the central.
21 I briefly wanted to kind of talk about some updates, and
22 this is -- the first one will be zone 2/3, and just to
23 kind of show where these are, zone 2 and 3 are the
24 primary industrial areas. Zone 3 is this area here in
25 blue, and the main area is the former industrial

1 maintenance area. Zone 2 is this area. This is
2 Southwest Military up here and jet engine test cells,
3 the old industrial waste water treatment plant was here.
4 There was some old plating operations down here. So it
5 was also an industrial area.

6 Okay. Some of this, we just talked
7 about; but this is where we're at in zone 2 and 3.
8 Outside of the environmental -- I'll just say industrial
9 waste water treatment plant that operated at Kelly, and.
10 Norma mentioned the Richter facility investigation is
11 nearly complete and will be submitted; but the other IRP
12 sites and salt waste management units, the
13 investigations have been complete in zones 2 and 3 and
14 have been approved by the TCEQ. We have submitted --

15 MS. POWER: There's a copy of Don's
16 slides in your package, if you want to reference them
17 until they come back on the screen.

18 MR. BUELTER: The corrective measure
19 study has been submitted recently, I believe it was the
20 January RAB meeting. The TAPP contractor presented his
21 findings -- or suggestions on the zone 2/3 CMS. Those
22 have been given to the state, and they're using those as
23 part of their review.

24 One thing that the state is waiting on,
25 Norma mentioned we're submitting a ecological risk

1 assessment report in June. There's some -- part of that
2 ecological risk assessment deals with the zone 2 area,
3 and so Mr. Weegar, before he supplies his final comments
4 on that document, kind of wants to see what potential
5 eco risks may be there before he approves remedies for
6 those areas.

7 Now, the next step, after we get that
8 approval, is to submit the corrective measure
9 implementation work plan, CMI work plan. This is what
10 the discussion was just for zone 4 and 5, and this is
11 basically the design document setting up monitoring
12 networks, and that will be due no later than 180 days
13 after the approval of the CMS. At that time, it's the
14 same process; we'll have the public meeting, all the
15 things that Mark just talked about and Norma and
16 William.

17 What's important to note is during the
18 investigation steps, when we're doing the corrective
19 measure study and preparing the CMI work plan, the
20 processes that the state has for cleanup, we can install
21 at anytime. As you see as we go through these charts,
22 we have done that. A fair amount of the systems in zone
23 2 and 3 are in place, as well as zone 4 and 5.

24 Three sights in zone 2/3, site E-3, site
25 S-8 and site S-4, the final remedial action is in place

1 and operating at those sites.

2 MR. SHENEMAN: Do you have any idea where
3 you are here?

4 MR. BUELTER: I'm on just the second
5 slide. I'm going to the next slide, which is zone 2
6 treatment systems, and those that are in italics,
7 there's a little more detail that we'll talk about a
8 little bit later. These are really primarily the
9 remedies that were selected in the zone 2/3 CMS and
10 earlier bids. The costs are approximate. In some cases
11 the funding was a larger project, and I had project
12 information but I didn't have contract information. So
13 based on the type of projects that were associated, I
14 kind of had to make an estimate. And so what we have
15 here are a series of sites in zone 2 that were in that
16 zone 2/3 CMS. The exception I just wanted to point out
17 was site SE-2 which was a fire training area, and we
18 used -- oh, thank you -- bioventing at that site. It's
19 a petroleum release, basically. We submitted a closure
20 plan for that site to the state EPA. Closure was
21 approved based on the risk rules that the state has.
22 Again, that's one of the sites though that's really
23 pending final closure with the Ecological Risk
24 Assessment. Should I try this, or --

25 MR. WEEGAR: Do you feel lucky?

1 MR. BUELTER: In zone 3, the major
2 treatment areas -- and we'll talk about these in italics
3 and in the red. There's more information in the back.
4 We're putting reactive barriers at 360, 301. One of the
5 important interactions is why some things are done
6 early, was the slurry well pump and treat system at
7 sight MP. There was three phase tetrachloroethylene TCE
8 within the ground water at that site. Part of this cost
9 is for the investigation of the site and also the
10 removal of those poles where we have 2,000 gallons of
11 product that we pumped into the ground at that sight.

12 And then site S-8 is the final system.
13 Site S-4, and these others are soil sites primarily in
14 the zone 2/3 CMS. We are preparing funding documents
15 for next year. Right now those projects look like
16 they're going to be below the agency funding line; but
17 we want to be prepared in case funding becomes available
18 for one, if not more of those projects. These soil
19 treatments, there's an associated ground water system
20 with those, so although there are soils that need to be
21 treated, there is a treatment system for the ground
22 water, so they're not just left --

23 MR. WEEGAR: Don, you might note that for
24 site S-8 and site S-4, those are two sites that have
25 already gone through the permit modification process and

1 selection of a final remedy and approval by the
2 commission, and it went through the public comment
3 process, and what not. Those are two sites that have
4 already gone through that kind of detailed process that
5 I was talking about earlier.

6 MR. BUELTER: Again, one of the things to
7 point out is using the interim action, that the ground
8 water systems have all been installed, and actually for
9 zone 4 and 5 they have almost. There's one remaining
10 project.

11 MR. SHENEMAN: Let's back up here just a
12 second now. What is bioventing?

13 MR. BUELTER: Bioventing is basically you
14 use a blower, and you blow air into the ground. What
15 you're trying to do is get oxygen into the soil for
16 microbes that -- there are certain contaminants that --
17 borabenzene is one, and we'll talk about that a little
18 bit later, where the microbes need oxygen to break down
19 the borabenzene.

20 MR. SHENEMAN: Are you inoculating with
21 microbes, or are you just --

22 MR. BUELTER: They're native here. We
23 don't add any microbes in any of these areas.

24 MR. SHENEMAN: That doesn't sound good.

25 MR. BUELTER: Well, they're -- this comes

1 back, and I think it was last fall when Mrs. Hannapel
2 asked a question about our fact sheets, and I didn't
3 answer the question very well back then. So I just
4 wanted to walk through it real quickly dealing with
5 PRBs. And this is a statement that's in our fact sheet
6 for PRBs, that the iron filings react with the
7 contaminants, converting them into water, carbon dioxide
8 and minerals. And the reaction that is normally
9 presented for, in this case it's TCE with iron to ethene
10 is kind of shown here. And in most environmental books,
11 this is where they stop. Ethene is a benign chemical
12 for environmental hazards with it. If you continue
13 though, the ethene breaks down rather quickly in the
14 presence of oxygen and carbon dioxide and water.
15 Minerals, basically, you know, ions are considered
16 minerals. We have heavy water when you have minerals in
17 your water, and that's the hydroxide and the chloride.
18 So this statement --

19 MS. HANNAPEL: May I ask a question? Do
20 you have a reference for that?

21 MR. BUELTER: This is -- this is -- yeah.
22 This definition of a mineral is right out of Websters.

23 MS. HANNAPEL: Okay In the first place,
24 the fact sheets, some of them say water, carbon dioxide
25 and ethene; some of them say ethane, and none of them

1 say mineral. They all say the mineral fluoride.

2 MR. BUELTER: The one I just looked at
3 the other day said mineral.

4 MS. HANNAPEL: Fine. I'll show it to you
5 - actually, I'll email that to you. And how do you get
6 that conversion to ethene and what's causing that?

7 MR. BUELTER: It's biological.

8 MS. HANNAPEL: Biological? In the iron
9 filings? We're talking about reaction to the iron
10 filings.

11 MR. BUELTER: The complete reaction, you
12 produce the ethene. The ethene is converted rapidly by
13 carbon dioxide.

14 MS. HANNAPEL: By what?

15 MR. BUELTER: Microbes.

16 MS. HANNAPEL: Microbes? Okay. You're
17 assuming there are microbes there?

18 MR. BUELTER: There are microbes that
19 break down petroleum products.

20 MS. HANNAPEL: Sure. But aren't the
21 PRBs, aren't they mostly anaerobic microbes, if you have
22 them there?

23 MR. BUELTER: Right. Just a few feet
24 downgradient.

25 MS. HANNAPEL: You know, I'd like to see

1 a reference for it. Do you think that's unreasonable?
2 Because I have talked to professors at universities who
3 say that carbon dioxide, that's a real stretch. That's
4 basically what you said in the beginning, too.

5 MR. BUELTER: Given time to think about
6 it, this is not a stretch. These are --

7 MS. HANNAPEL: Well, given time to think
8 about it, these people that I've consulted said hey,
9 that's not going to happen, it depends on the -- the
10 whole point, the reason that I brought that up is if you
11 put this out to the community - and no one in the
12 community is a geologist, or whatever - and you put that
13 out to the community, and they're supposed to accept
14 this without any references. I mean, I teach at
15 Northwest Vista, and if one of my students handed
16 something to me without a reference, I'd hand it right
17 back to them. If I started to teach -- if I told my
18 leader, my cluster leader there that I wanted to teach
19 some stuff, but hey, I don't know what the reference is,
20 do you think that I would be there for very long?

21 MR. BUELTER: Well, any organic chemistry
22 book, right here.

23 MS. HANNAPEL: Okay. I took the class,
24 and I can't remember -- I didn't know you were going to
25 bring that up. That ITRC, or whatever it's called, I

1 forget what it's called. Someplace you can go on the
2 internet. Ms. Power, you were the one that told me
3 about that.

4 MS. POWER: Yes. IRTC is correct.

5 MS. HANNAPEL: I took an advanced course
6 there, and I asked that question. They said that no, it
7 would be very difficult for that to happen. I have that
8 recorded; okay?

9 MR. SHENEMAN: It does not go directly
10 anyway. They're intermediate steps. You can't do that
11 unless you bring up with fire.

12 DR. SMITH: We'll put that in a request
13 for information.

14 MS. HANNAPEL: I put in a request for
15 information. I was told the Air Force did not need to
16 reply to me and not give me any references. Is that the
17 way it's going to be right now? Because I'm asking for
18 references right now.

19 MR. BUELTER: Well, it's a series of
20 steps. Every chemical reaction is a series of steps.

21 MS. HANNAPEL: Absolutely, but you can't
22 have the reactions going to completion, if you don't
23 have everything that's supposed to be there.

24 MR. SHENEMAN: The intermediate, that's
25 what we want to know.

1 MR. BUELTER: This is the intermediate
2 right here.

3 MR. SHENEMAN: You're showing iron on one
4 side of the equation and soil compound on the other
5 side. What is this $3\text{FeOH}_3\text{Co}_3$? Is that what that forms?
6 You're saying medonic (phonetic) MR. QUINTANILLA: over
7 here. On the right-hand side of the equation, the far
8 side, you're showing three mills of Fe_2 plus I'm going
9 to escape the ethane, plus three mills OH hydroxide and.
10 three mills chloride. Is that a compound?

11 MR. BUELTER: No, this is --

12 MR. SHENEMAN: No, no, no. They don't
13 hang out there by themselves. Now don't do that. We're
14 dumb, but we're not that damn dumb.

15 MR. BUELTER: If you --

16 MR. SHENEMAN: You're showing that as an
17 equation. In the first place, chloride would be toxic
18 as hell.

19 MR. BUELTER: Chloride, no.

20 MR. SHENEMAN: What do you mean no. What
21 the hell is that stuff? What is it?

22 MR. BUELTER: Chloride is table salt.

23 MR. SHENEMAN: Oh, shit. It is not.

24 That's about as nutty a thing as I ever heard. Where
25 did you take chemistry?

1 MR. BUELTER: Colorado School of Mines.

2 MR. SHENEMAN: He took chemistry at St.
3 Phillips, obviously.

4 DR. SMITH: Excuses me. I wouldn't let
5 Mr. Buelter talk to you like that. I'm not going to let
6 you talk to him like that.

7 MR. SHENEMAN: I still want to know, I
8 guess, the same thing you want to know.

9 MS. HANNAPEL: This is unacceptable to
10 have someone talk to us this way and not give us
11 references. That's what we're asking for. This does
12 not seem to be correct; okay? And to say ethene or
13 ethane -- when is it ethane? Because many of those fact
14 sheets say that.

15 MR. BUELTER: I don't know.

16 MS. HANNAPEL: It's on the AFRPA website.

17 MR. BUELTER: Yeah. And the one I looked
18 at had this.

19 MS. HANNAPEL: I'll send it to you
20 tomorrow. I'll find out your email address, or I'll
21 mail it to you.

22 MR. WEEGAR: I just want to make a very
23 quick observation here. The purpose of this briefing is
24 to provide a general overview of how a PRB works to
25 break down chlorinated solvents, which are the

1 contaminants that we're worried about in the ground
2 water --

3 MR. SILVAS: Works, or doesn't work?

4 MR. WEEGAR: All of this bickering and
5 discussion that I'm hearing about who has the biggest
6 brain when it comes to chemistry --

7 MR. SHENEMAN: I beg your pardon?

8 MR. WEEGAR: -- has absolutely zero --

9 MR. SHENEMAN: No, no, no.

10 MR. WEEGAR: Excuse me. I'm not
11 finished. This discussion I've been listening to here,
12 it all deals with a chemical equation that has gone
13 beyond the process of removing contaminants that are a
14 hazard to human health and the environment. I'm sure
15 the Air Force can provide references for this
16 particular -- for these equations; but the bottom line
17 is what we should be interested in is does this
18 technology take chlorinated solvents and break them down
19 into non-hazardous compounds.

20 MR. SHENEMAN: That's the question.

21 MR. WEEGAR: But whether we're talking
22 about ethene or ethane, does it go to CO2 and water. I
23 mean, we're beyond the point of are we taking
24 chlorinated solvents and breaking them down into a
25 compound that's not harmful to human health and

1 environment.

2 MS. HANNAPEL: All right. That's a good
3 question; but in these fact sheets, it does not mention
4 that these break down to DCE and vinyl chloride.
5 Where's that information?

6 MR. SHENEMAN: That's right.

7 MS. HANNAPEL: That is a happy thing.
8 Water, carbon dioxide, that's what it breaks down to,
9 and that is unfortunately not correct. It breaks down
10 into DCE and vinyl chloride. PRB is not working then.
11 You're adding vinyl chloride. Where is that in the fact
12 sheet?

13 MR. WEEGAR: But again, you indicated
14 you've taken the ITRC. I'm assuming it was probably
15 their web course on PRBs, and I'm sure that within that
16 course, it shows that the breakdown of it goes out to a
17 certain hypothetical end point. The bottom line is does
18 TCE break down to DCE vinyl chloride at some point in
19 that process. Absolutely, but it happens within the
20 confines of the reactive wall; and the process of
21 monitoring that to determine whether the complete
22 breakdown is taking place within the wall or not, that
23 is why in the ultimate scheme of things, that's why
24 there are monitoring well transcripts of transects
25 before the wall, within the wall and downgradient of the

1 wall, but that stuff is all monitored.

2 MR. SILVAS: That's why we've had
3 problems monitoring these wells. You don't go back
4 consistently to the same wells, whether they're dry or
5 not. That's been a persistent problem in the past, and
6 we've identified that to you and again, it's been
7 identified.

8 MS. HANNAPEL: That is giving the wrong
9 indication to the public that this always breaks down
10 into water and carbon dioxide.

11 MR. SHENEMAN: These are individual
12 steps, and that ain't so.

13 MS. HANNAPEL: Absolutely. We talked
14 about that place in Fort Worth where the vinyl chloride
15 was. You talked about that.

16 MR. WEEGAR: But you have -- Mark Weegar,
17 TCEQ. You have either not studied that information, or
18 you are misrepresenting what that information says at
19 Carswell Air Force Base. The vinyl chloride and the DCE
20 that was produced at Carswell Air Force Base in a plume
21 is a result of a reaction in the TCE plume that was
22 already downgradient before the PRB was ever installed.
23 The PRB is breaking down TCE from the milligram per
24 liter concentrations, ungrading it to non-detect as it
25 exits the wall. Now, what that wall has done at

1 Carswell Air Force Base is it developed an anaerobic
2 environment because of microbes eating organ (phonetic)
3 that were used to dissolve POD and it is reacting with
4 water that was already downgradient of the PRB. The PRB
5 is itself not creating DCE and vinyl chloride, it is not
6 producing that and issuing it out the back side.

7 MS. HANNAPEL: Well, that is not my
8 understanding.

9 MR. WEEGAR: Well, I'm the project
10 manager on Carswell Air Force Base, and that is what --

11 MS. HANNAPEL: When Mr. Patrick Lynch
12 came out, he said the same thing.

13 MR. WEEGAR: He is not accurate. He
14 hasn't studied --

15 MS. HANNAPEL: This is in text books.
16 It's on the internet at university sites.

17 MR. WEEGAR: What I'm telling you is you
18 referenced Carswell Air Force Base. What I'm saying
19 is --

20 MS. HANNAPEL: Perhaps that's not --

21 MR. WEEGAR: Well, that keeps being
22 brought up again that the PRB at Carswell Air Force Base
23 produces vinyl chloride and DCE. It doesn't. It
24 completely reacts with the TCB and nothing is exiting
25 that PRB. What is happening is the microbes in the

1 environment have set up a zone immediately downgradient
2 of the PRB that has reacted with water that was already
3 there before the PRB was installed. The Air Force took
4 additional actions to address that, but the PRB did not
5 cause that; and to suggest to anybody in these meetings,
6 which I have heard on numerous occasions, that this PRB
7 has in fact done that, is clearly a misrepresentation or
8 misunderstanding of the information that the Air Force
9 was providing.

10 MR. QUINTANILLA: In other words,
11 Carswell put a wall there or a damn in the middle of a
12 contaminated lake; is that what you're saying? Is that
13 what happened?

14 MR. WEEGAR: What they did is there is a
15 large area of ground water contamination at Carswell Air
16 Force Base --

17 MR. QUINTANILLA: Call it a lake.

18 MR. WEEGAR: Within this plume, there is
19 a channel of gravel that provides a preferential flow
20 path for ground water coming from Air Force Plant Four.

21 MR. QUINTANILLA: I'm familiar with plant
22 four.

23 MR. WEEGAR: What the Air Force did is
24 installed a PRB across that preferential pathway to
25 prevent any further contamination. It's --

1 MR. QUINTANILLA: It had already gone
2 beyond that.

3 MR. WEEGAR: It's still on base, but yes.
4 There was already ground water contamination that was
5 downgradient. They installed it and it cut off minor
6 concentrations. What has happened is the stuff that was
7 already there, you know -- the horses -- this part of
8 the horse is already outside the barn running around,
9 and there is something that's happened with that part of
10 the horse; but the part that was trying to get through
11 the barn door never got through.

12 MS. HANNAPEL: Okay. Mr. Weegar, if I
13 may just say this: I didn't know we were going to
14 discuss this tonight, or else I would have brought an
15 expert; and two, the person from UTSA, an environmental
16 engineer, he said one of the problems that appears -- it
17 doesn't always happen, but the reaction does not go to
18 completion. So then you are producing vinyl chloride.
19 It's one of the problems with PRBs. That doesn't mean
20 it's always going to happen, but it means it happens
21 sometimes. That's what I'm saying, that these fact
22 sheets are not pointing that out.

23 MS. POWER; Could I ask, because you and
24 I had a similar conversation, Ms. Hannapel, and you
25 provided me with references, and it was a professor at

1 the University of Delaware, and you and I and the
2 professor at the University of Delaware had an email
3 exchange. I have copies of those email exchanges. And
4 he -- the professor, I think his name was Dr. Chang -
5 I'm not 100 percent sure - I have this information. A
6 very similar conversation occurred.

7 MS. HANNAPEL: Right.

8 MS. POWER: Could you provide the
9 reference to UTSA? Maybe we can have an exchange with
10 this person, because if you remember, the professor at
11 the University of Delaware indicated that you did not
12 completely grasp the point that he was trying to make to
13 you.

14 MS. HANNAPEL: He also said that carbon
15 dioxide would be very difficult in that situation, and I
16 do have that email.

17 MS. POWER: Well, yeah. You just asked
18 for a reference. If you could provide back to us your
19 reference, it would probably be appreciated.

20 MR. SHENEMAN: Who was the chemist that
21 went out with us to -- was it 36th street, that we saw
22 the ditch open on a Saturday? I was there.

23 MS. POWER: I wasn't there.

24 MR. SHENEMAN: Was I the only one that
25 was there?

1 MS. LANDEZ: C. K. Tan?

2 MR. SHENEMAN: That's who that was. He's
3 out here at Southwest Research. He's also a buddy of
4 yours, isn't he?

5 MS. LANDEZ: Well, no. He did some work
6 for us.

7 MR. QUINTANILLA: You mean Southwest was
8 involved in this?

9 MS. LANDEZ: No, Dr. C. K. Tan.

10 MR. SHENEMAN: T-A-N-N, or --

11 MS. LANDEZ: He was interested in seeing
12 the construction and the tour was happening, and so he
13 went. And he's always a wealth of information.

14 MR. SHENEMAN: Yes, he is.

15 DR. SMITH: Back to my role here.

16 MR. WEEGAR: We didn't get through this
17 at the last RAB, didn't even get to this at the last RAB
18 meeting, and the purpose of this meeting is to get
19 through this. I would love to see us get through this.

20 MS. HANNAPEL: Isn't that what it says
21 right there?

22 MR. BUELTER: Let me -- I will talk about
23 this. This is building 301. We've completed three
24 sample events beginning in December of 2003. We are
25 trying to get on a six month period. We collected

1 samples in November, 2004; we actually started this in
2 May. We are sampling all of our PRBs again.

3 The last round, there is one area the
4 next chart will show this, we have three transects
5 across this. The southern most transect -- this shows
6 all three results upgradient within the wall, and then
7 downgradient. Part of what we -- there is vinyl
8 chloride at the site. There was vinyl chloride before
9 the wall was put in place. With this concentration of
10 vinyl chloride, the wall may or may not be treating that
11 vinyl chloride that was existing at the site, at least
12 at this point in time. The kinetics may not have caught
13 up.

14 What you see is basically similar vinyl
15 chloride concentrations across Kelly Air Force Base.
16 Vinyl chloride does not migrate very far. Downgradient
17 monitoring well, even before you get to the containment
18 systems along the base boundary, this is no longer
19 present.

20 MR. SILVAS: How can you say vinyl
21 chloride doesn't migrate very far?

22 MR. SHENEMAN: Where does it go?

23 MR. BUELTER: It's either volatilized,
24 but most likely when you get into anaerobic
25 environments, anaerobic bacteria breaks vinyl chloride

1 down very quickly.

2 MR. SILVAS: What is quickly?

3 MR. BUELTER: In a matter of hours. You
4 don't see large vinyl chloride plumes on Kelly Air Force
5 Base, even where you have much higher concentrations of
6 vinyl chloride in the water than this. We're watching
7 this other transect. We keep sampling it. Also the
8 treatment that we're going to do in building 301 is soil
9 and shallow ground water. Upgrading the wall will bring
10 these upgradient concentrations down prior to it
11 reaching the wall.

12 Building 360, basically at this point
13 there are no problems there. In five transects, we have
14 detected no VOCs within the wall or the well just
15 downgradient of the wall. Actually, some areas we have
16 less concentration upgradient of the wall than what we
17 anticipated when the wall was built.

18 Zone 2 PRB was completed in December.
19 Our first sample was in January. Took one in April.
20 There is no -- the first round, there is no PCE, TCE or
21 vinyl chloride detected downgradient of the wall. This
22 last round, again, these compounds weren't detected
23 downgradient of the wall. Of the five transects,
24 there's one that's near a source area near building 522.
25 The primarily contaminate is TCE and DCE. The DCE

1 fluctuates, but you can see from the January to April
2 time period, the DCE has increased, so again to vinyl
3 chloride.

4 MR. SHENEMAN: But you said there was no
5 DCE detected downgradient and you're showing less than
6 one microgram per liter?

7 MR. BUELTER: Right. This is the --

8 MR. SHENEMAN: One microgram per liter is
9 an amount, and I don't know what the toxicity of that
10 is.

11 MR. WEEGAR: That's the laboratory limit
12 for vinyl chloride. You could have put in there
13 non-detected, something like that. Two parts per
14 million is the MCL for vinyl chloride. At these levels,
15 they're below the drinking water standards for vinyl
16 chloride.

17 MR. BUELTER: I want to look at some of
18 the basically site MP. This is a chart you'll see again
19 next month. I want to look at two locations. Sight MP
20 here built this wall around it here. Ground water
21 concentration is what we see, and looking at the trend
22 well, that's 1,000 -- about 1,000 feet downgradient of
23 the wall. Within the wall, these are samples taken from
24 a recovery well within the wall. Again, there's a large
25 source of three phase PCE within this slurry wall,

1 concentrations of PCE are about 8,000 micrograms per
2 liter. It's eight parts per million. TCE and DCE are
3 about the same, about 1,000 micrograms per liter and
4 fairly consistent over this two year period. This is
5 what you would expect where you had a large source, and
6 it's slowly dissolving into the ground water.

7 The slurry wall and recovery system was
8 installed in 1998. What this is showing throughout the
9 sample of these wells, earlier on is even more than
10 annual; but we've been sampling annual. Prior to the
11 slurry wall being put in place, concentrations are
12 relatively stable at TCE around 300, DCE and PCE between
13 six and 800 micrograms per liter. With the slurry wall,
14 concentrations steadily decreased. The DCE is near, I
15 believe it's about 5 micrograms per liter. The TCE, as
16 you can see, is around ten, still a little above the
17 drinking water standard, but a couple of orders of
18 magnitude less than what it would still be if that
19 slurry wall wasn't installed at that location.

20 Site E-3, it's an old waste pit in zone
21 two. Looking at two different chemicals here, the major
22 contaminant is chlorobenzene, and the scale here is a
23 little different. This is a logarithm scale. It's
24 charted this way so you can see both compounds easily.
25 Chlorobenzene is relatively stable around 10,000

1 micrograms per liter. Vinyl chloride ranges from just
2 below ten to occasionally over 1,000. What this is
3 showing is there's a source there. You have a soil
4 vapor extraction. Both of these compounds break down in
5 the presence of oxygen, and one of the projects we're
6 going to do later this year is to optimize the venting
7 system here to get more oxygen down into the subsurface
8 to get the microbes working and hopefully start to
9 decrease that source.

10 What we have at site E-3 there is a
11 ground water containment system and that was put in in
12 1995. This is a monitoring well. It's about 12 feet
13 downgradient of a previous monitoring well installed in
14 the '94/'95 time period. Basically every once in a
15 while, I get a small detection of either primarily
16 chlorobenzene but mainly non-detect for vinyl chloride.
17 The pump and treat containing those high concentrations,
18 they're not moving downgradient and the plume off of E-3
19 has pretty well disappeared, once you get beyond that
20 containment system. Our action is to get back into the
21 source and optimize it and get more treatment to reduce
22 the concentrations of chlorobenzene and vinyl chloride.

23 MR. SILVAS: I'd like to state, first,
24 going back to our last meeting, I went over some of
25 Patrick Lynch's comments regarding the collection of

1 samples and the Air Force's eliminating chemicals of
2 concern without fully following up the full collection
3 of 20 collection samples and finding one and eliminating
4 them, and then they were continuing collecting less than
5 20 samples and still eliminating chemicals of concern.
6 Your presentation here today, I have doubt on, and I
7 continue to doubt because of the Air Force's way of
8 collecting data and presenting it. TCEQ has oversight
9 on everything you do, and they're letting you do this;
10 and so again, on the record, your presentation today in
11 here, I just disagree with.

12 MR. SHENEMAN: Robert, this is where we
13 need to get Elaine Ingram involved.

14 MR. SILVAS: She's on her way.

15 MR. SHENEMAN: Oh, is she? I sat over
16 there at the whatever, the Southwest Workers' Union, and
17 she repeated everything I had heard up to that point. I
18 was feeling pretty good about everything until I went
19 over there. All of a sudden, it made me sick.

20 MR. QUINTANILLA: Could you go back to
21 slide three, please? Zone 2 treatment systems?

22 MR. BUELTER: It's here.

23 MR. QUINTANILLA: On site E-1, 4,900,000
24 for enhanced remediation. Before you started that,
25 didn't we have a slurry wall there before? How much did

1 that slurry wall cost?

2 MR. BUELTER: It was not a slurry wall,
3 it was ground water pump and treat.

4 MR. QUINTANILLA: It was a pump and
5 treat?

6 MR. BUELTER: Yeah.

7 MR. QUINTANILLA: And it didn't work?

8 MR. BUELTER: No, it works. This was to
9 remove -- the main part here is the excavation. What we
10 did here, Mr. Quintanilla, primarily is an excavation of
11 the soils at site E-1. We backed up the ground water,
12 we added vegetable oil before we back filled it. That
13 will help degrade the remaining ground water
14 contamination.

15 MR. QUINTANILLA: What made it so
16 expensive, \$6 million?

17 MR. BUELTER: One, this stuff is
18 expensive.

19 MR. QUINTANILLA: That's more than you're
20 spending out there on the whole community.

21 MR. BUELTER: Actually, we're working
22 with the contracting officials at --

23 MR. QUINTANILLA: Is it SAIC?

24 MR. BUELTER: No. Actually, we're
25 working with the contracting officials at ECC. We are

1 actually expecting a rebate on this cost.

2 MR. QUINTANILLA: You're getting a
3 rebate?

4 MR. BUELTER: Yeah.

5 MR. QUINTANILLA: How much?

6 MR. BUELTER: Potentially one to \$2
7 million.

8 MR. QUINTANILLA: You should. It should
9 have been done right the first time. This is bad
10 government.

11 MR. BUELTER: These are two separate
12 actions; one is ground water, and one is the soil.

13 MR. QUINTANILLA: You're excavating the
14 soil, but you're bioremediating the soil also.

15 MR. BUELTER: No, the ground water.

16 MR. QUINTANILLA: The ground water.
17 Because the pump and treat didn't work?

18 MR. BUELTER: Pump and treat is a
19 containment system. This is to --

20 MR. QUINTANILLA: Well, that's what I'm
21 talking about. You did have a containment system, and I
22 heard it had leaked out and that's the reason I question
23 it. I heard.

24 MR. BUELTER: There are two things -- and
25 you're correct, back in '94/'95, a ground water

1 collection trench was installed. Two things happened:
2 There was questions whether it was eating the lining
3 layer. It was also too close to the hillside.

4 MR. QUINTANILLA: It wasn't done right
5 the first time.

6 MR. BUELTER: Right. That was one of the
7 first systems that we put in. This was the replacement
8 for that.

9 MR. QUINTANILLA: Who caught it? Who
10 caught that boo-boo; TCEQ?

11 MR. BUELTER: It was primarily our
12 contractor, when he started looking at some of the
13 systems for optimization.

14 MR. QUINTANILLA: You don't know how much
15 of the 6 million you're getting back, do you?

16 MR. BUELTER: No. Like I said, we've
17 just signed the contract in August on this. Indications
18 are now the --

19 MR. QUINTANILLA: Could we find out how
20 much?

21 MR. BUELTER: Yeah. Hopefully by the
22 June or July RAB, that will be taken care of.

23 MR. SILVAŞ: Can we make that an action
24 item?

25 MR. SHENEMAN: Who is the contractor?

1 MR. QUINTANILLA: ECC.

2 MR. SHENEMAN: They may go broke.

3 MR. QUINTANILLA: You know, we shouldn't
4 have to be doing things twice. You've got to do it
5 right the first time. We don't have that much tax
6 money.

7 MR. BUELTER: Like the original, we're
8 all learning. Even construction people are learning
9 that.

10 MR. QUINTANILLA: That's an expensive
11 school.

12 MR. BUELTER: I don't have any idea. I
13 don't know what it cost.

14 MR. SILVAS: Are these barriers, how
15 proven are they, and how long have they been around?
16 These barriers you're talking about.

17 MR. BUELTER: The pump and treat, or the
18 reactor barrier?

19 MR. SILVAS: The reactor.

20 MR. BUELTER: They're well over ten years
21 at this point, and are working well.

22 MR. SILVAS: Do they trap arsenic?

23 MR. BUELTER: I don't believe arsenic is
24 a metal that they would work on. Arsenic basically will
25 come out oxygenated.

1 DR. SMITH: What do you think; can we
2 take five minutes to stand up and stretch; or do you
3 want to go straight on? Please keep it five, because
4 we're way behind.

5 (Recess.)

6 DR. SMITH: If you all will have a seat,
7 we'll get started once again. We're looking at an
8 update report, the update on building 361. Our
9 presenter is Jack Shipman. He said all we need to say
10 is here's Jack, and there you are.

11 MR. SHIPMAN: Okay. You probably
12 remember a few weeks ago --

13 THE REPORTER: I can't hear you, I'm
14 sorry.

15 MR. SHIPMAN: You can't hear me?

16 THE REPORTER: No.

17 MR. SHIPMAN: Just talk louder?

18 THE REPORTER: Yeah, if you will.

19 MR. SHIPMAN: At this time they've asked
20 me to brief the building 326 incident.

21 MS. LANDEZ: 361.

22 MR. SHIPMAN: I don't do this very often.
23 Next slide. A little overview of what we're going to
24 talk about, brief site summary and then the pre-incident
25 Rad survey and deed recordation; the 7 October incident,

1 and I'll describe that a little bit to you in-depth, and
2 then the investigation afterwards, radiation survey and
3 then the worker testing. And then finally in 12
4 January, '04, we have the contractor go back to work,
5 and then current status and questions.

6 As I briefed to you a few weeks ago, this
7 is all the sites on Kelly. About 27 sites, just about
8 got them all cleaned up. 17 were active sites right up
9 until base closure, things that they needed day-to-day
10 right up until closure; and then ten were historical
11 sites, like paint shops that we had to research the
12 records and interview some employees and stuff like
13 that.

14 If you're not familiar with the four
15 Radium paint shops, which was one of the biggest
16 concerns, it was where Kelly workers refurbished and
17 painted aircraft instruments and parts with radioactive
18 luminous salts. This was done from about the 1920s to
19 1952 at Kelly. Spills contained contaminated shop
20 floors were washed down building four drains and sinks
21 into a sanitary sewer system. That's where I'm cleaning
22 up here in 326.

23 There wasn't any sanitary sewer here in
24 building 324. This is where the incident was, but these
25 two are kind of unusual, because they're -- go to the

1 next slide. Because they are under these monstrous
2 hangars, and these things have been here since the
3 forties. Now go back to the last one. So there's not
4 much we can do, but we did the best we could by
5 investigating them and making sure there was no
6 contamination on the surface or around the perimeter.
7 And these two right here, 326 we're almost finished with
8 it, and we'll be finished with it in about 2005.

9 Next slide. And there's those monstrous.
10 hangars again. Go back. This is 361 and this is 365.
11 This is where the incident was. Okay. Just a little
12 bit of history on 361. It was the first Radium paint
13 shop from 1922 to 1929, and it was demolished in 1930.
14 It was a simple wood structure. I think before the
15 Radium paint shop, it was an upholstery shop.

16 The current hangar at building 326 was
17 built on the site in 1941, and then everything was fine
18 until BRAC in '95 came along and Kelly was on the list.
19 So among other sites, AFRPA started researching all the
20 radioactive material and waste sites. I was doing it.
21 And in order to transfer the property in building 361 --
22 in order to transfer the property, we had to do some
23 radiation surveys. The first radiation survey was in
24 July of '99. This was before the incident. This was
25 done by MKM, a contractor out of Las Vegas. We surveyed

1 the hangar floors, the perimeter, the ground water
2 downgradient, the monitoring wells, man holes and
3 nothing was impacted. Everything -- there was no
4 radiation anywhere. So due to this situation, the only
5 option we had was to record -- do a deed recordation
6 through the county. It goes through TCEQ and TEH and
7 they're aware of it.

8 So after we did all of this, 22 April,
9 '03, we receive an EPA note for reaction letter, and we
10 thought everything was fine. Next slide. Okay. Well,
11 in 1999, during base closure, Boeing leased building 361
12 along with 375, the big hangar. They were going to use
13 it as an aircraft paint stripping facility, which I
14 think it was before Boeing had it. Everything was fine
15 for about four years, and then in July of '03, Boeing
16 decided they wanted an upgrade. So they awarded a
17 contract for a new stripping system, and it just
18 happened to have a waste water collection trench in it.
19 So the project progressed for a few months, and then on
20 7 October, '03, during lease compliance inspection,
21 AFRPA saw the trench, which I'll show you a picture of
22 here in a minute, and alerted the Boeing contractor of
23 possible under slab radiation, recommending that they
24 get a radiation survey to survey the area and protect
25 their workers.

1 Next slide. Okay. This is the trenching
2 system that's in 361. You can see it already has the
3 steel in it. This is exactly the time when we stopped
4 them. These are Earth Tech employees surveying.

5 Next slide. Okay. That will give you an
6 idea of what it looked like. The Air Force, GKDA and
7 Boeing took immediate action to address the issue and to
8 make sure that workers' safety was okay and to get the
9 project back going. The day after Boeing hired Earth
10 Tech, an environmental contractor licensed to do
11 radiation investigation in Texas, they did a survey of
12 361 just to make sure everybody wasn't getting exposed
13 to radiation. They surveyed the entire building
14 interior -- I should have here exterior perimeter,
15 including the trench and later we had to monitor their
16 installation of the sanitary manhole right outside the
17 building that they hooked into the system. The survey
18 was completed. Oh, the survey was complicated by that
19 existing rebar steel in the trench. It was hard to get
20 their survey instruments under this, but they managed.

21 Okay. So we got a problem. So Earth
22 Tech did a survey, and they discovered elevated levels
23 above Texas action levels of Radium 226 in one small
24 section of the trench only. Go two more slides up --
25 one more. One more. And they found that -- you can get

1 an idea the plane would sit right her, and it would be
2 stripped and these trenches would collect the stripper
3 and waste water, and it would go over here into a
4 collection area. This just happened to be where they
5 found all the radiation, and evidently there was some
6 pipes going across here, and when they were installing
7 this trench, they cut these pipes and it seems like
8 these pipes were left over from this 1920 Radium paint
9 shop.

10 Take it back. Go back to nine. Okay.
11 So there was old cast iron piping discovered three feet
12 below the soil in native soil below existing slab base
13 material, so it was pre-1941. Initial meter readings
14 were 150,000 counts per minute, which is 15 times
15 background, which is getting up there. This won't hurt
16 you, but you've got to pay attention. 200 micro per
17 hour is getting up there, too. Anything over 100 and
18 you've got to kind of, you know, sit back and say
19 there's something here and we need to figure out what's
20 going on.

21 Okay. 9 October, we stopped work. That
22 was the consensus from all the players. 10 October, all
23 regulators were informed, including the Nuclear
24 Regulatory Commission. How many days ET took -- this
25 was with their meters, and then down here they took

1 actual soil samples, which are more accurate. Trench
2 soil samples, pipe sediment samples and concrete
3 samples. They took chunks of concrete from the floor.
4 The highest levels are Radium 226, and they have
5 instruments that will tell them it's Radium 226, which
6 tells them it was an old Radium paint shop. If it was
7 something else, then it wouldn't be associated with a
8 Radium paint shop. Anyway, 53 feet pCi/g was the
9 highest in the soil, which is not too bad; and 4,800
10 pCi/g was in the pipe, which was pretty high. Texas soil
11 cleanup action is 15 feet pCi/g. That will give you a
12 reference of how high this was.

13 Another little reference on the sanitary
14 sewer system out there on 326, my highest level was 400
15 pCi/g in the soil around the sanitary storage system.
16 So this is pretty high and that got our attention, too.
17 But it was in the sediment, three feet below the ground,
18 and it really won't hurt anybody. It's shielded quite a
19 bit.

20 Next slide. Okay. We've done the
21 survey, and we also learned that some of the waste soil
22 and pipe had already been taken out of the building and
23 disposed of in area landfills. ET investigated and
24 sampled the locations and none were impacted. I think
25 there were three other landfills. I used Gary to double

1 check me on some of this stuff, because he was writing
2 this. If you see anything -- and we checked the BFI
3 landfills. We weren't sure if any went to BFI
4 landfills. The contractor didn't really -- wasn't
5 really forthcoming on this, but we finally got it out of
6 him, I think. Anyway, they have radiation alert sensors
7 that as the dump trucks go through their gate, they've
8 got radiation sensors that will tell you if they have
9 radiation waste on them. Evidently BFI said none had
10 alerted in the last few months, so this was ruled out.

11 Also ET was tasked by Boeing to see if
12 they could find out where these things came from. They
13 just had them there in this trench about this wide.
14 Where did they go, where did they come from. So they
15 used two techniques here, and it wasn't successful
16 because the pipes were so old and corroded and full of
17 gunk and stuff.

18 MR. MARTIN: In addition to that, the
19 rebar in the slab affects that read. I'm sorry. Gary
20 Martin. I don't think you had it in there later; but
21 when we actually took samples from those pipes, we found
22 out that a couple of them were only about a foot long.
23 So they were completely removed.

24 MR. SHIPMAN: Yeah. After all the ET
25 investigation, 17 November, which was about a month

1 after the incident. the U.S. Air Force Radioisotope
2 Commission issued a permit for this site. The U.S. Air
3 Force is my regulator for all those sites right there.
4 They're the Air Force regulator, along with the EPA and
5 TCEQ to a certain extent. They just permit the site to
6 ensure safety precautions and that everything is
7 addressed satisfactorily before they close the site.

8 Okay. There's a picture of the trench,
9 and these are two ET workers. You can see it's really
10 hard to get down in there; but see, they're dropping
11 their little probes down in there and they managed to
12 get some soil samples satisfactorily. Next slide. And
13 here's the camera down there, and you can see these
14 pipes that they cut off. When they were installing this
15 trench, they just cut these pipes off, and it looks like
16 they were from the old Radium operation.

17 Next slide. And this is a diagram that
18 Earth Tech did of the trench, and this was the only
19 place that they found elevated reads. The whole rest of
20 the building was clean, perimeter, man holes,
21 everything. It was just this one area that was
22 elevated. Here's where the pipes were. The pipes were
23 right here, and you can just see them sticking in here.
24 Now, the workers that were doing this trench, the ones
25 that were working in here, we especially wanted to find,

1 and we found most of them and that's the next slide. We
2 wanted to test them to make sure they were okay.

3 So on 23 October, Boeing set up a meeting
4 of all the contractor and Boeing workers and had plenty
5 of experts there, and Boeing, Air Force, TDH experts in
6 attendance to answer all the questions. 12 employees
7 requested urinalysis, and the AFIOH and Boeing split the
8 samples for QA/QC measure, and the results were -- and I
9 have that analysis here, if you need to look at it --
10 that the levels on the workers were within normal ranges
11 for all populations. I didn't know this before this
12 incident happened, but everybody has got a little Radium
13 in them. I can feel mine right now. Anyway.

14 Okay. After all this, we tested the
15 workers, did all the surveys and everything was in good
16 shape. The pipes were still underneath the slab, but
17 everybody wanted to get back to work, so we tried to get
18 everybody's approval. ET and AFIOH determined that the
19 workers' radiation exposures in the hangar were no more
20 than background levels, which is about what it's like
21 here. The pipes were capped and plugged. 12 workers'
22 bioassay results were normal. Experts agreed that a
23 foot of concrete between the workers and the pipes would
24 shield most gamma radiation. CHPs worked this out, and
25 they've got all these calculations. They confirmed it.

1 We've got lots of CHPs that were helping us on this,
2 private sector and government.

3 Evaluation, Earth Tech did their final
4 status surveys just to confirm everything was safe, and
5 then all of these organizations approved. Everything
6 was okay, and then on 12 January - what is that, like
7 three months after the incident - Boeing was allowed to
8 finish the construction and the paint stripping system.
9 And on July 4th, the final report was approved. I've
10 got a copy of it over there, if anybody wants to look at
11 it.

12 Current status, as of today, Boeing
13 project was finished in mid 2004. The Boeing contractor
14 worked at the plants. The site's deed recorded with
15 Bexar County, and TEH and TCEQ, I think, have a copy
16 because I think it goes through them. You all probably
17 know what this is for, in case the property is ever
18 sold, whoever buys the property can see that there is a
19 radiation possibility under this -- it's not a
20 possibility anymore -- underneath the slab. If they
21 ever do any major remodeling, they need to either call
22 the Air Force, or get qualified people out there to
23 screen it and make sure their workers don't get hurt.

24 MR. QUINTANILLA: You mean it's still
25 contaminated?

1 MR. SHIPMAN: Yes, it's still under the
2 slab. What led up to this was poor communication
3 between GKDA and us. The digging permit system failed,
4 and now we put them all in email so everybody can see
5 all digging permit. There's a digging permit for this
6 process, and not very many people saw it. These
7 compliance procedures were upgraded, and so we're doing
8 a lot better now. We haven't had another incident since
9 this. Now all we're waiting for is the U.S. Air Force
10 permit termination, and that will probably happen as
11 soon as I get all employees ready and paint shops
12 finished and sanitary sewer system. We've got to sit
13 down and talk about all of these and then we're going to
14 permit -- we still have deed recordation, but the permit
15 will probably be terminated.

16 MR. QUINTANILLA: What does SS mean?

17 MR. SHIPMAN: Sanitary sewer. The next
18 two slides, I just put in here for your reference, if
19 you didn't know who my regulators were. And the next
20 slide there is cleanup requirements. I had to assemble
21 that slide just for your information. If you have any
22 questions?

23 DR. SMITH: Questions?

24 MR. SILVAS: What violations, or what
25 penalties did Boeing acquire on this?

1 MR. SHIPMAN: What?

2 MR. SILVAS: What penalties or violations
3 did they acquire over this?

4 MR. SHIPMAN: What penalties were
5 imposed? I don't think any. We certainly got a black
6 eye for poor communication, and you would think we would
7 have been better at this by as many years as we've been
8 doing this, but the digging permit process was pretty
9 poor and we weren't talking to each other, but it's
10 improved a lot now.

11 MR. SILVAS: Shouldn't there be penalties
12 imposed, or something of that nature?

13 MR. SHIPMAN: I don't know. That's up to
14 the regulators.

15 MR. MARTIN: Nobody knew that that
16 actually existed there. If it had been anywhere else --

17 MR. SILVAS: I have records showing that
18 it existed, and when Boeing showed up at their meeting,
19 I told them directly that there's documentation that
20 that building contained radiation.

21 MR. WEEGAR: Well, we didn't have any
22 information that there was radiation there.

23 MR. SILVAS: Oh, come on.

24 MR. WEEGAR: No. I'm the one who
25 actually approved --

1 MR. SILVAS: Oh, yeah. I see what you
2 approved.

3 MR. WEEGAR: There wasn't anything there
4 that showed any radiation in that building until we had
5 this.

6 MR. SILVAS: Sure.

7 MR. SHIPMAN: We knew the shop had been
8 there. I thought surely that it was all scooped up when
9 they installed that big old hangar. I know when you
10 install a building, you scoop out that much soil.

11 MR. SILVAS: That leads to the other
12 question. Where do all these pipes containing the
13 contamination lead to? Where was this hangar that
14 consisted of radiating paint?

15 MR. SHIPMAN: That was part of ETAPT's
16 tasking was to try to figure out where that came from.
17 We were unsuccessful. So the pipes are still under
18 there. It's probably just some pipes left over from
19 when they built the building. When they built the
20 building, they didn't scoop them all up, and they were
21 left from the old Radium paint shop. But the thing is
22 all the experts have said that it's shielded, it won't
23 hurt anybody. It's three feet below the ground. That
24 floor is very thick. It's a foot in some places, and
25 two feet in a lot of others; and expert CHPs have said

1 it's shielded satisfactorily. The only option is to
2 tear the hangar down, and I don't think that's an option
3 at this point. Maybe when it gets older, we can tear it
4 down. I'm sure the Air Force --

5 MR. SILVAS: Maybe when you have another
6 accident.

7 MR. QUINTANILLA: When you record this
8 deed -- or rather this permit to get this digging
9 permit, did you go to the City for this digging permit,
10 or what?

11 MR. MARTIN: No. We have our own
12 internal digging permit process between the Air Force
13 and GKDA.

14 DR. SMITH: Mr. Garcia was trying to get
15 in.

16 MR. GARCIA: You said you put shields on
17 it. Did you put shields all around it and encapsulate
18 it; or just put shields on top and then put a foot of
19 concrete?

20 MR. SHIPMAN: No. We plugged the pipes.
21 Maybe go back to this slide and show the picture of it.
22 It's still in there, maybe three feet below the surface.
23 It's like way down here. So when they -- here's a
24 trench right here. This thing, look how thick this
25 concrete is.

1 MR. GARCIA: I know you put a foot of
2 concrete in there, but there's a radioactive pipe there.
3 What did you do? You said you shielded it. Did you put
4 a shield on top, or did you encapsulate it with a shield
5 to encapsulate it, contain it? How long is this pipe
6 that we're talking about?

7 MR. SHIPMAN: We don't know how far it
8 goes back in here or here.

9 MR. GARCIA: So you only encapsulated or
10 put a shield on part of it, not on the whole system of
11 pipe that might be radioactive. You only covered that
12 one and put a shield, and then put concrete. You didn't
13 encapsulate it so the radiation wouldn't seep down lower
14 or somehow work its way down into the ground water.

15 MS. LANDEZ: The concrete is the shield.

16 MR. MARTIN: As I said before, when they
17 got down there when they were trying to take samples,
18 one of those pieces of pipe only turned out to be about
19 12 inches long. So that piece of pipe was removed. On
20 the other side, they were able to access the pipe a
21 little better, and it actually had a cap placed on that
22 end of it that was exposed. It's covered on the top and
23 it's covered on the side of the trench with concrete.

24 MR. GARCIA: You capped it, but what
25 happens because of old age it cracks and the radiation

1 that's in it starts seeping out into the ground water
2 somehow. Why didn't they remove all of those pipes to
3 be safe instead of just putting a cap on them or putting
4 a shield and putting a foot of concrete on top of them?

5 MR. SHIPMAN: What do you recommend they
6 do? What do you recommend they do?

7 MR. GARCIA: You said you took a piece of
8 12 inch pipe. Why didn't you remove it, the whole thing
9 and send it to a --

10 MR. SHIPMAN: They tried to dig in as
11 much as possible. I think they got like a couple of
12 feet; but you've been in radiation for a while, and you
13 realize if something is down there, you've got all this
14 shielding here. So they took all of these readings up
15 in here, and there was absolutely no --

16 MR. GARCIA: That's after you poured the
17 foot --

18 MR. SHIPMAN: -- exposure for a worker.
19 A worker up in here will have absolutely no radiation
20 exposure.

21 MR. SILVAS: How can you say that?

22 MR. SHIPMAN: That's been documented by
23 many AFIOH, ET --

24 MR. GARCIA: My concern is if you put a
25 shield and then a foot of concrete on top, what's going

1 to protect it if it breaks further and there's radiation
2 in it and it seeps into the ground water? Why didn't
3 you encapsulate the whole thing with a shield or remove
4 the whole thing?

5 MR. SHIPMAN: Well, it's impossible back
6 in here, but I don't think the Radium is very mobile.
7 That's what we found out in the sanitary sewer line
8 investigations. We're digging up this pipe, and it's
9 gone -- it's leaked out of the joints like maybe a foot
10 or two at the most. To ground water, you know, 50 years
11 of ground water percolation.

12 MR. GARCIA: I'm saying 100 years from
13 now, some other RAB is going to come in here and look at
14 the same thing and say hey, way back in 2005, they put a
15 shield and a foot of concrete. They should have removed
16 the whole pipe because now 100 years later, the bottom
17 of the pipe broke and the Radium has seeped into the
18 ground water. What they did was just protect the upper
19 surface and put a slab in there to protect the worker.
20 They didn't protect the bottom part of those pipes in
21 order to keep it from 100 years from now breaking again
22 and dumping Radium into the ground water again, right?

23 MR. MILLER: This is Gary Miller again.
24 What's in the pipe is a small amount of sediment. It's
25 not like this pipe is full of water or full of pure

1 Radium or something. It's some sediment that has some
2 radiation in it. The pipe is in there; there's --
3 ground water is what, 15, 20 foot below the building,
4 most likely?

5 MR. SHIPMAN: I don't know what it is
6 under that building.

7 MR. MILLER: What the theory was there's
8 no way -- there's not any contamination in that pipe
9 that's going to break out and flood ground water. We
10 don't have infiltration coming through the building, so
11 we're not getting flushing of water to flush it on down.
12 It's not going to go anywhere. It's like Jack said,
13 it's not very mobile. We found in a sanitary sewer that
14 had water in it for the last 50 years constantly, it's
15 only gone a foot down to the soil below that pipe
16 anyway. This building has been sitting here --

17 MR. GARCIA: What happens if the ground
18 water tables raises so much it starts affecting this
19 junk?

20 MR. MILLER: That building will probably
21 be destroyed anyway if it comes up that high, because
22 we'll start have foundation issues and everything else.
23 That would be an amazing occurrence.

24 MR. GARCIA: 1998 we had 100 year floods
25 and all of that. That affected a lot of ground water

1 and a lot of soil conditions and all of that, you know.
2 I see a concern over just putting a shield and putting a
3 foot of slab and leaving it exposed on the bottom.
4 That's a very tough concern over doing it this way.

5 MR. SHIPMAN: I'll ask my experts about
6 that, and see if that's --

7 MR. GARCIA: Give us a report on that,
8 because I think we have a serious problem with that that
9 needs to be dealt with as to why that thing happened
10 like that.

11 DR. SMITH: Mr. Quintanilla?

12 MR. QUINTANILLA: In the late 80s or
13 early 90s, they put in cameras in the sanitary sewers
14 and they photographed the sanitary sewers and flames
15 were coming up. Do you have any record of that?

16 MR. SHIPMAN: Flames? Old Kelly people
17 should know about that. I wasn't here in the 80s.

18 MR. QUINTANILLA: 80s and early 90s.

19 MS. LANDEZ: It was --

20 MR. QUINTANILLA: Do you have that tape?

21 MS. LANDEZ: I don't know if we have that
22 tape.

23 MR. SHIPMAN: It caught on fire?

24 MR. QUINTANILLA: Yeah. The sewers were
25 on fire underneath. The cameras caught it.

1 MS. LANDEZ: I know when the C5 burned
2 out on the tarmac and the fuel spilled into the storm
3 water system, and when it came out, there was a huge
4 fire ball. I know that. I was there. I had to clean
5 it up.

6 MR. QUINTANILLA: That was one incident,
7 but there's another incident where --

8 MS. LANDEZ: I've heard of that. I've
9 never seen it. I don't know.

10 MR. QUINTANILLA: CE was the one that
11 conducted the camera study.

12 MS. LANDEZ: I don't know if we even have
13 them.

14 MR. QUINTANILLA: It was briefed to the
15 General at the time. That is how I know about it,
16 because I was there and I saw it.

17 MR. WEEGAR: You were a General?

18 MR. QUINTANILLA: No, but I was there at
19 the briefing for the General.

20 MS. LANDEZ: I've heard the same thing.
21 I've never seen the tape. Whether we still have them
22 available, I have no idea.

23 MR. GARCIA: Does this justify any camera
24 work? This problem, does this justify any camera work?

25 MR. SHIPMAN: They tried to. That was

1 one of the two techniques they did. They got about this
2 far, and it was so full of sediment and plugged up, they
3 couldn't get very far. Then they tried another
4 technique -- they tried to find out where they came
5 from. They clipped on an electronic gizmo to the pipe,
6 and then tried to trace it back, an electromagnetic
7 system or something. That didn't work either, because
8 it was - I don't know, something happened. So we did
9 try to see -- the only option is to tear the dang
10 building down, and that's not an option right now. It's
11 not hurting anybody. There's one thing you learn in
12 radiation, there's exposure and there's no exposure to
13 workers right here; and they can confirm that. There is
14 radiation down in there. Now, if it was severe, really
15 high radiation, it could hurt people up here, but
16 this --

17 MR. GARCIA: It was just a partial patch
18 up job, just like the dead carcasses in the pipe over
19 there by military and base road. Not a complete --

20 MR. SHIPMAN: Do you want us to tear down
21 the building? That's the big paint facility.

22 MR. SHENEMAN: What is the half life of
23 this?

24 MR. SHIPMAN: I think it's 1,500 years.
25 None of us are going to be there.

1 MR. SILVAS: When did that get there?

2 MR. SHIPMAN: Huh?

3 MR. SILVAS: What year did that occur?

4 MR. SHIPMAN: The Radium paint shop was
5 from the 20s. It was the very first one here. A good
6 book I just read, if you all want to read a good book
7 about the first Radium contamination, go to Amazon.com
8 and get this book. It's fascinating what these women
9 that used to stick the paint brush in their mouth --
10 now, they stopped that when they were working at Kelly,
11 but back in the 20s when they first started that U.S.
12 Radium, they would lick their paint brush and do the
13 dials, you know, for the old aircraft; and half of them
14 they would go to the dentist, and they would have a bad
15 tooth. And the dentist would take the tooth out, and he
16 would look down in there and the jaw was rotting out.
17 And sooner or later, the jaw would have to be removed.
18 Then they started having joint problems. And this was
19 the first --

20 MR. SILVAS: I've got a final question.

21 MR. SHIPMAN: 1925.

22 MR. SILVAS: This incident is a Boeing
23 incident. Why aren't they here giving the presentation?

24 MR. SHIPMAN: Why what?

25 MR. SILVAS: This is their incident, why

1 aren't they giving the presentation?

2 MR. SHIPMAN: Well, GKDA was going to do
3 it, but decided for me to do it. It is my site. It's
4 one of these on that map. It is one of my sites, and I
5 did survey it the first time. I guess that's what
6 their -- but it was Boeing's incident. They paid for
7 Earth Tech, and they paid for all the workers' testing.

8 MR. SILVAS: How come they're not here
9 giving the presentation?

10 MR. MILLER: We didn't ask them to come
11 and make the presentation.

12 MR. SILVAS: That was a mistake.

13 DR. SMITH: Okay. Thanks. It's a
14 quarter after nine. Mr. Quintanilla has told me he's
15 already missed the first half of the game, so he doesn't
16 care anymore.

17 MR. QUINTANILLA: 40 minutes.

18 DR. SMITH: We do have these three items
19 on the board to get back to the Executive Committee to
20 take care of as action items; and please, if there are
21 other requests for information, put them on these sheets
22 of paper and we'll get the response back to those. The
23 original plan for meetings called for a TRS meeting on
24 June 14. My understanding is that has been changed to a
25 special RAB meeting in lieu of the TRS meeting.

1 MR. SILVAS: That's the problem. I spoke
2 to Adam about that. They wanted to move that meeting
3 until next month. I disagreed, told them that I would
4 like to stay with the planned date of the 23rd-24th of
5 May, and I was told to bring that up to EPA and TCEQ,
6 because they're scheduling their, whatever they have to
7 do, to meet that date is a problem for that to occur.

8 MR. SHENEMAN: Where is Quinten
9 Roosevelt?

10 MS. LANDEZ: It's building 171. It's a
11 conference room inside building 171 at Kelly Air Force
12 Base -- or Kelly USA.

13 MS. POWER: The big giant building where
14 Toyota is now.

15 MR. SHENEMAN: 143 Billy Mitchell.

16 MS. LANDEZ: You mean at the GKDA
17 building?

18 MS. POWER: No. The large building
19 that's over by the railroad tracks on Berman Road.

20 MR. SHENEMAN: What road?

21 MS. POWER: Berman Road.

22 MS. LANDEZ: We can probably send out a
23 map with the meeting agenda.

24 MR. SHENEMAN: Who the hell is Quinten
25 Roosevelt?

1 DR. SMITH: I guess there's apparently
2 still some question about the date; is that correct,
3 Mr. Silvas?

4 MR. RYAN: We're not going to answer that
5 question apparently in this group.

6 MR. WEEGAR: Can I ask a question? What
7 is the purpose of having another RAB meeting two weeks
8 from tonight?

9 MR. QUINTANILLA: Because we didn't
10 finish the last one, that's what I hear. It needs to be
11 rescheduled.

12 MR. WEEGAR: I don't understand the
13 purpose of doing it two weeks from tonight versus the
14 14th.

15 MR. QUINTANILLA: I'm not in that
16 meeting.

17 MR. WEEGAR: I'm unavailable that week.
18 I have deadlines and commitments.

19 MR. GARCIA: I've got another item up
20 there. On March 8th, TRS meeting in the minutes that
21 were sent to us, we had a lot of items that were
22 supposed to be put on for referral for information and
23 put on the flip chart as an action item, and there's a
24 bunch of action items in this meeting where we requested
25 information and data, and they haven't been answered.

1 March 8th -- this is April, this is May. It's been two
2 months, and the items we put on the action items list
3 included in these meetings, we did not get a report on.
4 You need to add that to the action item list.

5 MS. POWER: The first item this evening
6 you all agreed not to address those meeting minutes.

7 MR. QUINTANILLA: No, we didn't say that.
8 Not to approve them.

9 MR. GARCIA: I'm addressing the items.
10 I'm not questioning whether to approve them or not; I'm
11 calling that there's some action items in there that we
12 asked action on.

13 MS. KIRKPATRICK: I'm Cheri Kirkpatrick.
14 Mr. Garcia, I can speak to that item. The minutes that
15 are included do reflect the action items that you just
16 mentioned. There's another form in there signed the
17 27th of April, 2005, and it is a list of questions from
18 RAB members presented at the RAB meeting -- or TRS
19 meeting. It's in a separate package where these are
20 answered.

21 MR. GARCIA: Some of these -- like I
22 requested information and input on how they write the
23 qualifications for the contractor. I don't think that
24 is answered there.

25 MS. KIRKPATRICK: Yes, sir. It's number

1 6.

2 MR. GARCIA: I saw that. That's not
3 satisfactory at all. A lot of the questions I asked
4 information for cannot be answered in a one or two
5 sentence paragraph. You need to go back over this and
6 read it. When we ask for answers in here, it requires
7 some extensive answers, not just a one or two sentence
8 answer.

9 MR. QUINTANILLA: One question:
10 Mr. Weegar, you have an alternate. Is your alternate
11 available during this period of time?

12 MS. POWER: Which dates are these?

13 MR. QUINTANILLA: I don't know. I'm not
14 available on one of those days.

15 MS. POWER: I'm not available on the
16 23rd, but the 24th might work.

17 MR. SILVAS: 24th is good.

18 MR. QUINTANILLA: The 24th of May?

19 MS. POWER: Yes.

20 MR. QUINTANILLA: That's the date that
21 you're not available.

22 MR. WEEGAR: Pardon me?

23 MR. QUINTANILLA: Is that the date that
24 you're not available?

25 MR. WEEGAR: I'm not available the rest

1 of this month. My boss is now acting as a section
2 manager in one of the other sections while they are in
3 the process of hiring somebody.

4 MR. QUINTANILLA: So you're taking the
5 beating.

6 MR. WEEGAR: I always take a beating.
7 This is mild compared to what I take back at the office.

8 MS. POWER: Gary Miller, are you
9 available on the 23rd or the 24th?

10 MR. MILLER: No. I'm gone all that
11 week.

12 MR. QUINTANILLA: Does he have an
13 alternate?

14 MR. MILLER: My alternate is at the same
15 meeting that I'm at.

16 MR. QUINTANILLA: Apparently, the
17 community doesn't matter.

18 DR. SMITH: I think people have proposed
19 alternate dates, and I think it's going to be up to the
20 co-chairs to get together and decide when the date is
21 going to be.

22 MR. QUINTANILLA: When is your meeting,
23 the executive committee meeting?

24 MR. SILVAS: Tomorrow.

25 DR. SMITH: Okay. It will be decided

1 tomorrow.

2 MR. SILVAS: I had requested some data
3 regarding the Dean Apple collections data from parking
4 lot 171. The answer I got in the response was short of
5 any data that was collected by SAIC. I want an action
6 item on that. I want all the requested data that I had
7 requested before.

8 DR. SMITH: Anything else? Could I get a
9 motion to adjourn?

10 MR. SHENEMAN: I so move.

11 DR. SMITH: Second?

12 MR. WEEGAR: Second.

13 DR. SMITH: Opposed? Meeting is
14 adjourned.

15 (Proceedings concluded.)

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 THE STATE OF TEXAS |

2 COUNTY OF BEXAR |

3

4 I, Randall E. Simpson, Certified Shorthand
5 Reporter, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing
6 typewritten pages contain a full, true, and correct
7 transcription of my shorthand notes taken upon the
8 occasion set forth in the caption hereof, by means of
9 computer aided transcription.

10 I further certify that this Statement of Facts
11 truly and correctly reflects the exhibits offered by the
12 respective parties, if any.

13 Witness my hand, this 31st day of
14 May, 2005.

15

16

17



18 RANDALL E. SIMPSON, Texas CSR 568
19 Expiration Date: 12/31/05
20 Federal Court Reporters of
21 San Antonio, Inc.
22 10100 Reunion Place, Suite 310
23 San Antonio, Texas 78216
24 (210) 340-6464
25

FINAL PAGE

ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD

FINAL PAGE