KELLY AFB
TEXAS

ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD
COVER SHEET

AR File Number 3222.1

March 8, 2005
Technical Review Subcommittee Meeting of the
Restoration Advisory Board for the
former Kelly Air Force Base

Environmental Health and Wellness Center

Dr. Patti Smith: Ok, I think we can get started and keep on schedule as best we can. My name is Patti Smith, I am one of the facilitators with Smith/Associates. I know that you are use to one of the other facilitators. I am the stand in for this evening. My background is very much the same as David's with facilitation. Let me just give you a couple of agenda items to bring up to everybody. First of all I would lie to go over the agenda and what the primary purpose of tonight's meeting of the Technical Review Subcommittee is. We will be looking at the update on building 326, followed by a question and answer period. In fact you will have an opportunity to ask any questions you would like regarding that particular update. Then we will move in to the Semi-Annual Compliance Plan, and once again we will have a presentation, and then an opportunity for questions and answers regarding that particular item on the agenda. Then for a period of time we will go to the administrative section with the BRAC Cleanup Team Update, spill summary report, documents to the TRS that will forward on to the RAB. We will have a request for information, responses that are also in the packet, and one of the items we will have to do is approve the December meeting minutes, which was deferred from the last time because people had not had an opportunity to review all of the information. We will follow that by a TAPP update, and then we will have a meeting wrap-up with whatever items we might have regarding the agenda for this evening. You will find in your packet the agenda, followed by a set of slides that our presenter will use during the building update, then the Semi-Annual Compliance slides are also in the packet. If you look at the first five or six slides they are the update slides, following that there are 7 pages that will reference the Compliance Plan Report. Then there are numerous documents in the packet that are the request for information responses. The final page in the document should be the TAPP update graph, and the last thing is the items that were submitted and requested from the co-chair that should go to the RAB meeting. So you will see an additional packet and that is quite thick also. Does everybody have those documents and are aware of that? The one thing that I am going to ask you to do, is, if in fact you do have a question, if you can please raise your hand and let us know so that we can get you a microphone so that we can pick up the question and we don't have any blurring of what is being asked. The other thing is that when we take the microphone is that you please give us your name so that we can put that into the transcript. And we also have a mic up here which is picking up the speaker presentation. Does anyone have any questions about that? We are trying to hold all questions until the end of the presentation so that in fact we have the opportunity to move the mic around effectively to ensure that everybody is heard. I would like to ask Mr. Jack Shipman to join us. Do you want me to mention what we have there? All of those particular items, or are you going to work through it?

Mr. Jack Shipman: I think we will just work our way through it.

Dr. Patti Smith: All right. Great.

Mr. Jack Shipman: I am Jack Shipman and I am the radiation program manager and have been for quite a few years. Bear with me I do not do a lot of public speaking, but I will do the best I can. First of all I am going to do a summary of all the sites. Here is a poster with all of the sites. If you see the red dots – you can look at these later if you like. There were 27 of them originally, eight years ago, and we closed out all of them except for a few of the main sites before radium paint shops. Of those four radium paint shops, there are two priority radium paint shops, Building 326 and 324, and we are almost finished with those. Then I will tell you a little about the regulators and cleanup levels that we have to go through. Of the 27 closed sites, those red dots on there, they were almost base-wide, 17 were active sites and by active I mean that they were active until Kelly's last years. For example that would be any (Onionoxide?) shop that used electron tubes or a shop that we cleaned uranium counter weights which are on aircraft wings. And then the other ten sites were historical sites that we found through historical research, and went over plans, property records, and did historical stuff. And those included the four radium paint shops. The status of those is we got 24 no further action sites per EPA. And then we have one leaseback that is on Lackland control. We cannot survey this because it is still being used. They are still storing material in this and we cannot survey this. We have a few priority sites, which are 324 and 326, and with associate water sewer system, which had some contamination in it. If you don't know what a radium paint shop is, this is where Kelly workers painted air crafts and parts, the paint contained radioactive salts, and these were put in a paint binder. They did this all the way from 1920 to 1952. They painted things in the air craft, you know like handles, dials, and instruments so you can see them way up high in a blackout situation. The four radium paint shops on the main sites, which are 361,365,324, and 326, and you can see the dates that are there. 361 and 365, the original shops, are now under existing hangers, big hangers, that Boeing is using and we cannot remediate this. Go to the next slide and I will show you these hangers. Boeing is using them. So what we did was survey the surfaces around the outside and made sure that everything was clean. There is no contamination to hurt any workers. The only thing to do now was to keep a report out at the county, so that is Boeing or anyone else were to start to demo on that, then the Air Force would have to go in and remediate the site, whatever is necessary. Someday we may have to. And you are probably familiar with the Boeing incident that happened in October when Boeing dug in to the slab and hit a little bit of radiation, radium contamination, and we got the incident. We tested the workers to make sure they were ok and we sealed the trench they were working on. They finished the project and everything was ok. But these top two sites still have contamination there and it will have to stay there. It is nothing that will hurt anyone, it is very low level. So it will have to stay there until they demo the building. As you can see they are very large. Boeing needs them. 324 and 326 are sites that we can remediate; we have been working on this for many years. 324 – we got an EPA nuclear accident 9/5/03, and then 326 we are still working on, phase III, and we will talk about this a little later. We are on the last stage where we are digging up the sanitary sewer system; it's got a little radiation, radium in it. This is

similar to the SAWS workers that dig up the sewer lines. This is scheduled for completion mid-year. OK, now that is 361 and 365. These are very old radium paint shops that services the planes. They demoed in the 1930's and they built these – well these were form WWII. So we surveyed all of them. And everything is ok. Workers won't be hurt. There is no dosage present. This has been confirmed by many agencies that there is no harmful agents. Now these are the two priority sites, 324 and 326, you can see here 324, has already been finished. It took a couple of years to get this all remediated, and cost quite a few million dollars. And this is a sanitary sewer line coming out here. There is a little bit of contamination in the sanitary sewer line but we dug this up and replaced it. So it is all clean. But EPA wants to wait until we finish all of this work and then they will close out this permit and give us another. OK, 326 is what we are working on now. And this is phase I, phase II, phase III is the sanitary sewer system that goes all the way down here. You can see that we are working on this here. This is to give you an idea of what is going on. Next slide. OK, back to 324. This is a little brief summary of the survey done in 1999 and 2000. Completely remediated in 2003. We moved all of the contamination from the prior shop, floors, walls, and what was stuck on the roof, it was all contaminated. And about 100 feet of the sanitary sewer system, inside the building, here I will show you, that was under the slab. We also tested the exterior sanitary sewer system and storm water lines shallow ground water, manholes, everything and everything was not impacted. We got a final status survey which you will see as the final report in July 2003 from EPA who gave this a good nod in September 2003. But we still have to wait for the Air Force ok and our government entity is the Air Force Radioisotope Commission, which is up in Washington, we have to issue a permit on all four of the radium paint shops and they are going to keep the permit active until we close out 326 sanitary ewer system. Here is a picture of what we have to do when we come into a site. This was originally 324, it was a 1934 – 1942 radium paint shop, and it has been remodeled. You can see the ribs on there we have a grid. It is complicated system that we have to go through. We have to grid the system off and take samples and levels and there has to be a procedure that we follow set down by EPA and DOD and the Air Force. Now as we pull up this photo, this is kind of interesting, this was in 324, you can see it looks like in this radium paint shop they washed the brushes out. And it was very elevated. This was really elevated upon this sill, and it looks like they put the brushes up there and they were painting cans or something like that. We had to tear the whole thing out and dispose of it. So this is interesting that the sink was still there until just a few years ago when we remediated it, it is all gone now. Next slide. Here is the guy doing the final touches on that sink drain. You have to use all of this fancy equipment to chip all the concrete away. All the spills and everything get in the concrete and the only way to get rid of it is to chip it out. What they do is chip it out and then they suck it up with this hose hooked up to a (hypa-vacuum?) and so there's no dust. And these guys are suited up pretty good. There is not much dust coming out. Next slide. OK now here is a guy working on the sanitary sewer system, again to dig up under the floor we had to jack hammer all of the sanitary sewer pipes in the area and dispose of them. OK the last slide is 326 and it was a radium paint site 1942-1952 during WWII, it was a heavy volume of a lot of dials and air craft parts. We started surveying in 1999 and 2000, and I call it Phase I, which was ordered in December 2000 where we fully characterized it, that means investigated it. Parts of this were remediated, but we still need to do a lot more. So

phase II, these are all multi-million dollar contracts. These were awarded in September 2002 and this was designed to get all of the interior, that rectangular area you saw on the map a while ago. We resolved contamination from the floors, the walls, the interior floor crawl spaces, there was a crawl space under the floor that was very contaminated. Only 100 feet of the exterior building was sanitary which was right outside the building in an alley. We wanted to try just 100 feet to see how much it cost and how involved the area was. We also surveyed the sludge drying bins, since the sanitary sewer system ran all the way to the Leon Creek area where Kelly use to have a waste water treatment plant, which they had a original one. So we surveyed the entire sanitary sewer system, and we found three elevated areas where the radium from the WWII area had gotten in the soil. So we dug this up, excavated and disposed of it. We also surveyed the storm water lines and checked the shallow groundwater. All of these types of areas. We also, as a special project, went off base to the city of San Antonio waste water treatment plants to make sure that none of this radium water had gotten off base. Because I think in 1953 the sanitary sewer went off case, off Kelly, and we shut down our waste water treatment plant. So all of Kelly's sewage went off base, to the City of San Antonio's waste water treatment plant. We found two of these that were closest and surveyed them, and we didn't find any levels that weren't background. That survey was a couple of years ago; it is just sitting, until we get the sanitary sewer system done. Next slide. OK this is the current project, phase III, awarded October 2004. As of today we remediated about 500 linear feet of the total 2300 linear feet of the sanitary sewer. We have to dig up, replace, remove and dispose of it to make sure there is no contaminated soil. And this heads down towards Leon Creek, right down Berman Road. The radiation levels in the pipes and the soil we're digging up under the sanitary sewer system is high, it ran to about 150 (curies?), or about 20 times background. Now this background should be about 40 times background, that a typo. The 150 curies was correct though and it will give you an idea of what the levels were. Our clean up level is 15 (picocuries?), so Texas cleanup Level is 15 feet pico curies. So you can see this was above cleanup levels that we are being super careful and going down to 10 picocuries per gram which is approaching background you would have in your backyard. We, now when we were taking out the sanitary sewer system there were a few areas we had to dig up to three feet under the pipe, where we had a leak under the pipe which was headed down, so we had to dig up that much soil in a few areas. It was not a lot. OK, this project is scheduled for completion mid this year. We should get EPA no further action status for building 326 and 324 by October. Then USAF (Ric?) permit termination should be by the end of the year. This should complete the Kelly radiation program where we've cleaned up all of the 27 sites and we should be finished. These are pictures of 326 interior phase II. This is a big machine that just sits there and chips at the concrete all day. He is controlling it with a remote control. We have got a (hepa-vacuum?) going there to suck all of this up so he doesn't have to breath it, even though he does have respiration protection on. And this was a very large building, had to do the whole thing. And this is the alley. The shop was in here. It came out and got in the sewer line and had to dig all this up. This was very high levels in all of the man holes. Then it went down Perrin Road there that way. Next slide. This is what we are doing currently, this is the last week. We are digging it all up. The guys in the (PPE?) there. There's meters there, they have to screen themselves going out. They screen the tractors, decon them before they even move. We take the waste soil and the

waste pipe down to the dumpsters down there. It all has to e screened and documented. That's what I work with; should be finished this year. Oh, do we have time for, ok I got time, regulated aspect of this – the EPA of Texas, AFMLA which is the Radioisotope committee that I was talking about, and the AFIOH which is Brooks. EPA is the lead. Texas has got cleanup levels, but they prefer to let the EPA lead in this instance and instead of our regulator being a nuclear regulatory commission, the Air Force has a (masto—?)and the Air Force can regulate their own radioactive materials and issue RAMPs which is a radioactive material permit to places like Kelly. They usually do this on active bases but lately they wanted to permit Air Force remediation projects. And then AFIOH is the world wide Air Force radiation experts and they're my supervisors at Brooks. They are very knowledge and they are kind of like permit readers and safety officers on our project to make sure everybody's safe and no one's getting over-exposed, where the radiation levels were too high. And then the last slide – It's not that boring is it? Cleanup requirements are set by the EPA and state. The EPA has about 15mg annual dosage of radiation for a human for a risk assessment value, that means that we have to clean up our sites so that somebody standing on that contamination will not get any more than 15 mg dosage a year. Everybody gets 360 mg of radiation a year from just everyday life. Now how we see that – here is a chart of where that 360 mg comes from. I did have a slide on that. Now it is like from cosmic sources and x-rays and radon. There is radon everywhere. It may not be very high level, but there is still some. So everybody gets this 360. OK, the EPA does not want you to get 15 more than that 360. So that is why they hold it to 15 mg. Radiation workers can get more, if they are certified radiation workers. OK, so the EPA is our lead, and they have set the 15 mg per person, a nation wide thing, and EPA will accept the Texas cleanup levels and AFRPA needs EPA approval for property transfer to the City of San Antonio. So we need EPA's ok. And last – state regulations. The state has written out good regulations, mainly the TCEQ, for us to go by. Building surfaces, that is like buildings and concrete floors, we use the 5000 (emp alpha?), and at 5 picocuries per surface, surface soil down to about that much, and 15 picocuries down deeper than that. Now that 15 picocuries satisfies the 15 mg, and the EPA is happy about that. OK, that is all.

Mr. Armando Quintanilla: I have three questions. How money has been expended in remediating 361, 365, 344, and 346 and how much money is yet to be needed?

Mr. Jack Shipman: Probably about 5-6 million so far for those radium paint shops. I have spent about 1 million on the little bitty sites. Some of those sites were very minor, and I lumped them all into a big contract. Lots of little sites. These little sites are where they stored radioactive materials, nuclear waste and we went into them just to make sure that they did not spill anything. This took only a few weeks to survey. Or maybe they used a piece of equipment that had a little-bitty radioactive source, maybe a (Cesium source?) or something in it. That you wouldn't want a spill or for anything to get in the wrong hands, so we disposed of them.

Mr. Armando Quintanilla: Did I understand you correctly when you said that in 361 and 365, where the instrument shops use to be are under slabs of concrete, building 361 and 365?

Mr. Jack Shipman: Yeah. Those big hangers. The first two radium paint shops were – you know the old Jenny Biplanes. Well this was during that era. In the 20's and 30's there were two radium paint shops, and this happened to be under those big hangers. So over these paint shops you have these monstrous hangers, on top of them. But they re not debating the baseline on it, we are just saying this is on the same site.

Mr. Armando Quintanilla: I thought that they were adjacent to it.

Mr. Jack Shipman: No. They don't exist anymore.

Mr. Armando Quintanilla: OK, with all of the work that you do, EPA is the head regulator on that. Do they come in and check this to see how well the work has been completed?

Mr. Jack Shipman: They review all of our documents, they do site visits. TAH does too, the Texas Department of Health. And the Air Force people.

Mr. Armando Quintanilla: No other questions. Thank you.

Ms. Coriene Hannapel: Yes, you said that in the beginning that some of these spills were done in the 20's, 30's and 40's and that was well before Boeing was here. Why is it that we are just doing this now?

Mr. Jack Shipman: Why are we investigating it now?

Ms. Coriene Hannapel: Yes

Mr. Jack Shipman: Well, we did not know about it. We did not know about the four radium paint shops until we started the investigation in the mid 90's. 1996 and 1997 was when the program started. And it was weird; we went through old real estate documents. We had a guy that worked for us, he was a bulldog, that went through all of these old drawings. We had seen it, and I have a slide on it that shows the original plans for each building. And it was called a luminous paint shop. This is where they mixed radium. And they did not know that it was quite as dangerous as it was. Have you ever heard of the radium girls? There is a brand new book out – go to Amazaon.com and there is a book that tells about these radium girls back in the 1920's that use to lick the brushes.

Ms. Coriene Hannapel: So back in the 20's no one knew about it. But certainly in the 60's and 70's and 80's – well that was way before Boeing. How come?

Mr. Jack Shipman: OK, well they stopped using radium in 1952. That was the last radium paint shop ever, and it was replaced by other luminescent paints and stuff like in your watches. I just don't think they realized it. Now back in the 1940's they knew it was dangerous. I don't think too many people from Kelly got hurt. It was before that people really got hurt. But they still spilled it. That is what happened to Kelly. There

was no people hurt, I don't think, no cancer or anything like this. But what happened is that the spill is sloppy. They spilled it all down the drain, and for whatever reason there is a spill. It was spilled during the day of work and spilled all over the place, and then the janitors would come in and spread it all around. They would wash the bucket out that would go down to the San Antonio sewer system and then this stemmed out to 30-40 years. And that is why we are so interested at Boeing.

Ms. Coriene Hannapel: Thank you, but that really doesn't answer my question.

Mr. Jack Shipman: Well what is the question?

Ms. Coriene Hannapel: Why are you just doing this now? Certainly they did not know about it in the 30's, 40's or 50's, but in the 70's they did.

Mr. Jack Shipman: That is the reason; again we did not know that this thing existed until 1996. It was totally forgotten about. We discovered them when we were doing the environmental EBS study, when Kelly became a closure base ordered an investigation of all sites and all underground storage tanks, all underground water contaminations, and we found these radium paint shops.

Ms. Abbi Power: So you say that there are two, one in 361 and 365.

Mr. Jack Shipman: Yes.

Ms. Abbi Power: Those two buildings were built during WWII in 1940-something. So they were not using them from 1940-something to 1990-something when you all did the property research to find out the buildings were actually there before 1940-something?

Mr. Jack Shipman: You would not believe what we had to go through to find these sites. We had to get aerial photographs and real estate documents, old original drawings for these buildings that we had obtained. In the aerial photographs we had, we tried to proportion tem on to the present day maps. We had a guy that worked with us that is really good at this. That is how we found out where they were, originally. They just happened to have two under containment. The two that I think the most contamination were cleanup right away, they were easily accessible and we leaned them up.

Ms. Coriene Hannapel: We cannot examine the hangers if Boeing is using them. So how do we deal with that?

Mr. Jack Shipman: Well, Boeing dug up into a current situation. They dug into the foundation, they were installing some new equipment, and they did not tell anyone. They should have gone through a few more procedures.

Ms. Coreiene Hannapel: Well someone should have told Boeing before.

Mr. Armando Quintanilla: Did Boeing have approval for this?

Mr. Jack Shipman: Well, there was no permit for digging. That was the problem. And now we have really increased out digging permits procedures. Historically a permit is not used for an interior, it was always exterior. And we are doing permits for interior.

Mr. Rodrigo Garcia: Well, this was no accident. Well, the Air Force knew about these. They have been there for so many years. They know about all the contamination. It was just that they closed the base and everything started to come out. There's a lot of us that grew up around here, a lot of negative things on the Air Force part. It's coming out when they decided to close the doors. As far as this deal with Boeing and the digging inside the hanger, Boeing is leasing or renting the place. He is not the landlord, he does not know nothing. It is just like if you rent a house and I decide that I want to dig the interior without telling my landlord, there is a lot of questionable issues involved. All of this did not start coming out until they started closing the base. All of these problems did not come out until they closed the base, and these problems have been there for a long time. The problem is that the community and the people who worked there sis not know about this. But it is all coming out now.

Ms. Norma Landez: On the Boeing incident, Boeing told their contractor that they were designing and building, but they did not get an ok from us before they started digging. They did not give us that time to review anything. If they had given us time to review their plan, we would have told them that they could not dig where they were planning to dig. That was the problem. They went ahead without waiting for our approval. It is like you said about the landlord, if you go and tear the floor out from a house that you are renting, without telling the landlord, you are not going to know unless you go in and check. And that is how we found out.

Mr. Rodrigo Garcia: You're right. I should not tear up someone else's property just because I want to improve it. So it is the failure of the landlord to control its tenant.

Ms. Norma Landez: But the only way to know what they are doing is if they tell us what they re planning to do.

Mr. Rodrigo Garcia: But you should have landlord rights to examine your property on a periodic basis to see what the tenant is doing.

Ms. Norma Landez: And we do, we do.

Mr. Rodrigo Garcia: That is an Air Force problem as landlords; they did not monitor their property.

Mr. Jack Shipman: Well there were some mistakes made.

Mr. Rodrigo Garcia: A lot of mistakes. OK, one more question, are you working here at AFRPA? Because I want to write a report with 30-100 questions on this. I need to know where you are going to get it.

Mr. Jack Shipman: Well you can –

Mr. Rodrigo Garcia: No, this is too much of an issue that demands answers. So you are going to get 30-100 questions from me. I need to know where you work and where I need to send this to.

Mr. Jack Shipman: CI people. They accept all of those.

Mr. Rodrigo Garcia: I know they accept all these. But I need to know where you are at.

Ms. Sonja Coderre: Jack Shipman works for the Air Force Real Property Agency.

Mr. Rodrigo Garcia: OK, that is all I need to know.

Mr. Jack Shipman: They can get it to me.

Mr. Rodrigo Garcia: I know, I know.

Dr. Patti Smith: There's a couple questions in the back over here.

Unidentified Speaker: I wanted to double check. The 100 microcuries. You said that was 40 times background. What is the background level?

Mr. Jack Shipman: OK, radium, like in your backyard, on an average in the United States is 2 or 2 picacuries ---. So when you have an incident like this you know, we know we have contamination it's like 100 picocuries, , because in fact some of those readings are up to 120 picocuries. This level will not hurt you. You have to be exposed to this stuff and ingest it for 30-40 years, a whole life, for it to even hurt you. And then you wouldn't even have any health effects. Radiation is very mysterious, even now. EPA has wrestled with this for years. What is a clean up level? What will not cause cancer? And there is still a lot of work to do in this area. They've come up with these figures, and all of the guys I work with, all my contractors say that this is a good level to start with 15 picocuries. We're very protective of people.

Dr. Patti Smith: One question behind you.

Ms. Esmeralda Galvan: On the slide presentation where you talked about the radium paint shop, you said that the contamination was removed from the former shop. So if contamination was present before it was removed, does that say that the workers were exposed to that contamination?

Mr. Jack Smith: In what?

Ms. Esmeralda Galvan: In the radium paint shops.

Mr. Jack Shipman: Well, from 1920's to 1952, they were radium paint shops.

Ms. Esmeralda Galvan: But you said they were removed in 1997. So from all that time to 1997, those workers were exposed to radium.

Mr. Jack Shipman: The workers that worked in these radium paint shops were exposed to it.

Ms. Esmeralda Galvan: So at the present, we have people who worked, ex-workers from Kelly AFB that have come down with cancers and illnesses, caused by this.

Mr. Jack Shipman: Well, that's not for me to…

Ms. Esmeralda Galvan: Well there is a connection there.

Mr. Jack Shipman: Well, I am sure we can get them tested. There are a few tests to see if there is any connection.

Ms. Esmeralda Galvan: Well, the tests that we have now are very general. The ones that the Health Screening gives, they are not cancer type of tests that are given here, at this particular Metro Health Clinic.

Dr. Patti Smith: Well, let's hold on to that one that's an issue, but not necessarily the basis for this particular meeting.

Mr. Glenn Wilkinson: Ok, let's look here. These buildings, building 3000, building 3050, there is, all of Zone 4, east Kelly, another DRMO here housed contamination. These people sold stuff. But what radiation were they selling?

Mr. Jack Shipman: You see there were small pieces of equipment that had small, little radioactive sources.

Mr. Glenn Wilkinson: Who would they sell them to?

Mr. Jack Shipman: Well, these were small pieces of equipment that they would use in their daily work to test metal, paint. I think they were called metal analysts.

Mr. Glen Wilkinson: They sis not do that work. They sold stuff.

Mr. Jack Shipman: Well they had scrap metal.

Mr. Glenn Wilkinson: What happened to the equipment?

Mr. Jack Shipman: What happened to the equipment? The equipment, DRMO, when they shut down, they had to turn it in when they shut down, and I think they took it to Fort Sam. Except for some permitted pieces of equipment called (XRF Probes?).

Mr. Glenn Wilkinson: What did the --- do with the equipment? What contamination...If I want to turn it into a memorial site where DRMO sold more than 20,000 barrels of Agent Orange stuff to Texas. Two million Texans have died from Agent Orange poison due to the fact that DRMO sold it as a generic nontoxic weed killer. Now if that building is uninhabitable, how can we turn it into a historical monument?

Dr. Patti Smith: Well, I guess I'm going to have to ask you to put that out there, but I don't believe that this is really the place. I'm not sure…

Mr. Jack Shipman: Well, the building if inhabitable. The building was given a No Further Action site. All that was over there was equipment with little pieces of …we removed them. And we surveyed the area and it is all fine.

Ms. Norma Landez: So the equipment that had the radiation sources.

Mr. Jack Shipman: There are no radioactive sources now. They checked metal sources for sheet metal.

Ms. Norma Landez: Oh, OK.

Mr. Jack Shipman: I'm sorry; it's a metal alloy that tells you what kind of metal it is.

Mr. Glenn Wilkinson: But did it have radiation in it?

Mr. Jack Shipman: No. It contained a source. It is like a (Cesium?) source that shoots out a beam and they ---

Mr. Glenn Wilkinson: And then the third site in the bottom was a radiation storage facility. Right here. What happened to all of this material?

Mr. Jack Shipman: Well, 3810 was a storage area for ---

Mr. Glenn Wilkinson: For what? Give us a manifest.

Mr. Jack Shipman: I don't know. Well, for all sorts of radioactive waste.

Mr. Glenn Wilkinson: What was it and where was it shipped? How many years was this used as a storage facility?

Mr. Jack Shipman: Do you know what depleted Uranium is? Well, it is what they used on air craft (arands?), it is what they used because of the heavy metal. It is Uranium and they had to shape it.

Mr. Glenn Wilkinson: Yeah, and they had --- bombs at that base --- so don't pluck me.

Dr. Patti Smith: Thank you for your comment.

Mr. Robert Silvas: I disagree with your comments on the past actions of workers stating that they spilled waste onto the floor. I don't think that is the case here. There is plenty of responsibility that needs to be taken and that goes to the fact that this stuff was not spilled, it was intentionally dumped. You know that, I know that, and it is always an issue here when this comes up.

Mr. Jack Shipman: Who intentionally dumped it?

Mr. Robert Silvas: Well, the, who used it? The Air Force workers. Now you are saying that it was spilled.

Mr. Jack Shipman: Whether is was done accidentally or intentionally, we just prefer to clean it up.

Mr. Robert Silvas: Well, the words that we use are carefully stated as a spill. And it was not like that. It was dumped.

Mr. Jack Shipman: Why would they do that?

Ms. Esmeralda Galvan: The supervisors told them to do it.

Mr. Robert Silvas: These chemicals were dumped in the sink; they were dumped on the floor…

Mr. Jack Shipman: On purpose? Kelly workers were doing this?

Mr. Robert Silvas: The Air Force is responsible for their worker. They were trained to do what they were told.

Ms. Esmeralda Galvan: They were told to hide these chemicals too.

Mr. Robert Silvas: My next question. The building back at Lackland, 1530 – what is being stored in there now?

Mr. Jack Shipman: Well, that was a storage area for nuclear weapons – do you know where it was, across here –and I think they stored some parts. They did work on button systems. Before Lackland gets out of there, we will have to survey this and make sure there are no spills. That is what we are going to do. If a piece of equipment has moved on many years ago, there is no residue left, then there is nothing to clean up. We go in and scan the complete core, it's an area a lot bigger than this with scanning instruments, to make sure there are no spills. That is what my job is.

Mr. Robert Silvas: Well, 1530 is on the west or east side of the runway?

Mr. Jack Shipman: It is in the big new hanger. It is on the east side. It's one of our newest hangers in Bay E.

Mr. Robert Silvas: Right. Is that the only nuclear ---?

Mr. Jack Shipman: Well, nuclear weapons were right across the street, and a guy that worked in the area told me that. That they used this as a storage area. It is not that sinister. It was like whatever parts of equipment they worked on, weapons systems, it was no big secret. Parts came through and they needed more storage area, so they went across the street to the warehouse, it's a warehouse and stored them there. And we're going to make sure there were no spills.

Mr. Rodrigo Garcia: Now it is on the Kelly side of the runway, not on the Lackland side of the runway. Then Kelly RAB and AFRPA is responsible for this.

Mr. Jack Shipman: Yes, but Lackland is going to help us survey this because they were using this as a leaseback. Do you know what a leaseback is? They're leasing it back.

Mr. Robert Silvas: What about the actual warheads?

Mr. Jack Shipman: The nuclear warhead on Kelly? Well, I don't know which…

Mr. Robert Silvas: Well, I don't think this is a laughing matter.

Mr. Jack Shipman: I am not laughing.

Ms. Esmeralda Galvan: Yes you are. Well what do you call that?

Mr. Jack Shipman: I'm the radiation Program Manager. I came here in 1997 to clean up spills. If you want to research something and find out something that happened during the Cold War, I don't really know anything about it. Kelly was a (SAC?) base and Medina. There were nuclear weapons at Medina, it is common knowledge. But Kelly ---

Mr. Robert Silvas: You never researched any type of nuclear warhead accidents or---?

Mr. Jack Shipman: I don't know.

Mr. Robert Silvas: Why wouldn't you?

Mr. Jack Shipman: Why wouldn't I? Because I don't know of any.

Mr. Robert Silvas: Well, how about all that research?

Mr. Jack Shipman: You know the nuclear weapons shop, I know they worked on nuclear weapons during the Cold War era, they had the different parts, I don't know they

had the complete weapon. But what Kelly did was they were a site base and they had them – there were certainly nuclear weapons and that was common knowledge. But as far as nuclear warhead accidents, I am not aware of.

Mr. Robert Silvas: Why wouldn't you?

Mr. Jack Shipman: Because I don't know of any.

Mr. Robert Silvas: Well, you did all this research.

Mr. Jack Shipman: In the nuclear weapons shop, they worked on nuclear weapons.

Mr. Rodrigo Garcia: Well, we are just worried about the radioactive material in that building next to the big hanger. That is the one they are talking about.

Mr. Robert Silvas: Next question. This next question is about phase I that was characterized in the partial remediation. Who was awarded that?

Mr. Jack Shipman: What building?

Mr. Robert Silvas: Two priority sites, building 326.

Mr. Jack Shipman: Building 326 page 1. That was Earth Technical.

Dr. Patti Smith: Would you like to repeat that question?

Mr. Robert Silva: Who is the contractor and can I also have Jack Shipman's phone number for the RAB to contact?

Ms. Sonja Coderre: If you will contact the Public Information Line, we can get in contact with him. We've got so many questions, we want to have time for the Semi-Annual, do we want to table the discussion on radiation to another time. We've got hands going everywhere; I'm just concerned about time.

Ms. Coriene Hannapel: I would like to ask a question about what you said.

Dr. Patti Smith: Is it about information given or…?

Ms. Coriene Hannapel: Well, it is a question about how questions are answered.

Dr. Patti Smith: OK, go ahead.

Ms. Coriene Hannapel: Some of the questions we gather go to CI. Is that correct?

Ms. Sonja Coderre: Well CI is Community Involvement, which is the team that I lead over at…

Ms. Coriene Hannapel: Which is the group that is contracted with Booz Allen. OK. I asked a certain question and got answers, and we all apparently are going to get some answers. What I was told is that the Air Force is not required to tell me who is answering my questions. They are not required to tell what expertise level of the person who is answering my questions. So it could be Joe Schmo, and it could be a Harvard researcher. That makes a big difference. I want to make sure that when I ask a question, I wick know who is answering. Who is I charge of that?

Dr. Patti Smith: Can I ask you to hold onto that, that's a little off the topic, but I will get back to you. Let's ask questions about this topic. Let's get to this gentleman's question.

Ms. Coriene Hannapel: Well, that is a question. I want to ask questions before hand and I want to know how they are going to be answered. Is Mr. Shipman going to answer these questions or…

Mr. Glenn Wilkinson: Real Property Agency has to ---

Ms. Coriene Hannapel: Or do you have the CI department where people with public relations degrees answering questions.

Ms. Sonja Coderre: Well, actually the people from the CI department, the public affairs department, when we get questions from the community, what we do is that we search out the expertise in the staff. It is a question about radiation, then of course we go to the radiation staff. And we have him help explain, figure out what the answer is. If it is about water, then we have our water experts seek this out. If it is a general environmental question, then it goes to Norma or Don. The community involvement team does not have the expertise to handle answering highly technical questions, so we don't. We make sure that the right person is the one answering your question.

Ms. Coriene Hannapel: I would like to know who is answering my questions, and I would like to know that I am going to get that answer.

Dr. Patti Smith: OK. Let's go to the next question. We can put that as an action item.

Ms. Henrietta LaGrange: My name is Henrietta LaGrange. Mr. Shipman, I wanted to let you know that this is not a laughing matter. Apparently you did not come here tonight to give straight answers to our questions. A am very upset because you come here and you laugh and what the government is doing is trying to genocide the Hispanic community, the poor people that live around here. And I am sorry but you should apologize to us. The poor people who have died. Because it is not a laughing matter. And you also mentioned that you tested people, and they tested fine. For how many years are you going to follow up the testing? Because it won't show up in one or two years, it might not show up for 5, 10, 15 years.

Dr. Patti Smith: As far as questions, I don't think that this is a question that we can answer. We can put this as an action item.

Ms. Henrietta LaGrange: He said that he tested people.

Mr. Jack Shipman: I have told you about my program in all sincerity. I have been perfectly honest with you. I've worked on this many years. We are just cleaning up the mess that the Air Force created, that's no mystery. We don't want there to be any more radiation on Kelly, nothing to hurt people.

Dr. Patti Smith: I am not sure what the question was.

Ms. Henrietta LaGrange: My question was, he says he tested workers. What I want to know is how long are these workers going to be followed?

Ms. Norma Landez: Well, I want to clarify that when he is talking about workers being tested, they were tested during the Boeing incident. He was very specific. We told you about this in the past also. That was not led by us, it was led by Boeing and their folks. They did have the workers that were impacted that were in the area when the accident at Boeing occurred, they were tested by Boeing. So those people were tested.

Ms. Henrietta LaGrange: So who is going to follow the testing?

Ms. Norma Landez: That is up to Boeing that is their responsibility.

Ms. Henrietta LaGrange: It is up to Boeing. They began digging, but they did not know what was under there. So Boeing is responsible, not the DOD, is my answer…

Ms. Norma Landez: It is my understanding that they can follow up on that question and answer that.

Ms. Henrietta LaGrange: I want an answer to that.

Dr. Patti Smith: Thank you. Are there any more questions that can be answered here? Do you have a question?

Mr. Armando Quintanilla: Yes. Following up on Ms. Galvan's question, when was radium last used in building 326 and 324? In 1996?

Mr. Jack Shipman: In building 326 to 1952. And building 324 was 1934 and 1942. Then they moved across the street when 326 was a brand new facility. So in 1952 they stopped.

Mr. Armando Quintanilla: In 1952 they stopped using radium at Kelly.

Mr. Jack Shipman: Paints, yes.

Mr. Armando Quintanilla: So the workers there were workers that did use radium paint that was during the Korean War.

Mr. Jack Shipman: Yes. If you look at an old newspaper, there are stories about them that are really interesting. You can go to the Lackland library, I think that there are a lot of newspaper articles that are very interesting.

Mr. Armando Quintanilla: OK, let me ask another question. Radioactive waste was buried in the golf course, has that all been cleaned up? This was not in the presentation.

Mr. Jack Shipman: That was in the Lackland area, right over here. It was in (RE12?), and it is in this area here. It was Kelly but then Lackland took this area and they have addressed both of these issues and dug it all up. I am not exactly sure. There are reports you can read in their admin record. They dug all of he waste and radioactive material, I don't know if they finished that other site, but you can get the status on that.

Ms. Abbi Power: Those two sites and the golf course were cleaned up prior to…

Mr. Rodrigo Garcia: Prior to closure.

Ms. Abbi Power: Yeah, they were cleaned up prior to transfer.

Mr. Rodrigo Garcia: Yes, they were cleaned up prior to transfer, and we asked for information verifying that they were cleaned up before the base was closed. After the base was closed we asked for verification while it was still in Kelly jurisdiction that this was cleaned up and we never got it. Because I still have the ATSDR report when Kelly was closing.

Mr. Jack Shipman: Well, I've seen some reports at Lackland, and I think they have finished the remediation there.

Mr. Rodrigo Garcia: Well, there was more than just radium in that place. They use to have that B52 by the golf course. By Military and Medina Base Road. And there was a lot of radioactive junk in there. Besides radium there was some other radioactive chemicals. And we need the answer to that.

Dr. Patti Smith: Is there any more requests for information that is going to take research?

Mr. Glenn Wilkinson: Yes, on Medina Base – work on Medina Bas.

Dr. Patti Smith: I guess I'm going to ask, is that referencing this particular presentation?

Mr. Glenn Wilkinson: On Medina Base Road there was radioactive, a whole field that had signs all throughout that had "keep out" and "radioactive waste buried here". Are those sites cleaned up?

Mr. Jack Shipman: They had the same contractor I had, Earth Tech is out there, they have contracts out there and I think they cleaned all that up. I don't know Medina, but I know they're working on it.

Mr. Robert Silvas: What about unknown sources of radioactivity?

Mr. Jack Shipman: What do you mean?

Mr. Robert Silvas: Well, if you found out due to old drawings that these buildings were on top of old prior buildings. What about sites that you may have missed?

Mr. Jack Shipman: Well, that is everything that we know. Those 27 sites, well 29 sites, including the two on Lackland. And before I too over the program I interviewed the radiation guys on Kelly and they showed me everywhere they had radioactive material stored, used, waste, any shops, waste, every place that they thought they had this – that is where this 1530 came up. Do you know that this is just a rumor? And that is to the extent that we are going. That is just a rumor in 1530 that nuclear weapons were supposedly stored there. That is the only information we have. But we are still going to go in there and do a survey.

Mr. Glenn Wilkinson: All the people you say you have talked to – I want a name and social security number on those people.

Dr. Patti Smith: OK, folks, if we can kind of pull this together, we have another presentation to get through.

Mr. Robert Silvas: The buildings on top of older buildings that were radioactive, that seems to be, because, could there maybe be other buildings like that?

Mr. Jack Shipman: Well, I'm not going to say that there are not. There may be other buildings like this. But we have done extensive searches, in fact, if you look at the dates of old aerial photos of Real Property records. We have done the best we can and we have talked to a lot of people about this.

Mr. Robert Silvas: Alright, thank you.

Mr. Glenn Wilkinson: Do you have aerial photographs from 1968 to 1980 of East Kelly?

Mr. Jack Shipman: I thin so.

Dr. Patti Smith: If you would like that information, you can fill one of these out for me and we can move on to the next presentation. Thank you so much, I appreciate that. We have to move on to our next presentation. Thank you for all of your questions, and it is time for us to move on.

Mr. Mark Stough: My name is Mark Stough and I am a technical project manager at the Air Force Real Property Agency. I am here to give you a presentation tonight, and basically tonight's presentation is to focus on giving you an overview of the January 2005 Semi-Annual Report, and talk to you about the types of data that we collected, to look at an evaluation of the data, and summarize the results. The scope of this project is to fulfill the monitoring and recording requirements that are clearly spelled out in the compliance plan that was issued to the Air Force and by the Texas omission for Environmental Quality. With the execution of this project we are able to get a snap shot if you will, a picture of the condition of the shallow ground water in to and around Kelly AFB and also Leon Creek. We use the data that we collect form this project and give this to out remedial system manager who uses the data to optimize our remedial systems. I did want to point out that the last bullet; this is a very comprehensive report. There is over 110,000 pieces of data on the comprehensive report. Wanted to mention what the report does not address, again, it is the focus on monitoring and recording section of the compliance plan, not the corrective action, such as determining types of remediation. There are different sorts of remediation that cover our monitoring. This is to give you a slide here that gives you an idea and to summarize how the report is broken down in four binders. Each bullet represents a binder, the first binder ha three parts. Part one introduction is a good overview of the Semi-Annual Report. Part II is Leon Creek and everything we have done to monitor Leon Creek and evaluating the data is found in part II. Part III deals with the four RCRA units that we have and we will talk about that a little later. And Part IV is the more comprehensive monitoring that we done on an annual basis. We do this after we monitor a number of wells. The last two binders are primarily appendences. The last one being all of the plume maps that we have drawn. I do want to point out that there is about 30 more pages of summary and conclusions in this report, hopefully this will be easy to read though. Let's talk about compliance monitoring and groundwater monitoring that we conduct. These are broken down into three categories; we monitor fourteen waste management areas identified specifically in the compliance plan. These are areas that contain IRP site or more than one IRP site. We have four RCRA permit units that we monitor the shallow ground water and areas around the base and the Leon Creek area. This slide is difficult to read, hopefully your hand out is a little clearer. It points to the waste management area and where it is spread out over the base. And this slide here shows the four, as I mentioned, four RCRA units and three units that are located in Zone 2, and the one on ---. As I mentioned earlier it is a very comprehensive project. It involves a massive amount of data collection and I am going to be showing in this slide here the types of information and data we gather, through the execution of this project. Again I mentioned the RCRA units, we sample those wells twice a year, in January and July. The wells that we sample and the time, all of the information is spelled out specifically in this compliance plan. We get water level information measurements from the shallow ground water to help us determine the ground water flow direction. As mentioned the annual comprehensive base-wide sample,

and in July we will do another round sampling of the RCRA wells and Leon Creek. And we are actually required to do an annual biological sampling of Leon Creek and that will be done in July. In blue you will see the things contained in the January Report, January 2005. As I mentioned the annual comprehensive sampling of shallow ground water in and around the Kelly AFB in the early summer time frame is about 450 wells. We send the samples to certified laboratories for analyzing required in the compliance plan and in the next slide it will spell out what we analyze for. We are not really required to do all of the VOCs and we are required to do about 27 of the 39. And yes, VOC we do about 32 of the 64, about half of them. Also metals, cyanides, pesticides and PCE testing is done as well. The primary tool is used to evaluate the progress in our program in terms of the shallow plume maps. There are a number of plume maps. We added a new graphic to the report. This was a request the last time I was here that we show the progress that we have made. So we plotted PCE, TCE, vinyl chloride in the shallow plume, in the shallow ground water contours in 1998, 2000, 2002 and 2004. This gives you a picture of the progression. The most notable improvements are ES, Zone 4 off-base as you can see on the map. This one slide here shows the PCE contour lines were drawn in blue in 2000, and then fades down to this aqua color is 2004. So you cab see how the plumes are shrinking, This is TCE and as you suspect for the most part follows the same general trend. You can see in 2000 where it extends, then you can see 2004 so you see the plume shrinking. Semi-Annual sampling, these are the four RCRA units that we have. This is an overview of the four units, three of them gain are in Zone 2 associated with the old industrial waste water treatment plant, and these were closed, and the structures have been removed. Site SE-2 and SE-1 have been closed. We've me all of the remediation standards there, risk reduction standards (SA2?) is still pending approval on the ecological assessment that's ongoing, these two sites are essentially close. The only site in Zone 2 that we have a remediation system in place is for E-3, for groundwater remediation. The site in Zone 3 is S-8 is where we had the former underground tanks and we have a system in place there. Just to kind of give you an idea, or to show some of the sampling results of E3. As you see here on the graph there are several chemical constituents in the groundwater that exceed the protection standard, ground water protection standard GWPS, that is the gold color. So you can see that we have some parameters that are exceeding the groundwater protection standard. That is the purpose of the monitoring, to find out how we are processing in the cleanup and if we have met the standard or have not met the standard. Obviously at E3 we haven't, so we continue to have system operations. We have shown drastic reductions in the plume over time, so we're headed in the right direction, but we're not there so. Again similar to Es, this shows S-8, there are the chemical and constituents; there we show we're still above the ground water protection standard. I do want to point out for S-8 you'll notice PCE and TCE and vinyl chloride those are wells that are up gradient of S-8 and are catching the 300 area plume that's coming down. So that is really not indicative of site S-8, it's just that they happen to be in the wells in association with S-8 monitoring network. Again here in S-8 we see drastic reduction in the size of the plume. So we are headed in the right direction, but we're not at the ground water protection standard that's why we monitor as we do. I just wanted to show that site of E-3 shows a couple of wells. The top there we're above the standard , but we're stable. This well again is within the capture of the system. We can expect the concentration sitting there because they're

within the capture system. We also moved outside the system and we had a well there showing steady decline. We are headed in the right direction. Similar with S-8 and that's a good sign. Wanted to show a couple of wells, one we're not there yet, but we do see it stabilize. Also about Leon Creek, generally when you asses a water body, such as a creek, you look at three things, you look at the physical aspect of the stream, you look at the chemical, and you look at the biological. This is what we do as Leon Creek monitoring. During July in the summer time we went out and conducted flow measurements at four segments, we measured flow from outfalls. We measured surface water elevation and what is called a hydrologic budget. All that is it shows water in and water out. Which indicates what segments in the stream may be gaining water, from the shallow groundwater. We can see what segments maybe loosing water and contributing to the shallow groundwater. The biologist who does the work takes photos and documents the appearance of the stream so we have all of that in our assessment of the stream. The results of these are what we would expect from an urban stream such as Leon Creek. It is a small stream, it is very shallow, slow moving, not far above Highway 90, where the creek is intermittent, so it does not have water in it year round, so it is a low flowing stream. The lack of riparian and tree cover around the stream allows, it is a stressor on the stream, in the summer time I allows the water temperature to elevate. Deficiencies in the amount of oxygen, we know what that does to biological communities. This is highly susceptible to flash flooding as you know, and I believe the drainage area id about 200 square miles. So it's susceptible to other forms of urban run off. Moving on to the chemical assessment of the stream, during July we went out and collected surface water samples from 31 stations and collected sediment samples. Again, following the compliance plan, we analyzed what is required by the VOCs. When we look at the chemistry lab results, we noted that there are only two surface wall parameters that exceeded the Texas Water Quality Standard guidelines. (Chloroform?) we expect in an urban stream and vinyl chloride, I believe there were five stations and I believe these were located adjacent to the golf course. And the standard for vinyl chloride is 2 micrograms per liter, and I believe three of those stations were just a little over 2. One of those stations was 5. So we are very close to the standards. I want to point out that the water quality standards are not like the groundwater standard, you have to take action if you exceed these indicators. So if you do exceed these you have to do you have to do a risk assessment to see if there's any risk to the biological community and human health. We are in the process of doing these biological risk assessments. There were 18 chemicals in the sediment that exceed the criteria, and for your information that is what they are. You will notice the bar to the left is very light. If it does not show I apologize, it is because of the slide. The bars right here show an upstream. And you will note a number of perimeters were found upstream of the base. We are above the standard here. You can see on this that some of the constituents are adjacent to the base as well. The (florathynes?), the (10 and three pyrenes?), those are PAHs. You typically find those in exhaust emissions and stuff like asphalt, and pesticides and PCB chemicals we found were because of their prevalent use in the 1970s. That was the chemical results, and we also have done some biological testing. We go out to the spring, as you can see there, and we collect fish, and we use the fish to do fish tissue testing. We are also using them in the rapid bioassessment, and we use them in a (cronic-toxicity?) test. Essentially what they do there, and I am not a chemist or biologist, but I understand that they take creek

water from the station and take it back to the lab and they put controlled specimens in there and measure survival, growth and reproduction, that could be a minnow or water flea. That is what the (chronic toxicity?) is. The results of those tests you will find that on the (chronic toxicity?), it shows the potential surface water and sediment toxicity of some of the stations. We have that down through the years; we have been monitoring Leon Creek since the late 1980s. You see it up gradient of the base, so we believe that it may be something you find in an urban stream. We are again doing a biological risk assessment that is ongoing. The preliminary results indicate that the majority of the toxicity is due to habitat imitations and not necessarily in the chemicals. As mentioned earlier, the stream is low flow. It heats up in the summer time, the low oxygen stresses biological communities, and that is what the preliminary shows. Again, we are in the process of working out the details of that. Next is the bio assessment. Essentially the biologist looks at the combination of the stream characteristics, the ripples, runs and pools, and critters that live in the sediment. How many there were, what their species were. At the station when they collect the fish and numerate the species they count out how many fish of one species they collect, like large mouth bass, and based on that they are able to determine, if, by certain scoring procedures, the stream is meeting its use designation. We also do three reference stations of stream; we use Salado Creek, Medio Creek and the Medina River. We did not get to so the Medina River this time because when the biologist was out sampling it was in the flood stage. And they can't get to the water to so that for safety reasons, so we weren't able to do Medina River. But the Medio station meets its aquatic life use-designation. We would like to point out that his is intermediate, which is easier to meet than high. For some reason Leon Creek and Salado are required to meet a high aquatic life use. I am not sure why, it is a designation assigned by the state. Those streams will never, most likely ever, meet that use. The urban streams are just the nature of the stream, will not allow them to meet, because of the urban influence around them. That high aquatic life. If Leon was an intermediate, it would meet the use of the lower designation. We found PCBs in the fish tissue samples, and are actual whole body samples, they weren't filet samples, but the PCBs were below what the FDA requires. Next chart shows the fish tissue results. You will notice we have PCBs in the reference stations at Salado Creek, which again is not telling us anything new. We can find PCBs in pesticides and in water bodies just as a result of the widespread use in the 60s and 70s. I don't really know what to say about the (---DEA). I am not going to attempt to pronounce it. It is there if you want to know what it is. That is a – we had the lab report checked and made sure that it is not a laboratory error. We have not seen that before. It is an additive in gasoline and lubricants. It is suppose to have a low bio concentration factor so you're not suppose to see it in fish, so I am not really sure why it is there, but it is there so we reported it. If you look at the trickle analysis of Leon Creek over the years and it had remained constant. Again, we need to reiterate the fact that we are taking a look at the ecological communities affiliated with the creek. We are working to do that. And the preliminary dry findings are showing a low risk for ecological receptors in the creek.

Mr. Rodrigo Garcia: Before we get into questions, at the last Semi-Annual compliance report briefing, I brought it up because it was a very sketchy report, very poorly done, and a lot of RAB members that don't know what a risk assessment it, and all of that.

They weren't trained about that in the orientation, and you covered this. We are not scientists. You covered all of this like a scientist. Who did this? CH2MHill?

Mr. Mark Stough: Yes.

Mr. Rodrigo Garcia: And why aren't they here with the scientists to answer scientific questions?

Mr. Mark Stough: A decision was made at the Air Force Real Property Agency for me to do the presentation.

Mr. Rodrigo Garcia: That is wrong. I want to set up a meeting with Mr. Ryan and Mr. Antwine when he comes back. Because this baloney with the Semi-Annual Compliance Report has to stop. It has to be done properly and in great detail. I wrote a criticism on this thing and I asked for executive summaries and reports to be written in layman's terms so all these new RAB members can understand the main meaning of this, and it has not been done. I asked that they get the scientists to put this in layman's terms so that all the people can understand it. We don't have time to sit here and read four volumes. If you want me to I will read four volumes and give you 400-600 questions on all of this. But it should have been done. We evaluated this and evaluated, but what happened? You did not tell us what happened.

Mr. Mark Stough: Yes I did.

Mr. Rodrigo Garcia: No, a lot of those were not answered. You just said you evaluated this well and that well. But it was very poorly done. It has to stop. I am tired of this going like this. It has to stop. We have to have a better job done by the people who write the reports. Executive Summaries and report summaries need to be given to the people so they understand all this. These are the most important reports twice a year. Something has to be done so that we get better reports and not just a brief slide presentation. I am tired and I am going to put a stop to it. So a better job has to be done. We will make sure that gets dome then.

Ms. Norma Landez: Mr. Garcia, I know that the report is a four volume report, it is a big report, but in the introduction of this report there is actually an overview of what the report does, and also what –

Mr. Rodrigo Garcia: How many pages?

Ms. Norma Landez: And also what the conclusion of the finding summaries are. I think if you look at it you will see.

Mr. Mark Stough: There are a total of 31 pages of summary in the report.

Mr. Rodrigo Garcia: Why didn't you give us the 31 pages that would have been a start so we could understand all of this? All of the new board members do not understand all of these.

Mr. Armando Quintanilla: Do you have 28 reports or 25 reports for the 25 RAB members?

Ms. Sonja Coderre: We have made copies for you on CD and of the Semi-Annual Compliance Plan so that you can have these.

Mr. Armando Quintanilla: I don't have a computer.

Ms. Sonja Coderre: OK, the copy of the Compliance Plan is also placed in the Information Repository. We'll also ensure Mr. Silvas, the co-chair, gets a copy to place here in the co-chair library. Understand that a lot of the documents that we cover are highly technical and it might be an opportunity that the RAB wants to explore next month for a Technical Assistance for Public Participation on the Compliance Plan.

Mr. Rodrigo Garcia: That is what we pay consultants to do. And then we get all of these reports like this. He can summarize the reports. I worked for a professional architect and I have to work with design analysis. I write the most technical reports there is. Sometimes 40-50 pages long. Then I write the report is a 6, 7, 8 page summary and I write it so that common parents in the Harlingen School District will understand how the school is going to be designed. It is not hiring someone else and spending more money. It is writing in the contract that CH2MHill is going to do that by the scientists and to turn around and convey their message and learn to deal with RAB members and satisfy the needs of the community. That is very important too, what they are suppose to do and they are not doing this.

Mr. Robert Silvas: A lot of the problem is that we need o identify this as a TAPP.

Mr. Rodrigo Garcia: No, this is a contractor problem and a staff problem. It is someone does not know how to write the guidelines to do this report. They have an obligation to do the report scientifically yes, but they also have an obligation to the Kelly and to the surrounding community to present their reports to the community as well as to the AFRPA. There's no excuse, it is a lack of professionalism and a lack of AFRPA writing the guidelines.

Mr. Robert Silvas: When we get the new rules it will be fine, but in the meantime, just to catch them, we need to get someone to come in and do exactly what you are asking for. Because they are going to continue to do what you don't want them to do.

Mr. Rodrigo Garcia: Well, we'll find a way to stop them or we need to find someone to write guidelines, either a congressman or a senator or combination. But they have to be taught how to communicate with the community and how to do their job. Because as a professional, you got to communicate with the people who hire you.

Dr. Patti Smith: I appreciate your comments:

Ms. Coriene Hannapel: What about the PRB, I did not heat anything about the PRB?

Mr. Mark Stough: This report is not focused on the PRBs. It is an overview of the plumes; there will be, as that information becomes available, briefed at a TRS meeting.

Ms. Coriene Hannapel: Well, I certainly feel that this should be included. When you're talking about the plumes, when you're measuring the plumes, are you measuring the same wells each year?

Mr. Mark Stough: Yes, well the best that we can. If we go to a well and the well is dry one year, and it has water in it the next year, then we go back and see how it is the following year and take samples if possible. We keep records of what wells we sample and which are dry.

Ms. Coriene Hannapel: Is that included in that report?

Mr. Mark Stough: There is data in there that will tell you which wells were sampled and if they were dry or not.

Ms. Nancy Garcia: I have a question; can you expand on the new substance that you found? (The DEH?)

Mr. Mark Stough: I will have to take that as an action item because to be honest with you, I am not that familiar with that. It is puzzling to us.

Unknown Speaker: We need to know what that is.

Ms. Nancy Garcia: Did you say it was an additive?

Mr. Mark Stough: Yes, it seems to be maybe some additives of gasoline. I am not really sure we cannot really explain it. It is a weird substance, not really sure what it is, can't really explain it.

Ms. Nancy Garcia: Do you know when this came about?

Mr. Mark Stough: Sometime in July sampling. This has this in the report. The fish species that were sampled and collected in each station and what the concentrations were in each one of them. So all that information is there.

Mr. Nazarite Perez: Are you talking about the combination of gas and slush or grease or grease?

Mr. Mark Stough: I missed that.

Mr. Armando Quintanilla: It's in gasoline, it's (ethlye?). It is lead.

Ms. Nancy Garcia: The last question, you will be doing further investigation on this new substance?

Mr. Mark Stough: Well, we will continue to monitor it because it's not a constituent that we have under any of our sites. As far as investigating where it came from, we won't do that, but we'll continue to monitor it.

Ms. Nancy Garcia: Just monitor?

Mr. Mark Stough: Yes.

Ms. Coriene Hannapel: Is this the same people that was in the report last time?

Mr. Mark Stough: Yes, the same contractor.

Ms. Coriene Hannapel: They did a long report and a lot of this is the same information from one to the next. So basically it is a copy and paste operation. OK, I'm sure nobody's rewriting that. Is this something that we need to research? Are they charging full price each time?

Mr. Mark Stough: Yes. It is not a copy and paste.

Ms. Coriene Hannapel: It certainly looks like it; I have seen several of them and compared them.

Mr. Mark Stough: The format of it is the same. But they discuss the actual results because they are different.

Ms. Corienne Hannapel: Of course the results are different, but there's a lot of lead up.

Mr. Mark Stough: There's some information that's repetitive.

Ms. Coriene Hannapel: I would like to know the answer to that, OK?

Ms. Esmeralda Galvan: I have a question; you said you were doing the annual (WMA?) sampling, you said that they are required to test all of the chemicals. Yet, this new substance came up. Why all of the sudden do you have a concern over this chemical if it's not required that you report it?

Mr. Mark Stough: Well, because we reported it, we tested for it.

Ms. Esmeralda Galvan: So you are not required to test it, but yet you reported it?

Mr. Mark Stough: It is not a specific constituent that we are required to monitor in the compliance report. But it was noted from the laboratory.

Ms. Esmeralda Galvan: So if other chemicals are present, you don't know what they are because you are testing specifically for certain chemicals that might be there?

Mr. Mark Stough: We are testing for the suite of VOCs that are called for in the Compliance Plan. The semi-volatiles, the metals.

Ms. Esmeralda Galvan: OK, you are not answering my question. I said "if you are testing for specific chemicals, that means that there maybe other chemicals, and there probably is, that we are not aware of the community, the public, are not aware of, at that time, and that will not be cleaned up?

Unknown Speaker: It could be.

Ms. Norma Landez: I would like to clarify that. What we are required to sample for is in the compliance plan. Those tables were derived from an initial investigation that we did for all of the sites. So the state decided to have us monitor these. If there is a chemical that has come up in our investigation that would be included. If it didn't come up or it was nondetect for a period of time in our investigating, then it would be excluded because the assumption is that it is not contributed to the contamination from the sites we have on base, because it may be on the sites that we have going here.

Ms. Esmeralda Galvan: OK, last question then. How did you determine that the plume is shrinking? Answer me in layman's terms. Don't give me none of this, just simple terms.

Mr. Mark Stough: All you have to do is look at the pictures. All you have to do is look at the maps.

Ms. Esmeralda Galvan: No, no, no, that is not explaining to me how you are cleaning this up and how it is shrinking. I know you are cleaning it up, how if it shrinking. Is it, what is it?

Mr. Mark Stough: If you look at the mass concentration on the maps, one year the constituent to the ground water is out here, but then next year they receded back, they're non detect out here. Look at this well. Non detect back here so we know that the plume is coming…

Mr. Armando Quintanilla: Not the plumes, just the constituents. So then the contamination is shrinking, but the water remains the same.

Mr. Mark Stough: No, no.

Mr. Armando Quintanilla: So you mean the water is coming down –

Mr. Mark Stough: No, the constituents in the groundwater are one year at a certain concentration, whether they have naturally attenuated, we go back the next year and test and they are non detects, so they are not there.

Ms. Coriene Hannapel: Only where you tested before. Where are you monitoring the area?

Mr. Mark Stough: Right, but there are 460 wells all over the base.

Ms. Coriene Hannapel: I have asked the question before. If they are not the same wells, we don't know…

Mr. Mark Stough: They are the same wells. We cannot collect water from a dry well. If the aquifer does not have water in the well, then we can't sample it.

Dr. Patti Smith: OK, perhaps this is an answer to that question. The question was, 'what percentage of the wells do you resample?' The answer is 95%.

Mr. Armando Quintanilla: 95% of the 460 wells?

Mr. Mark Stough: Yes, every year. They are repeated every year. We have to stay within a consistent network in order to evaluate the plumes. If we change the network every year then we could not evaluate this. These are all the dots, all the wells that we sampled. Maybe last year this one was out here or further out, but you notice it had some concentration that went away, and the actual attenuation, or whatever, so the plume is getting smaller in size.

Ms. Coriene Hannapel: This is a different answer that we got the last time from ---. That is a very different answer. If that is the correct answer then that is great. But this is not what the other man said. I questioned him afterwards, and during the meeting, and it is not what he said.

Mr. Mark Stough: Yes, that is right.

Dr. Patti Smith: Everyone feel comfortable with this, with the 95%?

Ms. Coriene Hannapel: Well, I'm comfortable with the truth.

Ms. Esmeralda Galvan: Well, which one is telling the truth? We are getting different aswers.

Ms. Coriene Hannapel: Another thing is that I am also told that the Air Force does not give out raw data. Which you have a brochure that says you give out raw data. When I submitted my questions, I was told that the Air Force does not. So which is it?

Ms. Sonja Coderre: We've talked about that and we'll get together again.

Dr. Patti Smith: One more question because we are really tight on time, we're going to have to pull this together.

Mr. Glenn Wilkinson: I'm from Corpus Christi, we're now restricted from fishing in the bay and in the ocean. We are told not to eat fish over 30 inches long, not to eat any fish more than three times a week. The water commission ain't telling us what to do because the general services built some buildings at Texas A&M, so they are not going to tell general services. Leon Creek I believe runs into Medina and San Antonio, and runs into San Antonio Bay and in the intercostal canal, and in between Mission Texas and San Antonio Bay, and into Corpus Christi, we can't eat our fish. You've ruined our shellfish and our fish.

Dr. Patti Smith: I'm not sure we can really address that right now.

Mr. Glenn Wilkinson: Now it is the same chemicals that you are picking up at Leon Creek, which you do not include dioxin test, because there is maps and pictures of dioxin all over this base all over this Kelly Air Force Base Operation Ranchhand, you do not do dioxin tests, and you are not going to do dioxin tests, because you say there is never the source when dioxins were produced, yet there is. Now, I have a letter from 1990 saying that we will do no more dioxin tests on fish in the state of Texas because there is no source. OK, Elmendorf Lake a yellow cat was pulled out and was 8.2 parts per million, billion contaminated with dioxins. I am not sure if Elmendorf Lake is piped with Leon Creek or Medina or San Antonio River, but somewhere or another all those fish down in the coast are getting poisoned and you are not doing a damn anything about it. It's coming from ya'll. You are killing our fish and our economy, and then we are going to come kill your economy. We are going to close your Fiesta down and Rodeo down and kill your economy.

Dr. Patti Smith: Thank you for your comment.

Mr. Glenn Wilkinson: OK, answer my question, are they doing dioxin testing?

Mr. Mark Stough: No.

Mr. Glenn Wilkinson: Why not?

Mr. Mark Stough: We are not required to.

Mr. Glenn Wilkinson: OK, that is just great.

Mr. Armando Quintanilla: How many pages are in these 110,000?

Mr. Mark Stough: You are suppose to ask an easy question—Yeah, I am sorry I don't know that.

Mr. Armando Quintanilla: What was the cost of that report?

Dr. Patti Smith: That's one we may have to revisit as an action item.

Mr. Mark Stough: Yes, because it involves all the field data.

Mr. Armando Quintanilla: What was the cost again?

Dr. Patti Smith: We don't have an exact cost but the question was 'Is this different than the last report.' We'll keep that one there because it seems repetitive.

Mr. Armando Quintanilla: That is the reason I am asking. The last report we received cost $355,000 and I thought it was done by SAIC and this is being done by CH2MHill?

Mr. Mark Stough: CH2MHill.

Mr. Rodrigo Garcia: One last question…

Mr. Armando Quintanilla: OK, let me finish please.

Mr. Rodrigo Garcia: Oh, I am sorry, I thought you were done.

Mr. Armando Quintanilla: CH2MHill are the ones that did the report, same as the one before?

Mr. Mark Stough: Yes.

Mr. Armando Quintanilla: How many of the 466 monitoring wells are off base?

Mr. Mark Stough: I'm going to venture between 100-150.

Mr. Armando Quintanilla: OK, the off base site is about 10-12 square miles. How much is the on base square miles?

Mr. Mark Stough: Well, the base, I believe, is about 4500 acres.

Mr. Armando Quintanilla: So, how many squared miles does that amount to?

Dr. Patti Smith: One square mile.

Mr. Armando Quintanilla: So what is the difference?

Mr. Sam Murrah: One half a square mile.

Dr. Patti Smith: One half square mile.

Mr. Armando Quintanilla: So what is the difference in the amount of wells?

Mr. Mark Stough: Probably on base we run more evaluation in the source areas. And off base again as we find the delineation of the plumes perimeter, we don't have to go further out.

Mr. Armando Quintanilla: OK. Site S-8. How id that site going to be restored or remediated? Is it pump and treat? PRBs?

Mr. Don Buelter: Well, we have a couple of pump and treat wells, and also bioventing. We are pumping air into the ground that is also treating the soil and the groundwater.

Mr. Armando Quintanilla: Now I am going back to the other question about the reduction in the things – when you say reductions of the plumes, it is reductions of the contaminants in there, and the amount of the PCB found in Leon Creek in the fishing area, how many parts per billion were found? Were any PCBs found in the water?

Mr. Mark Stough: Um, well. Let me see, there were no PCB found in the water, just in the sediment.

Mr. Armando Quintanilla: How does the PCB get into the sediment?

Mr. Mark Stough: PCBs are very persistent, they don't go away, they don't degrade. So as we have run off they collect in the bottom of the stream.

Mr. Armando Quintanilla: Is it possible that it could have come from the golf course where they were burying that stuff in the golf course?

Mr. Mark Stough: We have not been able to find any kind of channel that would give it a pathway to the creek.

Mr. Armando Quintanilla: But you did find PCBs in the golf course.

Mr. Mark Stough: Yes. And that is Lackland that is cleaning that.

Mr. Armando Quintanilla: I knoe. So you did find some PCBs in the golf course. But you have not found a channel from the golf course to the creek?

Mr. Mark Stough: No.

Mr. Armando Quintanilla: I have no other questions.

Mr. Rodrigo Garcia: OK, I have a comment. If you go back to the last Compliance Report, I wrote four or five letter, some very lengthy, complaining about all of this. And I explained to the AFRPA what I wanted and the way the report should be presented.

None of my concerns were ever addressed, and my letters have had no action taken on them, complaining on the poor presentation of the last report. My letters were not even addressed. Can you go back and dig up those letters and find what I want to be done for the community and layman to understand. All of that was written and submitted in a complaint that was never addressed and should be addressed.

Dr. Patti Smith: Thank you, one more question.

Ms. Coriene Hannapel: In the other report it indicated that perhaps there was connection between the golf course and the PCB and chlorinated solvents in that particular area. Was there any attempt to go back and kind of look at that report?

Mr. Mark Stough: We did not need to go back.

Ms. Corienne Hannapel: Why not?

Mr. Mark Stough: Well, TDH did that work and when we had some questions about it and the types of fish that they analyzed were predominantly not the kind of fish you would sample for testing of PCB. So there were questions that we had in their study.

Ms. Coriene Hannapel: Were these questions addressed in this report?

Mr. Mark Stough: Well, we reported what we found in the fish. That information is in there.

Ms. Coriene Hannapel: OK, I would like to know why this report was not looked at. The TDH report was brought up several times. Why not go back and address those questions?

Ms. Norma Landez: Well, you have to understand that the requirements for this report are all noted in the Compliance Plan. That is what we report and that is what we said early on in the slides. It is in your packet that this report will not give you documentation on air sampling, or specific information of what we are doing. What we are doing is monitoring the requirements in the Compliance Plan. So what we are doing is sampling many spots, but it does not tell us to go back. Now an investigation is going to be done to look at TDH's report to address those answers or questions in the report. Whether we are going back to sites, that would be to the Zone 1 site, and that would be the Lackland Air Force Base side, so you have to ask them for information.

Ms. Coriene Hannapel: But it is still an Air Force site and it is affecting the people in this area. I would like to know how that is going to be addressed.

Ms. Norma Landez: I am not going to say that it is not, but it is not addressed in this report. What we do in this report is provide monitoring results addressed in the Compliance Plan.

Ms. Corine Hannapel: OK, I understand that, but how then is this going to be addressed if we still have it?

Ms. Abbi Power: Lackland Air Force Base is responsible for the portion of former Kelly Air Force Base, which encompasses the Leon Creek where the fishing advisory has occurred. They have requested assistance from the San Antonio Metro Health District and from the San Antonio River Authority and Bexar Met. The agencies have gotten together, we are looking at PCB issues associated with all the urban streams in the greater San Antonio area. If you would like additional information, the Lackland Community Council on restoration, their RAB, they meet on a quarterly basis. They said she was going to try to provide information of the schedule of when they meet. They said she was going to try to. They have requested that San Antonio River Authority come in on a yearly basis and update them on what their study is doing for PCBs and fish infested found in the greater San Antonio area. This includes Leon Creek where the fishing advisory has been issued. So if you want additional info on that, these people have been requested to do it and Lackland has picked up this charge and this is what Lackland has determined they will be responsible for.

Dr. Patti Smith: Do you have a question?

Ms. Henrietta LaGrange: Yes, I was going to ask – on the information that we have, who is sharing this with Lackland. Or so they have to reinvent the wheel?

Ms. Norma Landez: No, Lackland and AFRPA are coming together in this project and are doing all of the monitoring, not just fro the former Kelly Air Force Base, but also the area realigned to Lackland Air Force Base.

Ms. Coriene Hannapel: It kind of sounds, your answers, like "well that's not my job and I don't know about that"

Ms. Norma Landez: I did not say that.

Ms. Coriene Hannapel: Well no, but that is my perception, perhaps I am wrong.

Ms. Abbi Power: Well, Lackland has chosen to take this responsibility. Someone has stepped up to the plate and said we will do this work.

Ms. Corine Hannapel: I understand that, but I still think they need to have that information here.

Ms. Abbi Power: They have offered, I believe, about one year ago they came and did a very detailed presentation on what they have done to date, and invited people to please come to their meeting because they are presenting all this information, and they have invited you to come. You may go their RAB, they call it CCR, and view that information.

Dr. Patti Smith: In the effort of time, we are running really late here.

Mr. Robert Silvas: We have another question.

Dr. Patti Smith: OK, I am sorry, I didn't see your hand up.

Mr. Robert Silvas: OK, first I want to make an action item to address Rodrigo's concerns and find out the future plans on any more presentations of these contractors that these written and forwarded through AFRPA. Are they going to continue to be here to respond to questions – the contractors CH2MHill that are responsible for that should have been here tonight. In the future will they be here?

Mr. Rodrigo Garcia: And what is the responsibility of them of writing executive and complete summaries to hand out to RAB members and the community to explain the four volumes or six volumes of work, in community terms so that we can understand the summation of their work? That is not a question.

Ms. Henrietta LaGrange: That is not a question, it is a demand.

Ms. Norma Landez: OK, I would like to respond to that. This is an AFRPA report and it was done because the state has given us requirements to comply to the compliance plan, which is reported twice a year. It is our report, all of the reports that are done by out consultants are our reports, done with our money.

Mr. Armando Quintanilla: But it is our tax money, not your money. Not AFRPA's, come on.

Ms. Norma Landez: What I am saying Mr. Quintanilla, is that these reports are Air Force reports. They are not—

Mr. Armando Quintanilla: They are the people's reports.

Ms. Norma Landez: They are reports that are done by the Air Force for you.

Mr. Armando Quintanilla: Exactly, good.

Ms. Norma Landez: They are done by contractors. Those are our reports to report to you. I am an Air Force representative, Mark and I are providing you—

Ms. Henrietta LaGrange: You are not providing us with—

Ms. Norma Landez: We are providing the information in the report to you, just as we provided it to the BCT this afternoon. This is what we are doing.

Mr. Rodrigo Garcia: No, we pay a lot of money for these reports. You need to write the owner requirements, as the person who hired these contractors, you write the owner

requirements and tell the consultant that this report is going to the community, here is the outline of how we want you to write it and a summary that we can submit to the community, as well as write the complete scientific report. The owner writes the reports for the community report.

Dr. Patti Smith: Can I ask you, basically what you are saying is that you are requesting that the reports that go to the Air Force be written –

Mr. Rodrigo Garcia: The Air Force should write the requirements for the consultants.

Dr. Patti Smith: OK, but the action item coming out of this is, the report should be written so that the document is easily understood by the RAB and community members.

Mr. Rodrigo Garcia: Yes. For what they're being paid, the Air Force should say, look you're getting paid a lot of money. I think that the Air Force should tell them the requirements and submit the community guidelines as well.

Dr. Patti Smith: And I think we'll try to address that. Let me see if I got this correctly, in the future the contractors should write the reports in an understandable manner and give the RAB a briefing.

Mr. Rodrigo Garcia: Yes.

Ms. Nancy Garcia: I thin as an advisory board that there has to be a different type of dialogue, because I think these meetings keep occurring like this. We are not going to get nowhere, especially us as a community, with different prospectives from you all. We need to create dialogue and need to communicate better. We have to do these reports to be compliant, then fine that is what we have to do. But we need to think about and create some type of different dialogue between the community workers, we come from illnesses, diseases. Where we come from we don't have health care. We are living out of pocket. We need to create a dialogue with you where we understand, just like some ladies were asking " how are the plumes reducing themselves." They want to know what kind of measurements are you taking and how are they being utilized to reduce the plumes. And why besides natural attenuation. These meetings cannot keep occurring this way. We have to communicate, and it is not being done.

Dr. Patti Smith: Put that action item up there.

Ms. Nancy Garcia: Please do. We have to follow these illnesses, we have to move forward, we have to come to a solution for these people, for my family, for my barrio, for my familia, for my raza. Step into my shoes. It does not require brains. We have the same capacity as you, but we are asking you to please create some type of dialogue.

Ms. Henrietta LaGrange: Yeah, I am just going to say a few words, and this is the message that I get. You don't think you are accountable to us. You don't think you are accountable to us. Sonja, you don't think you are accountable to us, Ms. Landez does not

think she is accountable to us, Mr. Shipman, you don't think you are accountable to us, and that is the problem. None of you think you are accountable to us, you don't owe us any information. Anything that we ask for you escape the question. You did not come here to give is the right answers. You laugh. You don't understand our problems. When we ask something, come here prepared to give us the right answers. If you are not going to give us answers, I know who will, and they don't live around here. You don't think you are accountable and you better understand that tonight, if you don't think you have to give us the right information, I know who will.

Mr. Robert Silvas: OK, to continue on these plumes that are coming out on East Kelly, in the past was identified by CH2MHill, the majority of the plumes are coming from Kelly. Can you state a little more on that the plumes are coming more from East Kelly than main Kelly?

Mr. Don Buelter: If you were to look at concentration from year to year, the major sources are in the area near site MP that we actually put in a slurry wall around and that's why the areas down gradient of the slurry wall and now we find non-detect in the groundwater. And the other two real major areas that we got up are building 360 and building 301, the source that was up here in East Kelly has concentrations that have decreased that use to be around 1000 parts per billion they're down to 35 and 22 with some source control up there.

Mr. Robert Silvas: Again, where are the majority of the plumes coming from, East Kelly or main Kelly?

Mr. Don Buelter: Um, this um point down here.

Mr. Glenn Wilkinson: He's scared. He don't know.

Mr. Robert Silvas: If you are not going to answer then—

Mr. Don Buelter: No, it is right here, from site MP. This plume here came from the old plating shop here on East Kelly. Where the college is. And there is some potential off-base, non-Air Force sources that are north of the base that also contributed.

Mr. Armando Quintanilla: Where did the TCE come from that is in the community? From what site?

Mr. Don Buelter: Probably the site that this leg of the plume came from.

Mr. Armando Quintanilla: Did it not come from the green worm?

Mr. Don Buelter: No, that is site S-8 and that's primarily (chlorobenzene?)

Mr. Armando Quintanilla: Wasn't that (Trichlorethelyne?) there?

Mr. Don Buelter: It's primarily (Chlorobenzene?)

Mr. Robert Silvas: Well, from here what I am looking at, it looks like the majority of the plumes come form East Kelly.

Mr. Don Buelter: If you go back, the reason you see the plume decreasing in size here is because it has made it's course out here. Site E-3, there's a three-phase—there's a slurry wall and the source has been cut off.

Mr. Glenn Wilkinson: Can I be recognized and make a comment?

Dr. Patti Smith: Yes sir.

Mr. Glenn Wilkinson: Texas Administrative Codes, back in 1996 and 1997, a lady went to the legislative, both the House and Senate drew up a bill, they passed the bill, the governor signed it, and it became law and it says that in the Texas Agriculture Dept, which I never see around here, who is suppose to regulate the soil? Anymore than that, that soil should be removed. Now the EPA and the water commission got together and said, oh we are going to set a standard at eight parts per billion. The whole state of Texas elected to be zero tolerance dioxins state, and they said no we don't have to listen to all the people in the sate of Texas. We make up our own laws. We can have eight parts per billion. Kelly is breaking the law. There's going to be law suits filed against ya'll.

Mr. Robert Silvas: I had a question regarding the extraction of chemicals. Are they currently extracting any type of bi products from any of the wells?

Mr. Mark Stough: Are you talking about constituents in the groundwater?

Mr. Robert Silvas: Yes.

Mr. Mark Stough: Yes they are.

Mr. Robert Silvas: What are they?

Mr. Mark Stough: Well, we have at E-3 a recovery system, (chlorobenzene), benzene at site S-8. We have extraction wells.

Mr. Don Buelter: There is a number of pump and treat systems. At the RAB in April we will go through these. Mr. Garcia asked for a project summary that will be going through the various cleanup systems we have.

Mr. Robert Silvas: Who is in charge of collecting and disposing of those chemicals.

Mr. Don Buelter: We have a ground water treatment plant where, pump and treat or our pumps extract groundwater, and it's taken down to the treatment plant. We have three different treatment plants where the water is discharged.

Mr. Robert Silvas: All right, the failure of the barriers that took place in the past, we had asked for a copy of that notice of violation, we still have not received it from Norma. Are those failures being taken into consideration?

Ms. Sonja Coderre: Is this about the fish?

Mr. Robert Silvas: Yes.

Ms. Sonja Coderre: Well we have not gotten the paperwork yet.

Ms. Norma Landez: And about the failure of the barrier that was during construction as they were digging out the trench to put in the iron. And they have ran in to a pipe that was in the ground that went out to Leon Creek. So the water that was put in there to keep the trench open went out that pipe, so it was not a failure of the PRB, it was an accident that occurred during the building of the PRB. Now we have not received the letter from TCEQ noted in the previous meeting. We will provide that information when it comes available.

Mr. Robert Silvas: One last question. I know you did a little bit of testing for mercury, it seemed that you should have done more testing. Was there a reason why there was very little testing?

Mr. Mark Stough: No, mercury is a required perimeter, and every time we collected groundwater samples, whether it was base wide or some other RCRA unit, we analyze for mercury.

Mr. Robert Silvas: On site E-3, the levels seem to be going down. Can you tell why that is happening? Is there some failure in the process for it to go all the way through.

Mr. Mark Stough: At site E-3 we have groundwater systems contained for pump and treat. We have slightly down gradient of the course material. We have an extraction system to remediate that storage material. It has taken longer than anticipated. But this is being contained within the old waste bin that is there.

Mr. Robert Silvas: What is being done to take the – out of the system there, what is being done to accommodate the build up?

Mr. Mark Stough: Well, the – extraction will take care of that and also the – breakdown of the bi products.

Mr. Robert Silvas: Well, it does not seem to be going down. Isn't that correct?

Mr. Mark Stough: It is very sporadic from year to year. We are looking at a system to optimize our – extraction and source reduction.

Mr. Robert Silvas: OK, I would like some more information on that, as to why that level is not going down. Am I correct in saying that the whole process is not going to completion? And the (BC?) is not there and this is a breakdown product. Right?

Mr. Mark Stough: Right.

Mr. Robert Silvas: So the whole process is not going to completion? I would like some more information on that. I would like to make one more comment. Looking around there are hardly any community members here, and the Southwest Workers Union never shows up. I was wondering about that. But now I see number one, no question is never really answered, and people have given up. Number two, everything pretty much stays in this room. No one outside of this room knows about these questions. We don't have our congress people knowing about this, the media does not know about this, they are all paying the bill. I think community members should be of interest here. That is what we are going to do.

Unidentified Speaker: We have one city counsel member here.

Ms. Sonja Coderre: Yes, Patti is the only one. Thank you David for being here.

Mr. Robert Silvas: I would like to give one last action item. I have done this before on paperwork submitted. It was pushed back to have this filled out. I thought maybe administrative help should help me to do that. I am going to request a second TAPP report for this review and I would like to put that down to see if you can assist in getting that paperwork initiated. If not then send it back to me again and I will do my best to have this done. By the regulations, all we need is three members of the –

Mr. Armando Quintanilla: I am signer number two then.

Ms. Sonja Coderre: I understand, can I finish. If you will start the process on talking to the community members to what it is exactly you are hoping to gain from it, then we are going to help with that, but the requirement is that the community, because this is a project that could fill your need, we need to communicate with each other what goals you are trying to get out of here so that then we can help you fill out the rest of the paperwork. There is some legwork that is supposed to be done so we can help you with this.

Mr. Armando Quintanilla: I have never seen those instructions, Can you provide these please.

Ms. Sonja Coderre: Yes, as a matter of fact, I have a copy here.

Mr. Armando Quintanilla: I will copy that now. I will be happy to work with you, chairman, on this.

Ms. Sonja Coderre: These were the materials that were handed out at the workshop. I would like to provide a copy of this to those who were not at that workshop and there is a section in there in the TAPP report, and that explains the process. And we briefly glanced over it at the workshop.

Mr. Armando Quintanilla: Will you put that as an action item for future TAPP on this presentation?

Ms. Sonja Coderre: Yes.

Mr. Armando Quintanilla: This letter was drawn in 1998, and I have been on the – since 1994, and I have never seen this.

Ms. Sonja Coderre: Never seen what?

Mr. Armando Quintanilla: The TAPP letter. For technical assistance.

Ms. Sonja Coderre: And in some of the discussions that we have had with you, Mr. Quintanillla, we realize that we have some –we need to get some information and make sure it was updated, to go back and look and some things and we all need to know what we are working on. That is why we held the workshop and why we put all of the documents in one place so that we have a common room to work on. I apologize that you did not receive this material sooner; we are trying very hard to catch up.

Mr. Armando Quintanilla: Suppose I make a motion that we use whatever TAPP money is available to give us an independent review of the CMS report that was presented today, in terms that the community can understand. Can I make this in the form of a motion and we vote on them?

Ms. Sonja Coderre: Are you referring to the semi-annual compliance plan?

Mr. Armando Quintanilla: Yes.

Ms. Sonja Coderre: Because there are two that came out.

Unidentified Speaker: PM stands for preventive measures.

Mr. Armando Quintanilla: OK, now the semi-annual compliance plan.

Mr. Robert Silvas: I would like these notices submitted to the RAB members, these are the PCB documents and the letter from the mental health.

Unidentified Speaker: I have a question.

Mr. Armando Quintanilla: No, no wait a minute. We are going to place a vote.

Mr. Robert Silvas: I make a vote.

Unidentified Speaker: I second that.

Mr. Armando Quintanilla: This will be the same as submitting the letter. We will reduce this time.

Mr. Robert Silvas: I will move that this be brought up to the Advisory Committee and the RAB.

Mr. Armando Quintanilla: No, it does not need to, if it never has in the past.

Ms. Sonja Coderre: I am sorry my understanding was that this –

Mr. Armando Quintanilla: It has been done in the past. We are the ones that are supposed to review all of the documents and make recommendations to the RAB. On the review. But we can't review all of the boxes of documents. And these documents that are big, like this Semi-annual compliance report, I think that we really need to submit the report this way.

Mr. Rodrigo Garcia: This is supposed to be a technical review. The items are of a technical nature. Your questions have helped us define the pieces of information that need to go forward to the restoration advisory board. The community makes motions and says you know what, thanks for doing this but you are still not speaking English, because of the highly scientific stuff. We would like to do this how. This is procedure because the subcommittee of the RAB, the RAB body in its entirety, and all of the folks that come to the RAB meeting, have an opportunity. And this is a subcommittee.

Mr. Armando Quintanilla: Well, time is of the essence, and if we wait until the next RAB to bring this up, we are losing a 30-day span.

Ms. Sonja Coderre: I understand that, it is your prerogative that three of the RAB members here today chose to make this motion, and you talk to your community members about the goals.

Mr. Armando Quintanilla: Well, we have three here, and if we identify ourselves, we will go ahead and address this.

Ms. Sonja Coderre: I understand that.

Mr. Armando Quintanilla: We have six.

Mr. Robert Silvas: OK, let's go ahead and process the packet.

Mr. Rodrigo Garcia: We would not have to do this if after the last compliance report, well I wrote to Mr. Antwine, and requested a report in layman's terms that the

community members of the RAB and the community can understand. I made that recommendation. So that when the next semi-annual compliance report came up, which is this one, that should have been done. These people are getting 300,000 dollars per report, that is enough money to have a layman's term report written. I brought that up at the last meeting, and I put it in writing, and you never acted on that.

Ms. Sonja Coderre: I understand.

Mr. Rodrigo Garcia: That is negligence on AFRPA, not on our part. Now we have to spend money to get someone to do this for us because you don't read the letters we submit or recommendations we make.

Ms. Sonja Coderre: Once again these reports are written to make the regulatory requirements that the Air Force has to respond to. This is precisely why the department of defense is established. Because sometimes the documents are technical and we have to get a third party view on these things. The report is highly technical in nature, now this group has determined that they want to use another alley. This is not about trying to argue. We are trying to help you use –

Mr. Armando Quintanilla: The process is that congress establishes for the purpose of making technical reports understandable to the community. Which is what we are doing here. If we have to go before the RAB and explain that we did not understand it, which is in April, another month from today, and then make a presentation, well we have lost a month already, and that is what we don't want to do.

Ms. Sonja Coderre: I understand that, but I need to make you aware of the condition – but if you noted you made the motion and did state that. All I want to do is to let you know of the subcommittee of the RAB, not the RAB itself.

Mr. Armando Quintanilla: I understand that well.

Ms. Sonja Coderre: Mr. Quintanilla, I am certainly not trying to –

Mr. Armando Quintanilla: Mr. Murrah and myself have been here since 1994, since this started and we understand it well.

Unidentified Speaker: Sonja, I have been to the City of San Antonio library and the records are not complete down there. There are two RAB reports, I had another that you did not have. They are not down in the San Antonio library. So does that mean that I can come to your office and look for those records, or what are you going to do about this. You are not completing your fulfillment of supplying information to the public. You are not doing it because you don't want to do it. Where an I going to get this information if it is not in the San Antonio library?

Ms. Sonja Coderre: Would you like to fill out this form?

Unidentified Speaker: No, no. Where am I going to get this information—

Ms. Sonja Coderre: Well, you asked me a question, and if you will allow mw to respond. I am going to respond now. The information for the administrative record lies in the informational repositories along with other documents. Now some times individuals that go to look at those documents access the information, and may remove some of those documents from the library. When we fond out about that then we can have these documents replaced. If there are documents that are not there that should be there, then—

Unidentified Speaker: There are four documents.

Ms. Sonja Coderre: Then we can replace those back in the library.

Unidentified Speaker: Then we need to do that because –

Ms. Sonja Coderre: There is also another library available to members of the RAB, which is housed here at the facility. I will have a list of documents that will provide you with information. That is for community members and the RAB to go and access them. All of these documents, such ad the Semi-annual compliance plan, are in that library. So we will look in to the information you need to access.

Unidentified Speaker: I asked the librarian—

Dr. Patti Smith: Let's move along.

Ms. Sonja Coderre: Norma, do you want to summarize this?

Ms. Norma Landez: At the BCT meeting today, there were members there that –

Mr. Armando Quintanilla: Can you state who was there and what they represented?

Ms. Norma Landez: Well the – is represented by myself as the Air Force member. I am Norma Landez. Mark Weegar is the TCEQ member, and Gary Miller is the EPA Region 6 member. Ms. Abbi Power and Greg Lessey from EPA Region 6 were also there.

Mr. Armando Quintanilla: Why are there no RAB members on the BCT review board?

Ms. Norma Landez: Why are there no BCT, why are there no community RAB members on the BCT?

Mr. Armando Quintanilla: Yes, since you are all making decisions on the clean up of our neighborhoods and so forth, why don't we have this? And this is contrary to title 10, section 2705.

Dr. Patti Smith: We can take your request for why there are no community members.

Mr. Armando Quintanilla: Yes, put it on the board.

Ms. Sonja Coderre: I will be happy to give you a copy of EPA's response to South West Workers union title six and things like this that have been addressed.

Mr. Armando Quintanilla: I don't need that

Ms. Sonja Coderre: We have responded.

Mr. Armando Quintanilla: I just want to know why we are not complying with the law? That is law that has been established by the RAB. The DoD set up and established RABs. We need to get the community involved in the decision making process, by the way.

Ms. Sonja Coderre: Well, this will be addressed as well. I can give you the –

Mr. Armando Quintanilla: I don't need it. This is a civil rights issue that was in that report.

Ms. Norma Landez: OK, so we have several topics to discuss, one of them was an annual work plan that is submitted to the TCEQ as part of out compliance schedule at the end of November every year. We discussed the possibility of reducing that since our funding eventually will only have two projects to do, which is operations and long term monitoring. Mr. Weeger from TCEQ said that he would like for us to keep that requirement on there, but we can get a permit to see if it is possible to modify, but he requested that is stay. We also had Mark provide the same briefing today for the Semi-annual compliance plan report that you received to the BCT members. And during updates we updated information for each of the zones. One of those included information on building 326. -- removal that we are doing that Jack provided earlier today. We also discussed that we are continuing with the site E-1 excavation, we have excavated 20 feet. We also have done action down at the bottom of the excavation. We are also in the process of reviewing the --- report and are going to provide a draft final to the regulators. We talked about a letter proposing shut down of the – North Bank to allow the PRB that we put down in zone two to operate without the water being pulled through. We talked about the PRB along the railroad avenue to start production. We putting about 25 injection wells and we are hoping to complete that project May 2005. We also talked the closing reports for a couple of the sites in zone four. We are working on zone four and five work plans, and monitoring systems that will be submitted to the regulators later this year.

Mr. Armando Quintanilla: How much input from the community is considered in all of this?

Ms. Norma Landez: In all what? I guess I don't understand.

Mr. Armando Quintanilla: How much input from the community members on the discussions that were held at the BCT meetings is put in?

Ms. Norma Landez: Well, like you had previously. In the Semi-annual compliance plan. We provide the same briefing that we provided this evening to our regulators.

Mr. Armando Quintanilla: Were the members of the community involved in the decisions that were made at the BCT meeting?

Ms. Norma Landez: We did not make any decisions at the BCT meeting. All we discuss is progress. Spill summary report. The Air Force has not had any spills since the last report. I noted a little while ago we have not received a letter from the TCEQ to date, but we will be sending one according to an email forwarded to me from Abbi from the water program.

Mr. Armando Quintanilla: That is on the fish deal?

Ms. Norma Landez: Yes.

Ms. Abbi Power: The letter has not been written yet to the best of my knowledge. I made a request today. It will be written, it has just not been done yet.

Ms. Norma Landez: Also a spill was reported to us from Boeing, they had a spill last month. Unfortunately Gary is not here to report that, otherwise he would report this.

Mr. Armando Quintanilla: Do you have any details you can tell us?

Ms. Norma Landez: You know it is one of those that I forgot to pull out at the last minute. It was some time last month, in February. If I had them I would pull out the notes. Unfortunately, I did not have a chance to check with Gary.

Mr. Robert Silvas: Do you know—

Ms. Norma Landez: Not off the top of my head. We will ask Gary Martin. I did not know until the last minute.

Mr. Robert Silvas: In the past there was an incident at Randolph – was that ever brought up in the spill report?

Dr. Patti Smith: I am sorry, I don't mean to rush you but we have a time frame to follow here.

Mr. Robert Silvas: That is fine.

Ms. Sonja Coderre: The documents that we will provide to you from the environmental health center library include the audio tapes from the January RAB meeting, as well as

what is in the packet that we get from the workshop, and the January 2005 Semi-annual Compliance Report that is here this evening. I am going to go ahead and cover the TAPP information. The last page of the hand out, everything that we went over, has this part in it. We have been asked specifically by Mr. Quintanilla and several others who requested this information, and I point this out as it is something that you specifically asked for. And out of the 100,000 dollar allocation for TAPP that was provided to Kelly, this is the list of projects that have been hired so far and the cost for those projects. This shows approximately a balance of 8,800 remaining in the Kelly TAPP fund.

Mr. Armando Quintanilla: And this is enough to cover the report that we just voted on?

Ms. Sonja Coderre: For the Semi-Annual?

Mr. Armando Quintanilla: Yes.

Ms. Sonja Coderre: I would presume, looking at the list of prices that I see here. I am not a contracting officer so those things get done separately. Based on the list of prices that I see, I would presume that it would cover all in the Semi-annual Compliance Plan. One thing I would like to point out—up to that 100,000 limit the procedures are simple. If we are to spend all of that money, that 8,800 dollars – for instance, for example, on the Semi-annual Compliance Plan and it left the Kelly fund with zero dollars, it does not mean necessarily that you can't have something reviewed by an outside source again. What it means is that it will be a lengthier process to gain approval and it will have to meet certain criteria that are spelled out in the documents, behind that green tab. Just so you don't think that this is the end of it. It can be potentially, but there is an avenue for asking for more money.

Mr. Armando Quintanilla: Then lets get it started on this now.

Ms. Sonja Coderre: You can't. The rules say you have to be at zero before you can – because it is not based on the money that you have, it is based on the need you have. But right now you have developed the need to have one document reviewed. And there is money to do that. When that document is completed and there is no money for an additional document, and you have an additional document that needs to be reviewed, then it is based on that need.

Mr. Armando Quintanilla: OK, say that review is 5000, which is what we used last time, and we have 3000 left, that is not enough to do another report. So what can we use that 3000 for that. Is there anything we can use this for besides review?

Ms. Sonja Coderre: It is going to depend. The report that I have is information on the TAPP that we provided to you. I don't know how, other than sitting down and doing a one-on-one to explain, but it gives what kinds of items are eligible and what is not eligible. Maybe if you take a few minutes and thumb through that, something will occur

and it may be right. But I am not a contracting officer and I could not tell you what it would be for a specific report.

Mr. Armando Quintanilla: Can we have a contracting officer come in to see this?

Ms. Sonja Coderre: I think that is certainly a possible. We can establish this as a thing we would like to –

Mr. Armando Quintanilla: There are a lot of things that we can do. We need to start thinking in that way.

Ms. Sonja Coderre: Understood. Those are the items that I have to report.

Mr. Armando Quintanilla: I understand as you say the Semi-annual Report costs 5000 and there is a balance of 3000, and we identify the need for another document to be reviewed but you don't have sufficient monies, can you go and request additional funding?

Ms. Sonja Coderre: That is my understanding, yes.

Mr. Armando Quintanilla: So you don't have to be zero, you just have to show a need to have additional funds besides what the balance is.

Ms. Sonja Coderre: That is my understanding of the process, yes.

Mr. Armando Quintanilla: We need to start looking at different perimeters and what can we discuss in the future.

Dr. Patti Smith: I think if you look at the agenda, we have put down the action items that people have requested. The next meeting is April 19th. Is that correct?

Unidentified Speaker: Yes.

Dr. Patti Smith: OK, 6:30 do we have a location yet?

Mr. Robert Silvas: I checked with the library here. I need to see what the seating capacity is.

Dr. Patti Smith: OK, the location to be announced. The next TRS meeting is May 10th held here. Thank you for the meeting and for coming tonight.

FINAL PAGE

ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD

FINAL PAGE