



KELLY AFB
TEXAS

ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD
COVER SHEET

AR File Number 3221.1

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

* * * * *

KELLY RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD (RAB)

TECHNICAL REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING (TRS)

* * * * *

TRS MEETING
FEBRUARY 8, 2005
6:31 - 8:26 P.M.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH AND WELLNESS CENTER
911 CASTROVILLE, ROAD
SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS

APPEARANCES:

- | | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| Dr. David Smith; | Ms. Coriene Hannapel; |
| Mr. Robert Silvas; | Ms. Henrietta LaGrange; |
| Mr. Armando Quintanilla; | Ms. Sonja Coderre; |
| Mr. Tim Sueltenfuss; | Ms. Melanie Ritsema; |
| Mr. Sam Murrah; | Ms. Abbie Power; |
| Mr. Gary Martin; | Ms. Leigh-Ann Fabianke; |
| Mr. Rodrigo Garcia; | Ms. Kyle Cunningham; |
| Mr. Pete Muzquiz; | Ms. Jennifer Edgar; |
| Mr. Nazarite Perez; | Ms. Alexandra Orozpe; |
| Mr. David Plylar; | Ms. Blanca Hernandez; |
| Mr. Gary Miller; | Ms. Linda Kaufman; |
| Mr. Don Buetler; | Ms. Norma Landez; |
| Mr. Glenn Wilkinson; | Ms. Cheri Kirkpatrick; |

And others in attendance who were not identified.

TRS 02/08/05

1 (6:31 p.m.)

2 DR. DAVID SMITH: Let us go ahead and begin. It's
3 6:30. This is the Kelly Restoration Advisory Board, Technical
4 Review Subcommittee meeting. My name is David Smith, the meeting
5 facilitator. I'm going to take just a moment to walk through
6 with you real quickly the agenda for tonight. We'll take the RAB
7 members and talk about what you received in terms of material.

8 Our priority item on the agenda tonight is
9 Dr. Katherine Squibb's presentation on the draft of the Public
10 Participation Review of the ATSDR Past Air Emission Study. That
11 is scheduled from 6:45 to 7:45.

12 We'll use our kind of standard procedure with that.
13 We'll ask you if there are questions that you know you want to
14 have answered, we'll try to gather those before Dr. Squibb
15 starts. And then we'll have ask you to hold your questions, if
16 you can, and we'll gather those as quickly as we can on the
17 board. And we'll set aside 7:45 to 8:15, if that's enough time
18 for our question and answer community comments on the TAPP
19 review.

20 We then have our standard administrative items, BCT
21 updates, spill summary, document section, et cetera, and then a
22 meeting wrap up and adjournment. We'll try to move through this
23 as rapidly as we can to give Dr. Squibb as much time as she needs
24 to make this her presentation and make sure you have enough time
25 to ask the questions that you need to ask.

TRS 02/08/05

1 RAB members, you received tonight a couple things.
2 One of them, of course, are the slides for presentation, your
3 agenda. There are also, on the chairs, transcripts from the
4 December TRS meeting. We'll ask that you take a look at them at
5 the end of the meeting.

6 Having run through that piece of the agenda, let me
7 first begin by asking whether or not there are questions that you
8 want Tim to capture here that you already know you want to ask
9 about Dr. Squibb's presentation before she proceeds.

10 Any things you want to get upon there right now?
11 Okay. We'll hold on then, and if you will try to jot them down
12 as we're going through and then we'll capture them at the end and
13 let her try to work her way through them as quickly and best we
14 can.

15 I asked Dr. Squibb if there is anything she wanted me
16 to say and she said, nope, just tell them I'm here. Here she is.

17 DR. KATHERINE SQUIBB: I know everybody knows me by
18 now. Thank you very much for inviting me to review this
19 document. I know y'all have been waiting for this for quite a
20 while. And it was quite as lucky for me having been involved in
21 these ATSDR Public Health Assessment documents from the very
22 beginning. I wasn't planning on taking more than half an hour,
23 so after this you will have plenty of time for questions.

24 What I'd like to do today is actually just briefly
25 review the approach that ATSDR took for looking at past air

TRS 02/08/05

1 emissions and determining their potential risk to the health of
2 the community around the base, and then specifically go through
3 their recommendations and findings and throw in a few of my own
4 comments about the approach they took and some of the conclusions
5 they made.

6 As you all know, the idea of looking at past air
7 emissions came up when they did the first assessment and they
8 published this as a phase one and promised at that time to come
9 back with a phase two, which is what we're reading right now.

10 At that time they modeled the current air emissions,
11 which was actually a new thing for ATSDR to do. This modeling
12 air emissions and EPA at that time was just beginning to really
13 have faith in this air modeling for looking at dispersion of
14 chemicals, and that's why they really felt that they could begin
15 to take this on. So they did look at the current air emissions
16 and current was 1995 and after, and they found that there was no
17 apparent health hazard in terms of these emissions off base, in
18 the community surrounding the base. And that's because the air
19 concentrations were so low, by the time that they got off base
20 that they were less than -- a cancer risk less than 10 to the
21 minus 5. So the important though was that they realized that in
22 the modeling that the emissions were getting off base, in sort of
23 the northwest and southwest directions, this had to do with, of
24 course, your standard air flow at different times during the
25 year. Which meant that when emissions were higher in the past,

TRS 02/08/05

1 there was a fairly good chance of perhaps concentrations of
2 chemicals being emitted from the activities at Kelly might have
3 given rise to concentrations in the air off base at
4 concentrations that might impose a health risk. And that was the
5 reason for this particular study that we're looking at.

6 The other thing that made them realize that perhaps
7 they really should pursue this -- and again this is the from the
8 first phase one -- was the fact that when they did their health
9 assessment looking at health affects that were present in the
10 communities around the base, they did find some increased
11 incidences of three different cancers: Leukemia, which was --
12 had elevated rates in these two zip codes northwest of the base;
13 lung cancer, which had two zip codes in which it was elevated,
14 although it wasn't elevated quite as much and your kidney
15 cancer -- as your leukemia, your kidney cancer and your liver
16 cancer. Liver cancer was elevated in almost all of the zip codes
17 around the base.

18 The one that they were most concerned about was this
19 leukemia. Number one, because that was the direction of the air
20 emissions and that's -- of course, not saying that they were
21 always in that direction. It did depend upon the wind at the
22 time, but that was the average over a whole year. And that's one
23 thing to realize in these calculations, that they were annual
24 average emissions that they calculated.

25 So, these leukemias were in the direction of the

TRS 02/08/05

1 plume of the contaminants off base, but also leukemia is a cancer
2 that's known to be caused by some of contaminants that were in
3 the plume, benzene and formaldehyde and butadiene. So they
4 really felt that they needed a follow up to see whether or not
5 concentrations could have been high enough to be causing those
6 leukemias.

7 So, short and sweet, the purpose of this health
8 consultation of this Phase Two document was to evaluate potential
9 exposure to past air emissions from activities at Kelly prior to
10 1995, and then evaluating these exposure concentrations that they
11 calculate for the potential increased risk of cancer from those
12 past emissions. Now you've probably been around long enough,
13 with all the risk effects that goes on, to know that risk
14 basically equals the hazard of the chemicals times the amount of
15 the exposure that occurs. So from the modeling of the air
16 emissions, they get concentrations of the chemical and then they
17 have to look up the specific hazard of each chemical to see
18 what -- number one, what kind of health effects it can cause, and
19 number two, at what concentrations it will cause those health
20 effects.

21 And that toxicity data, hazard data, comes from
22 mostly animal studies but also from human epidemiological studies
23 and/or, you know occupational exposures.

24 So, they gathered data relevant to air emissions.
25 Basically they asked people at Kelly Air Force Base to give them

TRS 02/08/05

1 the information they had on what chemicals were emitted from the
2 different activities that they had going on on base. They looked
3 at stationary sources and then they looked at aircraft emissions
4 themselves. It was such an active base, they were concerned
5 about what was in the air due to aircraft taking off and landing
6 and just running their engines while on the taxiway.

7 They used these data on emissions -- meaning they got
8 the amount of that chemical that was released in a given year.
9 So you can see why they need to average over the year. They
10 assume it was released evenly over 365 days. And they
11 reconstruct using the model of what the concentrations would be
12 off base, depending upon the way the model says that they would
13 be disbursed into the air. And they did gather the toxicity data
14 for the individual chemicals that they identified.

15 The stationary sources that they got data on or they
16 tried -- they asked for was the Hexavalent chromium which was
17 emitted from five plating shops that were very active on base
18 before 1995. They had painting and degreasing where they used a
19 lot of solvent or volatile chemicals that would be emitted into
20 the air during their use.

21 And they were asking for information on the
22 incineration of cyanide wastes. Now, this was actually not
23 evaluated in this document because they could not get any data
24 from Kelly on this incineration process. It was a very short
25 term from what I understand and they just didn't have data on it.

TRS 02/08/05

1 For the aircraft emissions, prior to 1994 they used a
2 lot of JP-4 as opposed to JP-8 jet fuel. The JP-4 fuel
3 supposedly has much higher concentrations and more volatile
4 solvents, such as benzene, so it was a worse kind of fuel with
5 respect to emitting these kinds of chemicals than the JP-8 fuel.

6 They got information for the types of emissions for
7 the length of time and how many take-offs, landings and the
8 amount of time taxiing of aircraft. In other words, Kelly, could
9 you tell us how long a plane, you know, on average sits on the
10 taxiway before it takes off? You know, what kind of emissions
11 occurs during take off, what kind of emissions occur when they
12 land so that they could model each part of that to determine how
13 much of these chemicals are actually being exhausted from the
14 engine during take-off and landing process.

15 They concentrated primarily on benzene, 1,3-butadiene
16 and formaldehyde for the aircraft emissions.

17 They used -- and that they talked quite a bit about
18 the fact that they used the worse case scenario for modeling the
19 aircraft emissions. In some ways they really did. They used
20 360,000 take-offs and landings as the maximum number of take-offs
21 and landings in any one year. And they did get this from the
22 information that Kelly gave them back in the 60s. I guess there
23 was an awful lot of activity and that was the maximum number that
24 was recorded in one year, so they used that in their modeling.

25 They used the least efficient engine, TF33-3. You

TRS 02/08/05

1 all may know the engines better than I do. That's supposedly the
2 least efficient, so it would exhaust the greatest amount of
3 chemicals from the fuel without bringing the chemicals. And they
4 also use the plane with the greatest number of engines, the B-52.
5 So you have the most engines, the least efficient engines, and
6 the actual number of take-offs and landings.

7 They also tried to get information on the misting,
8 which is a question that has come up actually from the very first
9 space-run document, where people wanted to them investigate the
10 fact that they're in the late 60s, early 70s and there seemed to
11 be, you know, fuel in the air sometimes. And they felt that it
12 was from the aircraft jet fuels just before landings so they
13 wouldn't have to land so heavy. There's quite a bit of time
14 spend trying to figure out what this might have been, this fuel
15 misting. They got quite a bit of information from different
16 people on what might have created it. If it was indeed a fuel
17 jet emission there are no records of it. It's illegal to do that
18 now. And if they did it during the last 60s, early 70's they
19 didn't know about it. So, it was pretty hard to track that down.
20 So this really was not evaluated as a source of chemicals to the
21 air.

22 So, how do they model the dispersion of the chemicals
23 in the air? Well, they use the EPA Industrial Source Complex
24 ShortTerm Version 3 model, which is the ISCST3 Model, which is a
25 well accepted model that EPA uses for point source primarily. So

TRS 02/08/05

1 it's very adaptive for your specific point source, stationary
2 sources. It also seemed to do very well for aircraft emissions,
3 which they dealt with as a point source essentially. I think it
4 was like 30 feet back from the end the engine. So they did
5 create it as a point source.

6 Chipim (sp) supposedly also modeled -- did a little
7 bit of modeling of the aircraft emissions using a different model
8 and came up with answers that are fairly similar to this one,
9 which is another reason to feel they probably did a fairly good
10 job of modeling it. Once again, remember that what they're
11 calculating are annual average concentrations. The uncertainty
12 in the model itself is from about .5 to two times the reported
13 values. So it could either be about half the reported value or
14 about twice the reported value, which is actually a pretty small
15 range for a model. Some models feel if you're in a factor of ten
16 you're doing pretty good. So this actually does seem to be a
17 pretty -- doing a pretty good job.

18 ATSDR themselves actually state that the largest
19 uncertainty was the emission stated that they obtained to put
20 into the model and not the uncertainty of the model itself, and
21 that does seem to be the case throughout most of the document.
22 It's what they weren't able to model that probably is creating
23 the greatest uncertainty as opposed to the information they had
24 that they did model because basically the data just were not
25 totally comprehensive that they worked about.

TRS 02/08/05

1 So, from the stationary sources, like I said, they
2 were the -- well, they tried to get the plating companies,
3 plating sources -- the degreasers and the paintings sources --
4 from the painting and the degreasers, they got about 15 --
5 information on 15 different solvents that are used as end paints
6 and then also as degreasers. So a lot of the common ones,
7 Tetrachloroethylene (PCE), you probably heard a lot about,
8 trichloroethylene (TCE). So these are very standard chemicals.
9 There weren't many unusual chemicals that they had to deal with,
10 which made it nice because they did have toxicity data for the
11 rest of the chemicals.

12 They felt that the information that got from these
13 two types of stationary sources were sufficient for analysis and
14 for information for collusions. The only one that they were
15 really missing was the Hexavalent Chromium prior to 1980, so they
16 really did not model and predict the health affect of Hexavalent
17 Chromium and also cyanide consideration that they were asked to
18 investigate.

19 From stationary sources the results they got was that
20 8 of 15 the chemicals were compared to chronic non-cancer
21 comparison values. So that they looked for potential for causing
22 cancer and then they look for potential for causing non-cancer
23 health affects.

24 Now, the non-cancer health affects are not
25 specifically stated, but usually the comparison value that you

TRS 02/08/05

1 look up for a chemical for non-cancer effects is usually based on
2 a specific most-sensitive health effect of that chemical. But
3 they don't mention it in the document anywhere, but when you see
4 those five cancer criteria, they'd have to go back into where
5 they got it from and find out what health effect that's based on.
6 It could be neurological, it could be reproductive, it could be
7 any other, you know, effects on the specific organs.

8 So, they looked at eight of the fifteen, the other
9 seven were so low they felt they didn't need to follow up on
10 them. They found no exceedances for the non-cancer comparison
11 values.

12 Four of the 15 chemicals that did calculate cancer
13 risks -- methylene chloride and PCE -- PCE had the highest cancer
14 risk at 7 times 10 to the minus 5th. There was enough Benzene
15 and Formaldehyde in some of these stationary sources that they
16 made a calculation of risk, but they were down to about 10 to the
17 minus 9 and ten to the minus 8, which are pretty low risk values.
18 EPA usually starts paying attention at about 10 to minus 6 and
19 then up to about 10 to the minus 4.

20 Again, Hexavalent Chromium was not evaluated.

21 Results from the aircraft emissions. And these are
22 your maximum concentrations off base. So they calculated prior
23 to 1973 and then from 1973 to 1994. And these are actually the
24 six chemicals they initially started with, but for the
25 calculation of cancer risk.

TRS 02/08/05

1 And I just wanted to show you the different ranges on
2 the 1,3 Butadiene and the Benzene. They actually calculated with
3 two different types of aircraft -- the B-52, which was a worse
4 case scenario and the F-16, which they felt was sort of your
5 least worse case scenario because it wasn't such a very efficient
6 engine. But you see the difference in -- it's not tremendously
7 different, maybe a factor of four between these two. So even
8 what really sounded like a real concern of their judgment by
9 picking the B-52, it didn't cause that much of an under estimate
10 compared to other aircraft.

11 So, if you want to go to the next slide. The cancer
12 risk that was calculated from what they call cancer slope
13 factors. So if you have an exposure dose and you compare it to a
14 slope which means for a given exposure you would expect, you
15 know, x-number of cancers. So each chemical has its own cancer
16 slope factor. And using that, here's your F-15 versus your B-52.
17 They also looked at 1,3 Butadiene, and looked at a human derived
18 cancer subfactor and an animal derived cancer subfactor. And
19 this is an example of the other kinds of uncertainties that you
20 can have for each kind of health assessments. Sometimes human
21 and animal data are very consistent and other times it seems like
22 humans may be more sensitive than animals and sometimes humans
23 tend to be less sensitive than animals. And 1,3 Butadiene there
24 is a pretty big difference between humans and animals. The human
25 seems to be more resistant. But then, of course, the human data

TRS 02/08/05

1 are nowhere near as goods as the animal data in terms of the
2 numbers of animals like that in controlled studies and
3 everything.

4 So not making any decision between the two, they
5 actually used both. And you can see that this -- there's a risk
6 of between 10 to the minus 6 versus 10 to the minus 3 for your
7 animals.

8 Your Benzene had a range from two to about 5 times 10
9 to the 5th for your F-16 versus your B-52. The acetaldehyde is
10 lower than most of these others at 3 times 10 to the minus 6.

11 So basically you can see that Butadiene really seems
12 to be driving the greatest risk, particularly if you use the
13 animal data with 2 times 10 to the minus 3rd for the increased
14 risk of cancer from exposure to 1,3Butadiene that they calculated
15 would be in the air off base.

16 Just one question. Actually Table -- 8-B, which is
17 where I took this information from said it was actually from both
18 the stationary and sources and the aircraft emissions. So
19 they're beginning to compile it. But for some reason they didn't
20 bring over the methylene chloride and the PCE from the stationary
21 sources in that table. Since -- you know, again, they were down
22 to the 10 to the minus 5th range, you'd say, well, they're not
23 driving an awful lot of risk. But one thing you need to do when
24 you got multiple chemicals around is consider what the affect of
25 the multiple chemicals are and not just the single chemicals by

TRS 02/08/05

1 themselves.

2 Okay. Summary of ATSDR's conclusions. Basically
3 they decided that there was no apparent health hazard, which
4 basically means that there was a cancer risk of less than 10 to
5 the minus 5th for individual chemicals from stationary sources --
6 which were primarily PCE and methylene chloride -- and individual
7 chemicals from aircraft emissions -- the Benzene, the
8 formaldehyde, and the 1,3 Butadiene. But didn't take into
9 account the animal derived cancer risks at 10 to the minus 3
10 though, which is interesting. I've got to guess that they really
11 would prefer using the human.

12 They decided that it was an indeterminate health
13 hazard from the Hexavalent Chromium before 1980 because there was
14 a lack of data available. But I didn't really see in the
15 document where they used the data that they have to calculate a
16 health risk. So basically they didn't derive a health risk of
17 cancer from the Hexavalent chromium.

18 Also, an indeterminate health hazard for the
19 interactive affect for the chemicals. As I mentioned, when you
20 start to mix them together, you want to know whether or not
21 they're having additive affects or whether there might be
22 synergistic effects. They might be potentiating each other. Or,
23 of course, you could have antagonistic effects. You know, they
24 might be antagonizing each other.

25 Most of the time for solvents you don't see any

TRS 02/08/05

1 antagonistic effects, but it's something that you do have to
2 consider. Since we don't really have studies on mixtures of
3 those particular compounds, it is unknown at this point in time,
4 so they declared it an indeterminate health hazard.

5 There was no assessment of the cyanide waste and fuel
6 emissions from misting so it was determined that that was an
7 indeterminate health hazard. Basically meaning it's their key
8 words of saying, We don't know. We didn't have enough data to be
9 able to evaluate it. So they're not making a conclusion on the
10 cyanide waste of fuel emissions, they're not making a conclusion
11 of the Hexavalent Chromium, and they're not making a conclusion
12 based on the mixing of the chemicals that are in the air.

13 One thing I thought we might start looking at is the,
14 you know, whether or not we have a conservative health assessment
15 here or whether or not we have a lot of uncertainty that sort of
16 offsets the conservativeness of the model that they used. As I
17 said, the conservative estimates, particularly in the aircraft
18 modeling, was that they used the aircraft with the most engines,
19 the least efficient engine, the engine with the highest emission,
20 and the year with the largest number of takeoffs and landings.

21 On the other side of the coin though, the uncertainty
22 of things such as the available information, such as the Chromium
23 IV, the variability and the cancer slope factors for things like
24 butadiene, for the animal versus the human. ATSDR said they were
25 not very comfortable with the specific speciation of chemicals in

TRS 02/08/05

1 and the emission in the JP-4 fuel. They felt that it may not be
2 representative, but they couldn't get what they felt was a very
3 good break down or assessment of exactly what chemicals would be
4 in that exhaust.

5 Also, they didn't consider at all metals in the air
6 emissions. And that we do know that from the Phase 1, the
7 Arsenic and Cadmium were above screening levels when they did the
8 current air emission assessment. So metals, as carcinogens, are
9 a whole group of chemicals that just were not addressed in this
10 document.

11 Also, you have a lot of particular matter that's
12 created and thrown up into the air during aircraft emissions and
13 small particles can carry compounds into your deeper lung more
14 than the larger particles. So that should be considered and also
15 just the particles themselves could do damage to the lungs.

16 So it's my recommendation that the aircraft emissions
17 ought to be called an indeterminate health hazard as opposed to a
18 no-apparent health hazard. As I said, they -- looking at
19 individual chemicals, they called it a no-apparent health hazard.
20 But I truly think it's an indeterminate. I think they did a
21 great job of getting as much information as they can. I think
22 we've information to at least have a ballpark idea of what they
23 worked with, what the emissions were. But I really don't think
24 we had a full assessment of what chemical were there in the past.

25 I did do some looking at the cumulative risk for

TRS 02/08/05

1 multiple chemicals myself. EPA says that if we don't know
2 information on cumulative risk or the effective mixtures that we
3 should just assume additivity. In some ways I think that this is
4 good if you figure you've got Benzene, formaldehyde, butadiene.
5 They all have the same end point. Essentially it's best to just,
6 you know, add them together and that gives you a measure of the
7 total risk. If you do that, for those three chemicals, basically
8 you have additive risk cancer. Cancer risk of 3.5 times 10 to
9 the minus 4 up to 2.3 times 10 to the minus 3. This then,
10 according to the ATSDR, would fall into the low to moderate risk
11 range opposed to a no apparent health hazard range. So just with
12 the data they're already giving us, it looks like you could
13 calculate that there really is a low to moderate risk range.

14 There's a kind of synergism, lung damage, that could
15 occur which would cause other chemicals to be taken up more. I
16 mean, there is the possibility that synergism could be going on.
17 You do not only have the benzene, 1,3 butadiene, and
18 formaldehyde, but you've got many other chemical components in
19 that JP fuel that may not have been considered. And then also
20 you've got those 16 chemicals from the stationary sources, which
21 may not be carcinogens themselves, but they may alter the
22 carcinogenicity of other chemicals, you know, that we did look at
23 specifically. So this is a whole area of uncertainty that shed
24 some question on the final conclusions.

25 So, again, I would recommend that the aircraft

TRS 02/08/05

1 emissions as modeled represent a low to moderate health hazard,
2 based on the additive risk for the multiple chemicals and that
3 synergistic effects might well increase the risk further.
4 Although this needs to be, you know, considered and looked into a
5 little bit more detail.

6 ATSDR's recommendations did recommend that they
7 further investigate the emissions hexavalent chromium prior to
8 1980. Since the data don't seem to be available, they suggested
9 that the hexavalent chromium outcome be included in the Kelly Air
10 Force Base civilian worker mortality study that I guess is
11 proposed. I don't know if its started yet, but they proposed
12 them doing that.

13 Since there do seem to be much higher concentrations
14 on base than off base, starting on base looking at civilian
15 workers on base is a very good place to start looking for health
16 effects. The higher the exposure, the more likely you are to
17 have them. So I think running the study is a very good study. I
18 don't know why it's just a mortality study though. I would think
19 that health surveillance would be -- there are other kinds of
20 health effects that may not necessarily -- you know, may still be
21 manifesting themselves, you know, would be working,
22 incorporating, into a health study.

23 One thing ATSDR tends to do is suggest that
24 plausibly -- biologically plausible health outcomes from the
25 chemicals should be included in this study, but they don't

TRS 02/08/05

1 specifically suggest which health outcomes, which I think is sort
2 of dodging the bullet. It would be nice. And I hope when they
3 work with further running the studies that they will come upon
4 with some, you know, point with much more specific suggestions
5 for what kind of health outcomes. Hexavalent chromium is known
6 to be a lung carcinogen, so that would be a very obvious one to
7 look at. But chromium also causes allergic dermatitis. It has a
8 lot of -- it can sensitize the immune system. There's a number
9 of other kinds of non-cancer health effects that you can look at
10 with chromium that might be worth looking at.

11 ATDSR also suggests that since we don't know much
12 about the central interactions, that we need to investigate the
13 elevated leukemia outcomes that they saw in greater detail and
14 also to consider biologically plausible heal outcomes, again, in
15 the Kelly Air Force Base Civilian Mortality Worker Study.

16 Again, there's a lot of different chemicals to look
17 at and they need to be very specific in what those health
18 outcomes are.

19 I do think that these suggestions are very good to
20 investigate the leukemia in greater detail and also to better
21 define the biological plausible outcomes that they need to be
22 looking at.

23 I think one concern that I had was just modeling
24 annual averages, which is what this model gives you. Is that
25 we're not getting an idea of what peak values might meet have

TRS 02/08/05

1 been throughout a year. You know, it's very likely that this
2 7,000 tons of PCE that was used in the degreasing was not used
3 seven days a week, 24 hours a day, average all year long.
4 There's very likely times when it probably would have been higher
5 and you're not going to -- from this kind of modeling and the
6 kind of information they got from Kelly, they really can't model
7 those peak concentrations. But I think it's worthwhile doing,
8 particularly for things that could cause exacerbation of asthma,
9 things that you could -- wouldn't necessarily cause cancer that
10 quickly, but there are other kinds of health effects in which you
11 would have a response to very high levels of chemicals for short
12 periods of times.

13 They compare the concentrations to OSHA standards,
14 which really isn't a very good comparison because as you all
15 know, OSHA standards are for workers who are exposed for eight
16 days -- eight hour days, for five days a week. They're usually
17 healthy workers. They're not young children, they're not
18 pregnant moms, and they not the elderly. So it's a very select
19 population of pretty healthy people that they're protecting and
20 they have -- they don't have as well a protection limit as EPA
21 and ATSDR do. So, I don't think -- it gives you an idea of what
22 the OSHA standard is, but I think trying to make comparisons and
23 feeling if it's below an OSHA standard is okay, I don't think is
24 a good conclusion to make.

25 I also think that they didn't pay enough concern to

TRS 02/08/05

1 the non-cancer effects of these chemicals. In this Table B-8
2 there were four chemicals that were actually above non-cancer
3 comparison values, and yet ATSDR didn't seem to mention them or
4 make much of a point of mentioning them.

5 Formaldehyde in particular, and acrolein, can cause
6 irritating and exacerbation -- other respiratory effects and
7 conditions. So I think that that would be important to follow up
8 on.

9 They said that 1,3 Butadiene didn't have a reference
10 concentration, and yet if you go on to the EPA IRIS, there is a
11 reference concentration for that chemical, which is two
12 micrograms per meter cubed. A reference concentration for EPA is
13 a concentration that you should be able to exposed to and not
14 have a health effect. So, if you're at that concentration or
15 lower there's probably no risk involved; but if you're above
16 that, there's a potential risk of having health effects from that
17 exposure.

18 The concentrations of 1,3, Butadiene that were
19 modeled ranged from one and a half to ten times higher than the
20 reference value that EPA had. So that is a significant, I think,
21 increase over the reference concentration. And that is based on
22 variant atrophy in an animal study so that it's -- the ovaries
23 seem to be more sensitive to the butadiene exposure.

24 So they need to follow up on their non-cancer effects
25 of formaldehyde and acrolein, particularly it could cause

TRS 02/08/05

1 exacerbation of asthma, particularly if there are peaks in the
2 release of these two compounds, and aspects of pulmonary disease,
3 which is something like an older person's asthma. It also could
4 exacerbated by irritating chemicals. And also the 1,3 Butadiene.

5 Also I think one health effect that was noted in the
6 Phase One document that they didn't really discuss here was the
7 elevated incidents of birth effects that may have occurred,
8 primarily heart defects. And this is important because
9 congenital heart defects have been related to solvent exposures
10 in moms.

11 And they, you know, particularly with the solvents
12 that we have in the air and the sensitivity of heart defects to
13 these solvents, I think it's worth following up on this. These
14 are types of effects you see after, you know, short-term
15 exposures. Not like cancer where they were 5 years ago or 20
16 years ago. So I think it's something that particularly on-base
17 civilian employees -- I understand Kelly's closing down, but you
18 know, if they occurred during the time that you do a health
19 history of some of these individuals, I think you could probably
20 find out whether or not they were having -- you know, if they had
21 babies with heart defects. You know, gather a lot more data for
22 specifically exposed populations that we know about.

23 So, in summary, I think the ATSDR report is
24 comprehensive and it acknowledges the uncertainties, particularly
25 due to the lack of comprehensive data. So they are very up front

TRS 02/08/05

1 about how they feel they did in collecting the data they needed
2 and how they can make that their conclusion.

3 I don't think the summary findings really acknowledge
4 the potential health effects that they did identify. You read
5 the document and they identify quite a few potential health
6 effects. You read their first page summary and it kind of just
7 says they're all indeterminate or, you know, no apparent health
8 risks. So you really do need to read the back of this statement
9 and read about the things that need to be follow up on or look at
10 more into the uncertainties involved.

11 They did have very good recommendations, I think, for
12 following up on those biologically plausible health outcomes, in
13 particular the leukemia for workers on base.

14 I think they need to recognize the potential
15 non-cancer health effects. Like I said, follow up on birth
16 defects. Follow up on potential for acute effects. And also,
17 see if they could determine how to -- determine potential
18 synergistic effects for the chemicals. And particularly having
19 an interest in those myself and knowing how carcinogenic they
20 could be and what kind of health problems they could cause, I
21 really do think they need to consider metals in the emissions
22 data, particularly get carried in the lungs on those particulates
23 that are formed and can cause some direct damage on the lungs and
24 other health effects too. That's it.

25 DR. DAVID SMITH: Thanks. Folks, what we've been

TRS 02/08/05

1 trying to do is invite folks to pose their questions. We'll try
2 to get them written down, capture as many as we can. We know
3 that answers are going to inspire another question, so we'll try
4 to keep it going through.

5 RAB members, let me start with you. Are there
6 questions you'd like to have Tim get on the board to begin with?

7 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: I have comments, but no
8 questions at the moment.

9 DR. DAVID SMITH: Okay. How about we hold comments for
10 a minute. We'll do questions first and then try to come back in
11 the other direction. No questions at moment, guys?

12 Yes, sir.

13 MR. RODRIGO GARCIA: I'm going to write her a 40 or 50
14 page question on this presentation. But for right now, I just
15 want to ask you, do you think this was -- I do not agree, but do
16 you think this was comprehensive enough as a start that we need
17 to do five or six more concentrated reports on air emissions
18 because to me this is just a start. Do you think we need to do
19 five or six more and more comprehensive reports to investigate
20 all the issues were that were not properly investigated in this
21 one?

22 DR. DAVID SMITH: Let's catch the questions and we'll
23 come and back and try to circle around to get all of them.

24 Mr. Silvas, did you have something?

25 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: Permit violations.

TRS 02/08/05

1 DR. KATHERINE SQUIBB: Shall I answer them now or wait?

2 DR. DAVID SMITH: Why don't we hold them and see if we
3 can get them all.

4 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: The other one you said was
5 mortality. You said there are other ways of looking into
6 people's illnesses or something. What did you mean exactly?

7 DR. KATHERINE SQUIBB: Health surveillance.

8 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: Health surveillance.

9 DR. KATHERINE SQUIBB: Which is looking for ongoing
10 health effects.

11 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: Like special Ed. studies or social
12 security studies that people are seeking money?

13 DR. KATHERINE SQUIBB: Well, you could set up a
14 actually -- you know, a study where you actually work with a
15 group of people and just either start with a short health history
16 for those individuals or just follow them with time, you know,
17 with a reporting on health effects that develop.

18 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: One last thing is the incinerator,
19 which they claim was used for a short period of time, and we have
20 a problem with that. Mr. Ryan stated earlier in other meetings
21 that it had been in operation for four to five years. The
22 incinerator, if it had been used for such a lengthy time, that
23 would have some considerable effect on...

24 DR. KATHERINE SQUIBB: To tell the truth, I don't know
25 what kinds of emissions would come out of that incinerator. I

TRS 02/08/05

1 think that's a question that's got to be determined through --

2 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: Let me start off with the
3 incinerator. The incinerator operated from 1975 to 1982. It
4 operated -- Kelly operated a gas-fired incinerator capable of
5 burning 100 gallons of waste cyanide solutions per hour. And
6 Kelly had, at that time, 43 (inaudible) permitted facilities in
7 more than two dozen facilities operated at Kelly under air
8 permits. I just want to, you know, put that on the table. It's
9 not a short time. A short time would be six months, a year. But
10 it operated for seven years, the incinerator. I think it's
11 significant, and yet Kelly doesn't have any data on it. You
12 can't study it. ATSDR can't study it unless data comes out of
13 that.

14 One other point, and this was in one of the
15 environmental impact statements when Kelly was closing on the use
16 of the runway by Lackland and also by the civilians. Kelly at
17 time emitted 1,200,000 pounds of air pollutions annually. Kelly,
18 before closing, was the fifth largest air polluter in Bexar
19 County. You know, this is how significant the problem is.

20 Now, we talk about air emissions and we about
21 benzene, and I understand that benzene also causes anemia. You
22 know, that's my understanding. I'm not a toxicologist or
23 anything else like that. Now, what can we do to find out on the
24 approaches coming into Kelly on the north end of the runway and
25 south end of the runway? Can we take blood tests to determine if

TRS 02/08/05

1 those people have higher elevated levels of anemia than others?

2 DR. KATHERINE SQUIBB: I don't know if I can answer
3 that.

4 DR. DAVID SMITH: Go ahead and answer. Let's cut back
5 so that we can get more questions.

6 DR. KATHERINE SQUIBB: The trouble is that these
7 exposures aren't still going on. You know, they may not all
8 still have a low anemia. Benzene causes acute aplastic anemic
9 and people can actually die from that. So that it usually ends
10 up being leukemia or it kills off all of the bone marrow cells.
11 So we can go back into the records to see how many people died
12 from that, which would, you know, be something that could be
13 looked at.

14 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: Wouldn't blood samples taken today
15 show some sort of past...

16 DR. KATHERINE SQUIBB: No, because, you know, solvents
17 are metabolized and they don't stay in your system. So you'd
18 have to have your continued exposure. And, you know, if it -- it
19 doesn't -- the kind of effect it causes isn't one that would be
20 permanent unless it of course it wasn't total aplastic anemia.

21 MS. HENRIETTA LAGRANGE: My name is Henrietta LaGrange.
22 I want to make a comment. And I know we have zip code 78237. I
23 wonder why it's just one zip code. But I also wanted to state
24 that the Hispanic community really doesn't do autopsies. So the
25 fact that we don't have the money to do autopsies would make this

TRS 02/08/05

1 very difficult.

2 DR. KATHERINE SQUIBB: Actually they looked at more zip
3 codes. I just pulled out -- it's just that 78237 was the one
4 that seemed to come up on almost everything they looked at.

5 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: 237 is in the north Kelly
6 gardens. But, you know, the airplanes land from both ends of the
7 runway. Also 78211 -- 78211. That's where, you know, we should
8 concentrate on far as the leukemia is concerned, not just on
9 78327.

10 We have sent a letter to the mayor, you know,
11 expressing our concern for leukemia on it. But it seems like
12 there's much to be done. What I'm going to recommend is that
13 when you make the report to the total RAB, that people possibly
14 from the toxicology department, from the University Health
15 System, the people from the Health Department, including
16 Dr. Guerra, be present when Dr. Squibb makes her report. They
17 should be invited to attend. And I think this behooves you to
18 write a letter inviting those people to attend whenever
19 Dr. Squibb makes her report. Because this is beyond us. It's
20 big and somebody should be doing something else, either providing
21 funds, you know, for more studies or things of that nature.

22 DR. DAVID SMITH: All right. So --

23 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: Especially when we're talking
24 about birth defects. We have Dr. Guerra, who is head of our
25 Bexar Metro, who is very concerned with children and birth

TRS 02/08/05

1 defects and small birth weight babies. I think that ought to be
2 emphasized in that. And we should do something about those
3 problems are elevated in those two zip codes, 78237 and 78211.

4 DR. DAVID SMITH: Okay. So, the action items coming
5 out of that right now, Armando, is you'd like to ask Robert and
6 the RAB to write a letter inviting those particular persons?

7 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: Not only Robert, but also
8 the -- Robert is the co-chair, but also the military co-chair
9 jointly. Asking, you know, for support or to listen to
10 Dr. Squibb and some of the problems that we're having with air
11 emissions.

12 We also have problems with the air emissions from the
13 City Public Service Board from the coal burning plant, but we're
14 not going to talk about that. We got this other problem here.

15 DR. DAVID SMITH: Thank you. Let's pick it up again.
16 I'm sorry. RAB members, I'd like to catch everybody up.

17 I'm sorry, sir.

18 MR. RODRIGO GARCIA: I got one more to ask you. When
19 the first Texas air study came out in 1952. The Clean Air Act
20 was adopted in 1963, it was amended 1970, and the air permit
21 program from the Texas Air Control Board started in 1971, and
22 they got all these permits on disburse all of this. And then
23 after that the EPA National Ambient Air Standards were
24 established in 1971. The Clean Air Act was amended again in 1997
25 and again in 1990. Do you think that these people should have

TRS 02/08/05

1 done a better job and gone through these states and federal
2 government agencies, looked at these permits and see what they
3 were going to disburse with these permits, and look in the files
4 with EPA and all these federal and state agencies to see what
5 these permits and were what they were discharging with these
6 permits, and if there were any violations on records to do this
7 research? I keep telling that they didn't do this and it should
8 have been -- all this research should have been part of this.

9 Also, when you read that report that ATSDR put out,
10 they assumed a lot factors in all these equations. Do you think
11 that was wrong? If they don't have information they ruled it
12 undeterminate. They assumed too many factors in the equations
13 and I would like for her to get a copy of the letter that I sent
14 to the ATSDR criticizing their air emission report so she can see
15 the 30 pages I wrote on harsh criticism and harsh comments on all
16 the work they did but they did not cover what we asked them
17 about. So, I think this is a -- two very, very bad factors that
18 they didn't to research, the state and federal law and their
19 programs, and they didn't study the permits they got and the
20 violations they committed because of these permits. That's
21 another factor that should have gone in this report. Do you
22 think it should have gone into this report?

23 DR. KATHERINE SQUIBB: The ATDSR would say, That wasn't
24 what we were asked to do. But you raised an awful lot of good
25 questions.

TRS 02/08/05

1 MR. RODRIGO GARCIA: I'm going to write them all down
2 and send them to you.

3 DR. KATHERINE SQUIBB: The real problem, and you
4 probably recognize it, but I think it was in 19 -- one of
5 amendments to the Clean Air Act said that EPA needs to come up
6 with standards for 189 hazardous air pollutants, perhaps, that
7 are talked about in here. They have so far done four. So the
8 EPA is way behind on coming upon with any standards, which means
9 that, you know, none of the states are -- you know, have any kind
10 of a muscle to be able to tell people that, you know, they have
11 to keep their concentrations down. I don't know exactly how --
12 each state does theirs differently to determine what the permits
13 should be. But the tools are out there now to do a much better
14 job.

15 DR. DAVID SMITH: Let me -- more questions, RAB
16 members? I have audience questions, we'll pick those up and come
17 back to you.

18 I'm sorry.

19 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: One last question. This is
20 regarding the issue of Agent Orange that had been released. The
21 possibly insignificance effects of the community, you know, are
22 going to have to be addressed later. Do you think this would
23 fall under the air emissions or how would that...

24 DR. KATHERINE SQUIBB: Unfortunately, probably not
25 because it's -- Agent Orange dioxin is not volatile. So, it was

TRS 02/08/05

1 probably not in the air, you know, at this point in time.

2 MR. RODRIGO GARCIA: If it leaked -- if it leaked out
3 of those 55-gallon drums, would it have put out any air
4 pollutants or would it just put out chemical pollutants that went
5 into the groundwater?

6 DR. KATHERINE SQUIBB: The dioxin components of it
7 would have gone into the ground and stayed in the soil. I don't
8 know what else was in the mix. You know, there may have been
9 some solvents in the mix, but the dioxin itself would stay in the
10 soil.

11 DR. DAVID SMITH: Okay. Let me pick up -- yes?

12 MR. GLENN WILKINSON: Yes, I was talking to a person
13 online who worked in Kingsville during the Vietnam War. She
14 became pregnant and she -- they pulled her off the line due to
15 the fact she was being exposed to J fuels. I don't know which J
16 fuel they were using, but her son came down with severe mental
17 retardation. And she's traced it back to her carrying that kid
18 on that line. She didn't tell right away that she was pregnant,
19 but it caused her severe retarded -- to have a son like that.
20 She told me this, and so what does J fuel on MH and MR have
21 effects on those people, of women carrying children being exposed
22 to these HMRs?

23 DR. DAVID SMITH: What's the HMR effects of jet fuels
24 during pregnancy?

25 MR. GLENN WILKINSON: For a pregnant woman carrying a

TRS 02/08/05

1 baby, what the effects a pregnant woman being around Kelly Air
2 Force Base?

3 DR. DAVID SMITH: All right. Yes, sir?

4 MR. DAVID PLYLAR: My question is about how your office
5 and the RAB communicates with Dr. Guerra. This report that was
6 made tonight, the tests was specifically on health data. That
7 report forwarded to Dr. Guerra and is Dr. Squibb in -- would
8 Dr. Squibb in contact with him to elaborate on any of these
9 findings and, you know, and comment on them? Sort of like
10 communicating with Dr. Guerra.

11 DR. DAVID SMITH: All right. Let me catch that on here
12 and we'll attempt to --

13 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: I don't think there's any
14 communications between Dr. Guerra and her. This is the reason we
15 want not only Dr. Guerra to be there to, but possibly Patty Radle
16 to listen to this. And also the other councilman on these
17 particular council districts to listen to her report. Because it
18 is beyond the RAB as to what the -- what actions we can take to
19 lessen the birth effects, to lessen the leukemia. What can we
20 do?

21 MR. DAVID PLYLAR: I understand that, but to me, the
22 significant element here is -- Dr. Squibb is in Baltimore,
23 Dr. Guerra is here. They talk the lingo, we don't. And she has
24 the data that Dr. Guerra needs, I think. So my question is: Is
25 there permanent communication with these reports and ongoing

TRS 02/08/05

1 communication with the consultants and Dr. Guerra on these health
2 issues?

3 DR. DAVID SMITH: Okay. Let's get it on our list here.
4 There is an answer to that, but let's get it on the list.

5 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: We not only need Dr. Guerra
6 here, we need also the Air Force Center for Environmental
7 Excellence to be there to listen to her report and see what can
8 they provide for us, what additional monies can they provide for
9 additional studies. What are we going to do to correct the
10 problem that's -- of low birth defects and low birth weighs and
11 leukemia and those canners? You know, those people are sick.
12 What can be done about that? And we need the Air Force to
13 provide the money to take care of those illnesses.

14 MR. RODRIGO GARCIA: And we need the health
15 professionals to tell us what kind of studies we have to do and
16 how extensive it has to do. Tell us how much money, 5, 10, 20
17 million dollars we need to do all these studies. Then go back to
18 the Air Force and say, Hey, we need 20 million to do all these
19 health studies. Fork it over, you know. Whatever, you know. We
20 need to have a combined effort to determine all the health
21 studies, what we're going to study and everything else, and then
22 take an itemized list and for 20, 50, 25 million bucks tell the
23 Air Force, fork it over. You know.

24 DR. DAVID SMITH: Okay. We have a question list. How
25 about if we go back to beginning of that question list. It'll

TRS 02/08/05

1 will probably expand into some more questions and we'll try to
2 capture all those.

3 Tim, will you try to get those?

4 MR. TIM SUELTENFUSS: Mr. Garcia asked: Do you think
5 the study was comprehensive?

6 DR. KATHERINE SQUIBB: I think it was comprehensive. I
7 got the feeling that ATSDR tried very hard to get as much data as
8 they could get. Not that they didn't -- not that they got
9 comprehensive data, but they didn't feel that they couldn't get
10 anymore data from Kelly Air Force Base, so they worked with what
11 they had.

12 So you asked about whether more studies should be
13 done. You can't do more of this type of study unless you get
14 more additional data.

15 MR. RODRIGO GARCIA: Okay.

16 DR. KATHERINE SQUIBB: So, they will have to --

17 MR. RODRIGO GARCIA: Strong arm the Air Force and the
18 EPA and everybody else involved to give us copies of all their
19 violations and their air studies and all of that.

20 DR. KATHERINE SQUIBB: Yeah. I mean, it's just hard to
21 know whether the data really do not exist or whether, you know,
22 they're just in a cabinet somewhere and nobody wants to look for
23 them.

24 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: Which brings me to my point.
25 We need the people there. We have \$5 million, you know, for

TRS 02/08/05

1 studies of this nature. We want the Air Force people to conduct
2 these additional studies of the people that are affected by this
3 contamination, for these emissions.

4 MR. TIM SUELTFUSS: Mr. Silvas, I didn't capture your
5 whole question. It related to permit violations.

6 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: How much of the past permit
7 violations were considered?

8 DR. KATHERINE SQUIBB: They weren't at all to the best
9 of my knowledge.

10 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: They weren't at all?

11 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: No. None of them were.

12 DR. KATHERINE SQUIBB: The real question is whether or
13 not your state has a record of permit violations.

14 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: I think so.

15 MS. ABBI POWER: Yes, we do.

16 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: How many were there? You
17 don't know --

18 MS. ABBI POWER: I don't know.

19 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: More than one.

20 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: Oh, it's more than one. It's
21 around 23 or something.

22 MR. TIM SUELTFUSS: Mr. Silvas asked: What effects
23 would incinerator use have?

24 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: What effect on the health the
25 community would have in time frame that it was actually used five

TRS 02/08/05

1 years plus burning cyanide. What would you see?

2 DR. KATHERINE SQUIBB: I can't answer that question
3 without knowing more about what's in the cyanide waste. You
4 know, cyanide itself is a fairly simple compound. It's just
5 carbon and nitrogen, a simple bond which breaks down into
6 nothing. But if it was in solvents, if it was in, you know --

7 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: Plating materials. Cyanide
8 was used on plating materials.

9 DR. KATHERINE SQUIBB: Plating materials. And if it's
10 waste, it pretty well has a chromium in it.

11 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: Yes.

12 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: That goes back to the chromium you
13 were addressing earlier?

14 DR. KATHERINE SQUIBB: Yes, it might go back to that.

15 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: Can you restate that, the chromium,
16 how they weren't addressing that fully.

17 DR. KATHERINE SQUIBB: Well, they said that they could
18 get no chromium emissions data prior to 1980. And again, I don't
19 know why at that point in time they didn't have any before that.
20 But in the document itself, they just didn't address the chromium
21 problem at all. They didn't make any calculations on it.

22 MR. TIM SUELTFUSS: Let me see if I captured this
23 action item correctly, or the suggested action item. Ask
24 community co-chair and installation co-chair to invite
25 representatives of the Health Department to attend the April RAB

TRS 02/08/05

1 and hear Dr. Squibb's presentation. And it's modified by also
2 asking the AFCEE, Air Force Center for Environmental Excellence
3 representatives.

4 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: And also the University
5 Health System. There's two individuals there, Dr. Bradshaw and
6 Dr. Herbal that are -- would want to get this information.
7 Dr. Guerra should be there.

8 MR. TIM SUELTFENFUSS: I guess we can come back to that.

9 DR. DAVID SMITH: We'll come back to that.

10 MR. TIM SUELTFENFUSS: Mr. Wilkinson asked: What
11 effects do J fuels have -- I'm sorry, what MH/MR effects on
12 pregnant women do J fuels have?

13 DR. KATHERINE SQUIBB: I'm not sure what MH/MR is?

14 MS. ABBI POWER: Mental health and mental retardation.

15 DR. KATHERINE SQUIBB: Well, the solvents can directly
16 effect the nervous system, Number One. Number Two, I believe no
17 pregnant woman should ever be around any chemicals. I know that
18 they're addressing this better in occupational studies now,
19 particularly in the first trimester when, you know, the fetus is
20 developing every organ system it has, and the neurological system
21 really develops throughout the whole nine months. You know, so
22 it is important that people be removed from an occupational
23 situation where they're being exposed.

24 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: I have one question that
25 the -- and that's concerning the high octane fuel that was used

TRS 02/08/05

1 before the jets came in. This is prior to the 50 -- around the
2 50's when we had the B-36 and the B-50, the B-29 aircrafts here
3 at Kelly, which the multi-engine aircraft. And nothing is said
4 about these high octane aircraft, you know, the hundred octane or
5 more gasoline than was used in these aircraft engines. What
6 bearing would that octane have on those people -- on the people?

7 DR. KATHERINE SQUIBB: Is that what hydrozene in it?
8 They mentioned some fuel that had hydrozene in it that they
9 decided not to address. Hydrozene itself is a carcinogen. I
10 would imagine it would be, you know, pretty well broken down.

11 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: It was leaded gas.

12 DR. KATHERINE SQUIBB: Oh, leaded gas?

13 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: Yeah, high octane leaded gas.

14 MR. RODRIGO GARCIA: Leaded fumes.

15 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: Leaded fumes, yes.

16 DR. KATHERINE SQUIBB: They got to do metal.

17 MR. RODRIGO GARCIA: There's a lot of these B-17, B-29,
18 B-26. And, you know, all of these that came in before the final
19 predecessors where this Jet B-12 and the B-52. You know, all of
20 these that came in before that the final predecessors were the
21 Jet B-12, B-52s. You know, the F-102 and the F-104s, all these
22 had all the unleaded fuels in them, you know. And there's lot of
23 things, like the chemical he said, they just decided not to
24 address because it was too much work or they decided upon
25 themselves that it was not a critical issue. But when you get

TRS 02/08/05

1 all these little critical issues, it will mount up to a big
2 issue. And that's why I'm very critical of that report.

3 MR. TIM SUELTFENFUSS: Mr. Plylar asked: Will this
4 report be forwarded to Dr. Guerra? Is there ongoing
5 communications?

6 DR. KATHERINE SQUIBB: I imagine Dr. Guerra has already
7 read it. I know Sam Sanchez well. I don't know Dr. Guerra real
8 well, but I know that they tend to keep up on these and read
9 them, and they're very interested in what ATSDR is finding. And
10 I think that they have a fairly good relationship with ATSDR
11 also. You know, I am agreed that, you know, the health
12 professionals need to get together here and work to develop --

13 MS. MELANIE RITSEMA: We can actually respond to that.
14 I'm from the Health Department. I'm Sam Sanchez's replacement
15 for the record. I've only been around for a few weeks, so I'm
16 still learning a great deal. But Kyle Cunningham has been with
17 us for a long, long time, along with Sam, and I'm sure she can
18 respond to that.

19 MS. KYLE CUNNINGHAM: Well, Dr. Guerra has read the
20 report. They've all been through the report. And not just based
21 on this report, but based on past information. We have been
22 working with TDH, the cancer registry, and also the birth defects
23 registry. We should -- we expect a report from them soon, which
24 will answer some of these. And then we're also working with --
25 in between trying to get together through TDH and ATSDR, we hope

TRS 02/08/05

1 to be meeting very soon to come up with other steps which will
2 include -- and I'm sure Dr. Squibb will be communicating with
3 you.

4 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: Well, I understand Dr. Guerra
5 made a report to the City Council last Thursday or Thursday
6 before last. Did he mention the ATSDR reports in his report to
7 the City Council?

8 MS. KYLE CUNNINGHAM: Yes, sir, he did.

9 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: And air emissions,
10 specifically leukemia?

11 MS. KYLE CUNNINGHAM: Yes, very much so. We talked
12 about other steps.

13 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: And what -- did he come up
14 with any solutions to the problem? How are we going to heal the
15 people that are sick?

16 MS. KYLE CUNNINGHAM: Well, that's what we were
17 trying -- first of all, we need to put together a study and
18 that's what we're working on and move forward with that. Now
19 Linda has already -- will be starting in the North Kelly Gardens
20 going door-to-door to do --

21 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: When will you complete the
22 North Kelly and go to the South Kelly?

23 MS. KYLE CUNNINGHAM: Well, we have 350 people or 350
24 homes to go through, so as soon we finish.

25 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: Okay.

TRS 02/08/05

1 DR. DAVID SMITH: I'm getting a signal from my court
2 reporter here, she's having a hard time getting your words. So
3 keep it up nice and high so it can be captured.

4 MS. CORIENE HANNAPEL: I had a question. If someone
5 asked will had report are shared with Dr. Guerra, I was assuming
6 they were talking about Dr. Squibb's report. Will Dr. Squibb's
7 report ever be shown to Dr. Guerra?

8 DR. KATHERINE SQUIBB: Oh, yes.

9 MS. CORIENE HANNAPEL: So will that be done
10 automatically?

11 MS. KYLE CUNNINGHAM: No, we review all the reports.

12 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: What is the process?

13 MS. KYLE CUNNINGHAM: What is the process? We get the
14 report and we share it. We start reading. And then we share the
15 information and go on from there.

16 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: And then what happens? You
17 know some of these things that's in the report, do y'all come up
18 with solutions as to how you're going to make it better? Better
19 the situation; stop the birth defects and the low birth weight
20 babies?

21 MS. KYLE CUNNINGHAM: Well, we look at that all over
22 all the time.

23 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: I know, but what is being
24 done to decrease that?

25 MS. KYLE CUNNINGHAM: Melanie, do you want to go

TRS 02/08/05

1 through it with me or...

2 MS. MELANIE RITSEMA: That'd be great.

3 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: Before she goes, could you
4 introduce yourself and background, please.

5 MS. KYLE CUNNINGHAM: Yeah. In fact, I'd like to
6 introduce Melanie Ritsema, who is Sam's replacement.

7 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: Okay.

8 MS. KYLE CUNNINGHAM: And she was at the last RAB and I
9 apologize to all of y'all for not introducing her at that
10 meeting. But Melanie has been with the Health Department -- for
11 six years?

12 MS. MELANIE RITSEMA: Yes.

13 MS. KYLE CUNNINGHAM: And was the manager of the WIC
14 Program. And so we're very happy to have her there. It's been
15 nice working with her the last couple of weeks.

16 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: What is your educational
17 background?

18 MS. MELANIE RITSEMA: I have a bachelors degree in
19 biology, a bachelors in nursing. I'm a registered nurse. And I
20 have a masters in public health.

21 At this point in time, I'm -- as I said, I'm still
22 very much learning all of this. This is very new to me, so if
23 you'll be patient with me, I will communicate with you as I'm
24 able to do so.

25 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: See, my problem is, we got

TRS 02/08/05

1 all of these reports, we spend thousands of dollars of our tax
2 dollars, ATSDR, Dr. Squibb, everybody else, and, you know, but
3 what is being done actually about the problem, to lessen the, you
4 know, the problem or to fix the problem?

5 MS. MELANIE RITSEMA: Well, it's a multi-faceted --
6 these are -- you know, there's a lot going on here. It's not
7 just one entity that can do everything.

8 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: And this is the reason I'm
9 asking that all the entities be there --

10 MS. MELANIE RITSEMA: Sure.

11 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: When she gives her report.

12 MS. MELANIE RITSEMA: That's understandable.

13 DR. DAVID SMITH: Mr. Wilkinson, you had your hand up.

14 MR. GLENN WILKINSON: I was going to say, the Agent
15 Orange and the Agent Orange they used at Kelly out there and we
16 put -- I talked to a coroner's office in Austin and he said that
17 he would consider a (inaudible) weed killer and that I'd have
18 every right to pursue death certificates (inaudible) of people
19 that died of Agent Orange which Kelly told us Agent Orange
20 (inaudible) living in Austin and trying to get how many deaths to
21 proceed to get somebody prosecuted. People just don't -- you
22 know, you can't just kill people and get away with it. That's
23 murder.

24 So, I wondered the statement here, where would they
25 be at? We're going to need all of that data and all the Agent

TRS 02/08/05

1 Orange data in San Antonio to pursue other people's death in
2 order to follow these up. Where does that information come out?

3 MS. KYLE CUNNINGHAM: Do you mean -- again, do you
4 mean -- you are you asking for all the Agent Orange deaths? Is
5 that the question?

6 MR. GLENN WILKINSON: Yes.

7 MS. KYLE CUNNINGHAM: I don't know that there's a
8 registry that really puts that together, other than what we can
9 get through maybe the VA, and I don't know that they really tie
10 anything back to specific --

11 MR. GLENN WILKINSON: I've been (inaudible) since 1990.

12 MS. KYLE CUNNINGHAM: Linda, you can speak to that
13 better?

14 And basically what Linda just said was there's so
15 many associated diseases until it would -- in order to do that.

16 MR. GLENN WILKINSON: Well, they should look at it, you
17 know.

18 DR. DAVID SMITH: I'm going to move us on.

19 MS. CORIENE HANNAPEL: The comment on the City Council
20 meeting. Had I not known anything about Kelly, Dr. Guerra's
21 presentation seemed to indicate that there were no problems or
22 any problems that were there were being taken care of. And I'd
23 like to get a transcript about what Mister -- Councilman Perez
24 said was, Dr. Guerra, it's great to hear that even those we've
25 heard about the problems at Kelly, it's great to hear from you

TRS 02/08/05

1 that everything's under control and there are no problems.

2 And I will get a copy of that transcript because that
3 kind of shocked me.

4 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: Something's wrong there.

5 MS. CORIENE HANNAPEL: Absolutely.

6 DR. DAVID SMITH: You've been kind of --

7 MR. NAZIRITE PEREZ: I was there at that meeting and no
8 solutions and it was an overall thing about the defects and so
9 on. And I saw a lot of cover through it, and not to the degree
10 that we speak here. We speak about a -- well, a lot about the
11 negative. And over there I seemed to get the notion of too much
12 positive instead of negative.

13 DR. DAVID SMITH: All right. Let him go first.

14 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: Yeah, I got a few things here.
15 First of all, the studies of air emissions, everything that goes
16 up eventually works it's way down into people and into the
17 ground.

18 DR. KATHERINE SQUIBB: Well, yes and no. There's a lot
19 of atmospheric chemistry that goes on and we do have a lot of
20 conversions that go on some things do get broken down by light.
21 They may come down, but they get disbursed and usually deluded.
22 Things like solvents usually just get deluded and eventually get
23 broken down.

24 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: What about death certificates, I
25 mean, should that be a consideration to review?

TRS 02/08/05

1 DR. KATHERINE SQUIBB: Well, I guess you can use -- I
2 don't know exactly how your cancer register is set up or exactly
3 how specifically death certificates are, depends on what you're
4 looking for. I tend to not want to just look at mortality. But
5 I think morbidity, which means diseases, you know, is really --

6 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: But the two would be important to
7 look at?

8 DR. KATHERINE SQUIBB: Yes.

9 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: And one last thing is,
10 Benzoidpyrene (sp) is an ongoing issue. It's from unburnt fuel.
11 And it's an issue ongoing because the past TAPP contractor
12 identified it as a chemical of concern. They're seeing it on
13 base at high levels. Now I'm sure that, you know, on base it's
14 more concentrated than it is off base, but in the past I've seen
15 documentaries stating that they're finding that same chemical in
16 whales in the ocean and it's passing PCBs through the milk to
17 their offspring, and the offspring are taking that chemical
18 through, you know, the milk from their mothers. Is that stuff --
19 can it go through the system like that through mothers?

20 DR. KATHERINE SQUIBB: PCBs can, but PAHs from the oil
21 are -- will generally tend to be broken down and metabolized by
22 animals along the way. So they don't tend to magnify and
23 accumulate the same way as a chlorinated compound like this would
24 be.

25 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: Okay. One other thing. Kelly

TRS 02/08/05

1 handled nuclear weapons, and in the past I told ATDSR to put in
2 writing what incidents they may or may not have had. Would that
3 be something to consider for past air?

4 DR. KATHERINE SQUIBB: It depends on what forms the
5 radio active materials were, you know, in if they were to become
6 volatile or not. You know, we'd really have to look into what
7 and handled.

8 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: Okay.

9 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: We had a nuclear explosion at
10 Kelly.

11 DR. KATHERINE SQUIBB: You did?

12 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: Yes.

13 DR. KATHERINE SQUIBB: That's iodine 125.

14 MR. RODRIGO GARCIA: That was at Medina Base.

15 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: At Medina Base, yes. It
16 shook up Kelly.

17 MR. RODRIGO GARCIA: More than once they had an
18 explosion over there.

19 It got two more little comments. You know that past
20 report they did and then all that stuff we discussed with you,
21 are any of those chemicals that got disbursed into the air
22 contributed very heavily to our ozone disaster that we have now;
23 ozone damage and disaster -- ozone damage that we have now that
24 we can hold the Air Force partially responsible for all these
25 ozone action days and all this stuff we get? Do any of those

TRS 02/08/05

1 chemicals cause any of the ozone damage?

2 DR. KATHERINE SQUIBB: They did when they were at the
3 higher concentrations because the VOCs are what are, you know,
4 help to create the ozone with light. So that they would
5 contribute to the ozone problem.

6 MR. RODRIGO GARCIA: They didn't cover that in the
7 report.

8 One final question. You have us a real nice summary
9 and all this. Is there an actual 40 or 50-page report that we
10 can read?

11 DR. KATHERINE SQUIBB: It's about a 10 to 12-page
12 report.

13 MR. RODRIGO GARCIA: I'd like to order the staff to
14 give us a copy of her report, please.

15 DR. DAVID SMITH: Okay. Anybody else?

16 MR. SAM MURRAH: And after that, you'd get -- the
17 vegetation would be effected too, wouldn't it? If you had a
18 concentration vegetation, it's to effect that ozone. There's a
19 lot of concentration to the ozone.

20 DR. KATHERINE SQUIBB: Yeah. And, you know, there's
21 multiple inputs here obviously. Kelly is not the only one. They
22 all contribute.

23 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: Just one comment. This is
24 for Mr. Plylar to ask -- to mention to Patty Radle the discontent
25 concerning Dr. Guerra's report saying that there's no problem and

TRS 02/08/05

1 for him to -- for Dr. Guerra -- and see if Patty Radle can get
2 Dr. Guerra to come to our April meeting and Dr. Squibb will be
3 there.

4 MR. DAVID PLYLAR: Well, I think it's incumbent on the
5 board to extend that invitation to Dr. Guerra and encourage
6 him --

7 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: Okay, but mention to her
8 that --

9 MR. DAVID PLYLAR: -- but the other thing that I can
10 tell you and other people here should know, you and several other
11 people on the RAB Board communicated several questions to
12 Dr. Guerra prior to that meeting where he made his presentation.
13 And as Patty Radle indicated, on the day of the presentation, the
14 questions that were submitted to Dr. Guerra were really not
15 answered by his report, and that we expect those answers to come
16 forward.

17 MS. MELANIE RITSEMA: That's also (inaudible) actually
18 to misrepresent the day before yesterday.

19 MR. DAVID PLYLAR: So there's a -- but I do agree that
20 it seems to me like Dr. Guerra in some way -- like Kyle says,
21 that he's getting these reports forwarded to him, I think that's
22 really critical. I'm just wondering how much opportunity there
23 is for Dr. Guerra to, you know, sit down and hear the, you know,
24 the remarks like Dr. Squibb made tonight, in addition to what's
25 in the written report and what's in the PowerPoint presentation.

TRS 02/08/05

1 That one-on-one interchange between, as I said, the people who
2 know the lingo has as much value as reading the reports
3 themselves.

4 MS. KYLE CUNNINGHAM: One thing I do want to say is,
5 Councilman Perez made that comment, but Dr. Guerra's report
6 didn't make that comment. It didn't say actually there was no
7 problems. We were looking into it with some other additional
8 work.

9 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: Well, he should be invited
10 also. We'll see to it that Councilman Perez and Dr. Guerra is
11 invited. We'll send them a letter.

12 MR. RODRIGO GARCIA: I think Councilman Perez that made
13 the most damaging comments. It wasn't Dr. Guerra. I know it was
14 Councilman Perez that made some very disparaging comments about
15 our mission and what we are doing. It was him that made most of
16 those comments, Councilman Perez.

17 MS. HENRIETTA LAGRANGE: Yes, I wanted to ask the lady:
18 Does Dr. Guerra read the reports or just what you read and you
19 tell him?

20 MS. KYLE CUNNINGHAM: No, Dr. Guerra reads the reports.
21 And we have consultants also that read those reports.

22 MS. HENRIETTA LAGRANGE: Well, I'm not worried about
23 the consultants.

24 MS. KYLE CUNNINGHAM: No, Dr. Guerra gets copies of
25 those reports and he goes through them.

TRS 02/08/05

1 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: You know, we're very critical
2 of Dr. Guerra because in the past he said it's because of our
3 lifestyle that we have the elevated levels of lung cancer because
4 we smoke too much, and liver cancer because we drink too much.
5 This is from -- and we didn't appreciate that at that time, and
6 that has lingered with us.

7 DR. DAVID SMITH: I want to be --

8 MR. NAZIRITE PEREZ: I saw that in between the lines.
9 I saw that. But again, it he wasn't that strong like other
10 times.

11 DR. DAVID SMITH: We ought to be kind of careful here.
12 Dr. Guerra isn't here and it's not exactly fair to be taking him
13 to task. Plus, we're kind of moving well beyond the range of
14 restoration in the conversation we're having here. So if we are
15 kind of coming to the close of those questions -- Tim tells me
16 that we basically picked up responses to all those and requests
17 for action that we put on the action item section at the end of
18 the meeting. Okay.

19 Thank you, ma'am, we appreciate that very much.

20 DR. KATHERINE SQUIBB: Thank you.

21 DR. DAVID SMITH: We are at that section of the agenda
22 where we're look at the BCT update. Ms. Landez, do you have
23 anything.

24 MS. NORMA LANDEZ: No BCT this month. We will have one
25 in March.

TRS 02/08/05

1 DR. DAVID SMITH: Have one in March; is that correct?

2 Okay.

3 Do we have a spill summary?

4 MS. NORMA LANDEZ: No spills since the last report.

5 DR. DAVID SMITH: No spills since the last report.

6 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: Is this a spill report time?

7 Is this the time to ask a question?

8 DR. DAVID SMITH: Sure.

9 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: We still haven't found out
10 how many fish were killed in October during the guar spill up
11 there on Citrus Road. Can you help us on that one?

12 MS. ABBI POWER: Are you talking about in Leon Creak?

13 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: Yeah, in Leon Creak.

14 MS. ABBI POWER: I'm sorry, I didn't realize that I'd
15 been tasked for the number of fish. I just knew that you wanted
16 information about the fish and I thought I'd provided information
17 for what was asked.

18 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: Well, who is going to replace
19 all those dead fish? That's my real question.

20 MS. ABBI POWER: The fish -- when asked, Will they be
21 replaced, the state will not -- I mean, these fish belong to the
22 citizens of State of Texas.

23 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: All right.

24 MS. ABBI POWER: They don't belong to any one specific
25 person.

TRS 02/08/05

1 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: I'm one of those non-specific
2 persons.

3 MS. ABBI POWER: Exactly. I understand that. But the
4 Texas Parks and Wildlife are the ones that make the determination
5 if the eco system has been set out of balance so far because of,
6 you know, so many fish dying in a certain portion of a stream.
7 Because fish don't always live in one little place. They swim
8 upstream, they swim downstream. So the Texas Department of Parks
9 and Wildlife would make that determination. My understanding is
10 that they did not make a determination that those fish in that
11 portion of the stream were impacted so great -- too many fish
12 died that the stream is not impacted so greatly that fish won't
13 swim back and forth through there. Do you understand what I'm
14 trying to say?

15 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: I do understand, but there
16 was 20,000 gallons of water spilled in there last year.

17 MS. ABBI POWER: I understand.

18 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: There was a fish kill.

19 MS. ABBI POWER: Yes.

20 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: Now, who notified the Texas
21 Wildlife Commission that there was a fish kill?

22 MS. ABBI POWER: I believe that when the --

23 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: Or does -- who's supposed to
24 do that?

25 MS. ABBI POWER: There is not a requirement -- there

TRS 02/08/05

1 was a notification of a fish kill that was called into our
2 agency.

3 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: Yes, I know that. I'm aware
4 of that.

5 MS. ABBI POWER: We responded to that fish kill. And
6 the Texas Parks and Wildlife was notified. I'm not sure if it
7 was somebody in my agency that made the notification or if it was
8 somebody out of the 1-800 emergency number that spills are called
9 into. I don't know who specifically made that notification. My
10 understanding is that Texas Parks and Wildlife didn't feel the
11 need -- and don't know if they actually sent anybody out there
12 that day. I don't know if they personally respond --

13 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: Can you find out for sure?

14 MS. ABBI POWER: Can I find out what specifically?

15 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: About the Texas Wildlife
16 being notified or not notified.

17 MS. ABBI POWER: They were notified.

18 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: They were notified?

19 MS. ABBI POWER: They were notified, yes.

20 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: All right. Now, they're the
21 ones that are supposed to replace the fish or --

22 MS. ABBI POWER: No. They -- no. They would make --
23 if there is a determination that this impact is so great that the
24 stream is damaged and that the only way to rebalance the natural
25 aspects of that stream is to put additional fish in, they would

TRS 02/08/05

1 make that determination. They determined that that was not
2 needed.

3 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: And "they" being the Texas
4 Wildlife Commission?

5 MS. ABBI POWER: Yes, the Parks and Wildlife would --
6 they're the ones that make the determination and they determined
7 that there was no need to put fish -- to restock those fish or
8 that portion of the stream.

9 MR. SAM MURRAH: That's two different fish. The fish
10 division and the large animal division.

11 MS. ABBI POWER: And the large animal? I'm not --

12 MR. SAM MURRAH: Like they have these fish hatcheries
13 all over the state.

14 MS. ABBI POWER: Yes, they do.

15 MR. SAM MURRAH: But they communicate with those
16 people.

17 MS. ABBI POWER: Right. I'm sure they to communicate
18 with those people.

19 MR. SAM MURRAH: I don't know how they do it, but they
20 have -- I've called up those people myself.

21 MS. ABBI POWER: Right. You can actually -- as a
22 citizen, if you have a tank on your property you can and them ask
23 them to stock your tank. I mean that's -- as an individual, you
24 have the right to do that. There may be a fee, there may not be
25 a fee. It depends upon, you know, if it's good for the

TRS 02/08/05

1 ecological balance for fish to be in that particular area. And
2 they also have to determine, are fish naturally going to come to
3 that area? Are they going to swim into that area. I'm not an
4 aquatic expert.

5 For those of you who may know him, Agodina Cruz (sp)
6 who has been with our agency for ten years announced his
7 retirement today.

8 MR. SAM MURRAH: First thing they got to determine is
9 that the water is back to where it's got --

10 MS. ABBI POWER: Exactly.

11 MR. SAM MURRAH: -- that it feeds and supports feeds.

12 MS. ABBI POWER: Right.

13 MR. SAM MURRAH: You could have a die off --

14 MS. ABBI POWER: You could have a die off for natural
15 reasons. You can have a die off for natural reasons. But in
16 this case, you have guar enter the creak and the guar affected
17 the ability of the fish to breath and that's why there was a die
18 off. The guar gum creates what they call a biological -- problem
19 with the biological oxygen band and fish get their oxygen out of
20 the water. They couldn't breath and the fish died.

21 DR. DAVID SMITH: Let me bring us down away from fish
22 kills and see if we can get to next question. Yes, sir?

23 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: One more question on this matter --
24 subject we're on now. Were there any fines or penalties and was
25 it determined who released it?

TRS 02/08/05

1 MS. ABBI POWER: Yeah. It was -- it came -- the guar
2 originated from a remediation activity located at Kelly.

3 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: Who was responsible for that?

4 MS. ABBI POWER: Kelly Air Force Base.

5 MS. NORMA LANDEZ: We were.

6 MS. ABBI POWER: I don't -- you know, I can't give
7 you -- I don't know who specifically. Kelly Air Force Base as a
8 whole. They have -- have y'all received correspondence on that
9 from the agency?

10 They will be receiving correspondence from the agency
11 regarding what they call a "Notice of Violation." And I thought
12 that it had been issued, but I guess it hasn't. I work in the
13 waste program and I'm not as familiar with what they call SWQ,
14 Surface Water Quality.

15 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: You were one of the people
16 that responded to that.

17 MS. ABBI POWER: Did I physically go out and respond,
18 no. I made phone calls and obtained information. My
19 co-workers -- people in my office, the Region 13 Office,
20 physically responded and went and saw the fish kill.

21 Now, what -- I have a specific request.

22 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: You got a specific request.

23 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: This one last question. The report
24 that's going to be sent to the Air Force, would they please
25 channel that to the board.

TRS 02/08/05

1 MS. ABBI POWER: The report --

2 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: Not the fine, but the Notice of
3 violation.

4 MS. ABBI POWER: The Notice of Violation? Can you also
5 give them a copy of it? I guess. Yeah. We don't -- we would
6 only give it to the responsible party. We can't hand it out
7 to -- I mean, you can come and request a copy of it or they can
8 provide you a copy of it.

9 DR. DAVID SMITH: Okay, so the action item there is
10 to --

11 MS. ABBI POWER: Find out the status of any
12 correspondence. And anything else?

13 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: Any fines or restocking the
14 fish. That sort of thing.

15 MS. ABBI POWER: No, the fish were not restocked. I
16 know that for a fact.

17 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: Does TCEQ fine people when
18 they make a spill like that?

19 MS. ABBI POWER: Yeah. The first step is that you get
20 a Notice of Violation.

21 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: Yeah.

22 MS. ABBI POWER: Yeah. And You'll get a copy of that
23 whenever it's issued. So I'm going to find out what the status
24 of that letter is, was it send or is it going to be sent or what
25 happened to it.

TRS 02/08/05

1 DR. DAVID SMITH: Trying to move us on again.

2 MS. HENRIETTA LAGRANGE: I would just like to make a
3 request of the people that are with the government to wear a name
4 tag so that they can identify themselves. I'm new and I don't
5 want to be getting -- so if they can wear a name tag or something
6 to let me know who they are and I can ask them directly myself if
7 I have a question.

8 DR. DAVID SMITH: Okay. Let me come back to the
9 agenda, documents to the TRS and the RAB.

10 MS. SONJA CODERRE: The proposed rule for RAB has gone
11 out into the Federal Register and we had what sent over to the
12 information repository. It's 32-CSR-202. And the public comment
13 period is open now until March 29th. And that's one of the
14 things that we'll talk about at the workshop on the 19th. So
15 that's been sent over.

16 MR. RODRIGO GARCIA: And that's the RAB rule or what
17 rules is that?

18 MS. SONJA CODERRE: It is the proposed RAB rule. So
19 the notification that we got awhile back that said, hey, we're
20 going to send this out. It's taken this long for them to
21 actually put the proposed rule in the Federal Register. Now
22 they've opened it up for a public comment period. So now is the
23 time that they'll start taking comments, then they'll review all
24 those comments and then they'll publish the final rule. I'm not
25 aware of their time frame other than needing to have our comments

TRS 02/08/05

1 in by the 29th of March.

2 MR. RODRIGO GARCIA: Is it 30 days, 40 days?

3 MS. SONJA CODERRE: I think it's less than that. I
4 think it's 14.

5 MR. RODRIGO GARCIA: Okay. Can you give us copies?

6 MS. SONJA CODERRE: Well, and we are going to give
7 copies at the workshop on the 19th. So that will be part of the
8 packet and we'll go over all of it.

9 MR. RODRIGO GARCIA: Well, can I get a copy within the
10 next few days. You know I'm going to research and read it.

11 MS. SONJA CODERRE: Right.

12 MR. RODRIGO GARCIA: So I can look at it and write more
13 comments on it. So I'd like to get the copies sooner.

14 MS. SONJA CODERRE: And the copy is actually in the
15 information repository so it will probably take longer to get you
16 your own copy.

17 MS. ABBI POWER: Can you get it online?

18 MS. SONJA CODERRE: Yeah, it is available online.

19 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: How many people -- you know,
20 it's out for public comment. We have 18,000 homes. This is a
21 low income area. Out of those 18,000 homes there's -- I would
22 say there's a very small amount -- less than 25 percent of those
23 homes have computers.

24 MS. SONJA CODERRE: Yes, sir. And that's another
25 reason why in addition to being online it's also in the

TRS 02/08/05

1 information repository, and the RAB members will have it
2 available on the 19th as well.

3 MS. HENRIETTA LAGRANGE: How many copies can I get?
4 I'm going to disburse mine to different communities because
5 that's my way of getting out the information.

6 MS. SONJA CODERRE: Gosh. I don't think we've ever
7 been asked that question before.

8 MS. HENRIETTA LAGRANGE: Because I'm going to a meeting
9 on March the 25th and I'm going to speak to 35 community leaders
10 and I can talk about it then. But there are -- like today, there
11 are a lot of community that are having meetings. In fact, my
12 representative or my alternative -- her name is Adriana Ortega --
13 she lives in the community, but she is in another meeting.
14 That's why she's not here. In fact, she's a cancer survivor.
15 Four of her sisters are cancer survivors and they live within a
16 mile of Kelly. That's why I'm saying, I have a lot of
17 communities that I want them to have those copies.

18 MS. SONJA CODERRE: Right.

19 DR. DAVID SMITH: Okay. Tim has tried to collect some
20 action items -- yes, sir?

21 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: On the RAB rule, I think that
22 ought to be an item at least for the RAB executive committee to
23 comment and also for the whole RAB. We want to -- the RAB wants
24 to make some comments on that RAB rule as to the operations.

25 DR. DAVID SMITH: I think the hard part about that, if

TRS 02/08/05

1 I understand the dates correctly, is that the comments have to be
2 in by March 29. Is that right?

3 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: And we don't meet until
4 April. So we won't -- so the RAB itself will not have an
5 opportunity to comment on it.

6 MS. SONJA CODERRE: Well, the answer to that question,
7 the workshop that we're pulling information together, which is an
8 annual workshop that the Air Force provided to the RAB -- and
9 it's intended for new RAB members, but of course we want anybody
10 from the RAB just to orient you on the rules and how we got
11 there. That is one of the documents that we will go over with
12 those in attendance at the February 19th RAB workshop. And just
13 section by section so that there's a whole understanding of
14 what's in that proposed rule for you to be able to make comments.

15 MR. RODRIGO GARCIA: Armando, I would like to suggest
16 to you and Robert that they run copies of that RAB rule and mail
17 them out tomorrow or the day after to the RAB members. That way
18 by the time we have the workshop, the RAB members will have
19 already read the rule. And if we get it now, it's going to take
20 a lot of time to read through that RAB rule and write your
21 comments. So if we wait until the next meeting, the time period
22 is over. If we wait until the workshop, we -- that cuts down on
23 time. So we need to get it to all RAB members as soon as
24 possible for them to read it, and study it and be ready to
25 comment at the work session. So we need to direct that to

TRS 02/08/05

1 mailing it out tomorrow or the day after to all the RAB members.

2 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: Do you agree with what he
3 said?

4 MR. RODRIGO GARCIA: Do you agree, Robert?

5 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: All right.

6 MR. RODRIGO GARCIA: Put that as an action item.

7 DR. DAVID SMITH: Tell you what, while Tim's working
8 action items into that, why don't we go through the list that we
9 have. The next item on our agendas to ask you to -- ask your
10 approval on the December TRS meeting transcript and summary.
11 You've you all received the summaries. They were mailed twice.

12 And I have extra copies here if somebody needs a copy to look at.

13 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: I got a question before you move to
14 approval. On these minutes, how recently were they just
15 finished? I mean, did they get done yesterday or...

16 MS. SONJA CODERRE: We got the transcript on Monday,
17 Friday. Monday. We received the transcript yesterday.

18 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: So as of Monday they were approved
19 and they were finalized?

20 MS. SONJA CODERRE: I guess I don't understand your
21 question, Mr. Silvas.

22 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: There's a process that y'all go
23 through once you receive the transcripts to spell check.

24 MS. SONJA CODERRE: Correct.

25 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: When was that finished?

TRS 02/08/05

1 MS. CHERI KIRKPATRICK: The hard copy was handed to
2 us on -- Cheri Kirkpatrick, contractor for the Air Force. The
3 transcript -- we received a hard copy version of the transcript
4 to us on Monday; however --

5 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: Last Monday?

6 MS. CHERI KIRKPATRICK: This Monday. Just yesterday
7 afternoon. In terms of reviewing the transcript, that was
8 completed last week.

9 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: I don't really understand. If you
10 received them just Monday --

11 MS. CHERI KIRKPATRICK: Right, in hard copy format.
12 They were given to us electronically earlier so we could make --
13 you know, go over it and ensure that your names were spelled
14 correctly, the proper speaker was identified, that type of thing.

15 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: And so as Friday of last week you
16 had them finalized or this...

17 MS. CHERI KIRKPATRICK: As of Friday last week we were
18 able to provide our court reporter here with our comments
19 electronically in terms of ensuring that your names were spelled
20 correctly.

21 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: Right.

22 MS. CHERI KIRKPATRICK: And once she incorporated
23 those, your names spelled correctly and things, the final copy
24 was handed to us yesterday in hard copy format for distribution
25 to you.

TRS 02/08/05

1 MS. HENRIETTA LAGRANGE: Excuse me. What are we going
2 to do to solve the problem so we can get them faster?

3 DR. DAVID SMITH: Robert?

4 MS. HENRIETTA LAGRANGE: Am I not going to get an
5 answer?

6 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: I think it should be an
7 action item.

8 MS. HENRIETTA LAGRANGE: I'm asking for an answer.

9 MS. SONJA CODERRE: As we discussed in our last RAB, we
10 will work to get them to you faster. We're doing what we can to
11 make that happen.

12 DR. DAVID SMITH: Let's go back to Mr. Perez.

13 MR. NAZIRITE PEREZ: Nazirite Perez. I'll abstained
14 from the vote since I wasn't here.

15 DR. DAVID SMITH: Thank you, sir.

16 MR. RODRIGO GARCIA: One of the objectives I put in
17 that 200, 205 report is that not -- that information be disbursed
18 to RAB members by mail as soon as it is received, like this thing
19 with the RAB rule. As soon as it's received, as soon as we get a
20 report from any of our consultants or anything, as soon as we
21 receive copies from anyone, then mail them to our -- to the RAB
22 members with a note from staff, Review this document because it's
23 going to be reviewed at the next TRS, next RAB, or next work
24 session or something. Because we have a problem with material
25 being distributed to RAB members as soon as it is received into

TRS 02/08/05

1 the office. So we need to give them a directive to do that,
2 because if not we're going to sit on this report. Oh, we got it
3 last week, but you're not going to get it until the RAB meeting.
4 And then you're expected to review it and approve it at the RAB
5 meeting. As soon as the material comes in, send it to the RAB
6 members and say, Oh, in 30 days you have a RAB meeting. Read
7 this report and be ready to comment on it at the RAB meeting.

8 So we need to set up a policy why any material comes
9 in, status line after status on projects and what future projects
10 that we have, any information that comes in that needs to go to
11 RAB members have to be disbursed to RAB members as soon possible
12 with instructions from staff.

13 DR. DAVID SMITH: Do you want to put that on the action
14 items?

15 MS. HENRIETTA LAGRANGE: What's the time limit?

16 DR. DAVID SMITH: What's that?

17 MS. HENRIETTA LAGRANGE: What's the time limit that we
18 need to get it --

19 DR. DAVID SMITH: It's the executive committee's job to
20 set that.

21 MR. RODRIGO GARCIA: We need to set that -- discuss the
22 guidelines and then present it to the RAB.

23 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: In the past I recall that we would
24 hand out materials before finalizing the copies and then a
25 statement would be put to not release any of this upon final

TRS 02/08/05

1 approval. That was done in the past and I think that should, you
2 know, be reconsidered.

3 MR. RODRIGO GARCIA: I think it should. I think what
4 happened was that it was in fact was released. So I think that
5 process has been done.

6 MS. CORIENE HANNAPEL: Can we delay approving these?

7 MR. RODRIGO GARCIA: We haven't had a chance to read
8 them.

9 MS. CORIENE HANNAPEL: For one thing, I just opened it
10 up to Page 68. Now, Abbi Power -- is it Abbi Power?

11 MS. ABBI POWER: Yes, ma'am.

12 MS. CORIENE HANNAPEL: "S at the end?

13 MS. ABBI POWER: No "s".

14 MS. CORIENE HANNAPEL: See, there's several places
15 where you've got an "s" on the end. And, you know, if there's
16 that kind of mistake -- you talked about names -- you know, I
17 don't know what other mistakes there are there. You know, I
18 can't go through this right now and make sure it's all correct.

19 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: Yes. We'll make a motion to delay
20 the approval until the next meeting.

21 DR. DAVID SMITH: Second to that motion?

22 MS. HENRIETTA LAGRANGE: I second.

23 DR. DAVID SMITH: How about the summary? Do we have
24 approval any of it or do want to look at it? You've got the
25 summary for December 22nd.

TRS 02/08/05

1 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: Maybe we should wait. I think
2 instead of -- we'll put that to a vote and have them approved
3 along with the minutes. Go ahead and put that into motion.

4 DR. DAVID SMITH: Somebody?

5 MR. RODRIGO GARCIA: Second.

6 DR. DAVID SMITH: All in favor? Okay. We'll defer
7 that.

8 Okay. Tim, can we go back to the action items?

9 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: Yeah. One more action item.
10 I don't understand the process here of this Technical Review
11 Subcommittee. I understand the RAB has a military co-chair and a
12 civilian co-chair from the community. Who is the military
13 co-chair of this subcommittee and who is -- yeah -- and who is
14 the co-chair for this -- for the community members of the RAB?

15 DR. DAVID SMITH: Armando, I think that, you know, as
16 you will recall, the TRS has been a committee that never had a
17 formal membership nor had a formal chair.

18 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: It did have a formal chair
19 and that was Dr. Lene. It was Dr. Lene.

20 Now, are we -- how are we operating in here? You
21 know, and this sometimes, you know, gets a little bit tricky. I
22 don't think that we're going by the RAB rule, the one that was
23 proposed in '94 and again in '96 and the one in 2004. I don't
24 think we're abiding by that.

25 DR. DAVID SMITH: I think you're probably right, and I

TRS 02/08/05

1 think that's one of the efforts that I heard Ms. Coderre say that
2 that's an effort to really try to bring these pieces together.

3 MS. SONJA CODERRE: And the Air Force is -- my
4 understanding is that the Technical Review Subcommittee is a
5 community member subcommittee of the RAB. This is your
6 opportunity to come together with occasionally your independent
7 TAPP contractor to review the Air Force's information. And the
8 membership is to be determined by you, but was never codified in
9 the operating procedures and those kinds of things, which is also
10 something that we --

11 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: Perhaps that ought to be an
12 action item. Codify the operation of it so that it works
13 smoothly. We definitely need the co-chairs here on this
14 committee.

15 MR. RODRIGO GARCIA: Clarify the operation procedure
16 for the RAB. Second, establish the RAB -- I mean, the community
17 member role in selecting the items for the TRS. And third, give
18 specific instructions on staff, as to what we need from staff for
19 our TRS meetings.

20 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: There's a couple of documents here
21 I need to submit for the community and have Air Force put them in
22 the documentation. One is from Mayor Ed Garza, and the laws of
23 the RAB, and the third one is a chart showing the Computer
24 Services Software contracts from Booze, Allen, Hamilton and SAIC.

25 And finally, I need to get a consensus from the

TRS 02/08/05

1 members right now to have a letter typed up and sent to Mr. Phil
2 Bynum, who is at their Austin office. And I'll submit this
3 letter too for the record. It was brought to my attention that
4 Mr. Pulser (sp) had -- their director -- had -- will approve his
5 attendance as long as I have consensus from the RAB. And so I'd
6 like to get that right now.

7 DR. DAVID SMITH: You won't have a consensus from the
8 RAB because you don't have a majority, we don't have a quorum.

9 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: Well, for the future then, I'd like
10 to put that as an action item to get their consensus.

11 MR. RODRIGO GARCIA: Put it on the agenda for the next
12 meeting.

13 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: Yeah.

14 DR. DAVID SMITH: So, add it to the RAB agenda; is that
15 the right way to say it?

16 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: Yeah.

17 DR. DAVID SMITH: Okay. Tim, you had a bigger job
18 doing the actions items than you would have thought. Tim
19 volunteered, but he didn't know what he was volunteering for.

20 MR. TIM SUELTFUSS: First action -- first recommend
21 action item, community co-chair and installation co-chair invite
22 representatives of the Health Department, the Air Force Center
23 for Environmental Excellence, the University Health System to
24 attend the April RAB to hear Dr. Squibb's presentation.

25 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: Also the appropriate City

TRS 02/08/05

1 Council people, like Patty Radle and Richard Perez --

2 MR. RODRIGO GARCIA: Councilman Barrera.

3 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: And Barrera, Councilman
4 Barrera.

5 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: Ms. Squibb's report or 10-page or
6 20-page report, to include those.

7 DR. DAVID SMITH: You want that sent with the letter;
8 is that what you're saying?

9 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: Yes.

10 MS. CORIENE HANNAPEL: Are we naming those people who
11 are going to be invited?

12 DR. DAVID SMITH: Excuse me?

13 MS. CORIENE HANNAPEL: Are we naming those people who
14 are going to be invited? It was the Health Department and
15 also --

16 MR. TIM SUELTFUSS: The Air Force Center for
17 Environmental Excellence, the Health Department, the University
18 Health System, City Council persons and a note to include the
19 report.

20 MS. CORIENE HANNAPEL: When you say the "University
21 Health System", what do you mean by that?

22 MS. SONJA CODERRE: Mr. Kennedy, as mentioned,
23 Dr. Bradshaw, and Dr. Herbel.

24 MS. CORIENE HANNAPEL: Okay. And I'd also like to add
25 one name to that then, Dr. Claudia Miller, who is a toxicologist

TRS 02/08/05

1 at UT Health Center.

2 MR. TIM SUELTFENFUSS: Mr. Silvas suggested an action
3 item, Air Force provide a copy of Notice of Violation pertaining
4 to the fish kill to the RAB.

5 Mr. Garcia recommended an action item, Air Force
6 distribute RAB rule proposed all RAB members.

7 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: Prior to the 19th of February
8 workshop. We need it before that time so that we can review it.

9 DR. DAVID SMITH: ASAP.

10 MR. RODRIGO GARCIA: ASAP.

11 MR. TIM SUELTFENFUSS: Mr. Garcia recommended an action
12 item, Air Force distribute information to RAB member by mail as
13 soon as possible. Clarification there?

14 MR. RODRIGO GARCIA: Reports, data, action items --

15 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: Minutes.

16 MR. RODRIGO GARCIA: Minutes. Minutes, report, all
17 pertinent information related to RAB activities to be mailed to
18 RAB members as soon as it's received, with instructions from
19 staff as to when it's going to be -- put it on the RAB or TRS
20 meeting for RAB member review.

21 MR. TIM SUELTFENFUSS: Let me restate this to make sure
22 I have it right. Air Force distribute information, including
23 minutes, reports and other pertinent information to RAB members
24 by mail as soon as possible, and include instructions pertaining
25 to when the RAB or TRS will review that information.

TRS 02/08/05

1 Mr. Quintanilla suggested the following action items:
2 How to file the operational procedures for the TRS.

3 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: As far as chairing --
4 chairing of the -- chairing -- yeah, chairing. Especially the --
5 who's going to chair it. Who are the -- who are going to be
6 chair persons?

7 MR. TIM SUELTFENFUSS: Okay. Mr. Silvas suggested an
8 action item, add consensus declaration pertaining to the letter
9 to doctor -- to Mr. Phil Bynum on agenda at the next RAB.

10 Did I get that?

11 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: One last item also. The issue of
12 trying to find more time for meetings for the RAB. And it was
13 brought upon that if meetings could be held on Saturdays, what is
14 the status on that or has that been looked at all?

15 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: Let me give you something to
16 justify that. Meeting every quarter is isolating the members of
17 the community from attending and from participating in this RAB
18 as required by public law.

19 MR. TIM SUELTFENFUSS: Can you restate that action item,
20 sir. I didn't capture it all.

21 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: To have more meetings in the future
22 on Saturdays; if the issue's been looked at.

23 MR. TIM SUELTFENFUSS: So a suggested action item by
24 Mr. Silvas: Have more meetings in the future on Saturdays.

25 MR. GARY MILLER: Are you talking about additional

TRS 02/08/05

1 meetings period? I mean, not -- I mean, over and above what's
2 already scheduled.

3 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: We only schedule four
4 meetings a year.

5 MR. GARY MILLER: Right.

6 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: This is insufficient. We're
7 isolating the community. They don't -- you know, whatever we
8 discussed, you know, in January, we're not going to discuss it
9 again until April, you know, that kind of thing. Or what we
10 discussed in September at the last meeting or in November, we're
11 not discussing it again, as far as the RAB meeting is concerned,
12 until April. That is not good. That isolates the community.
13 The Air Force, you know, more or less is putting up a wall there
14 and we don't want to talk to the community that often, and that's
15 not good.

16 MR. RODRIGO GARCIA: We have so many issues and so many
17 problems -- so many issues and so many -- so much remediation
18 going on that we have enough activities going on that and we can
19 put on -- on meetings on these agenda. Even if we go to meetings
20 once or twice a month, we still have an over abundance of
21 concerns and agenda items to fill up these agendas.

22 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: One more point. We don't
23 have sufficient meetings. For instance, we should have elected
24 the RAB members and the RAB co-chair way back in December because
25 come January when we had the elections, we had several RAB

TRS 02/08/05

1 members that could not vote. We did not have a co-chair. We
2 illegally appointed the Parliamentarian to chair the meeting when
3 the Charter says it must be elected. You know, those kinds of
4 things.

5 MS. SONJA CODERRE: Well, Mr. Quintanilla, I'd like to
6 take exception to the "illegally elected." When it's not defined
7 in the Charter, the Charter relies on Robert's rules of orders --
8 Robert's rule of order to determine who would chair that meeting.
9 And that's how the process went. There were motions made and the
10 meeting moved on. It was not an illegal process,
11 Mr. Quintanilla.

12 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: Ma'am, I disagree with you
13 and we're going to call it quits after this one. The Charter
14 states that the co-chair will be elected by a majority of the RAB
15 members. Check it out.

16 MR. TIM SUELTFUSS: Do I need to revise this action
17 item? I have: Have more meetings in the future on Saturdays.

18 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: One last thing, the issue about the
19 next round of elections. What's being done to move up those
20 elects to the proper timeframe?

21 MS. SONJA CODERRE: Currently the elections are being
22 held in place on the October RAB meeting that we have on the
23 calendar. Because Mr. Quintanilla identified that during those
24 discussions, we've moved it to the October meeting, tentative
25 calendar.

TRS 02/08/05

1 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: You're correct. The Charter
2 specifically states that the RAB elections shall be held in the
3 fall of each year.

4 MS. SONJA CODERRE: Mr. Quintanilla, the Charter
5 specifically states that normally elections will be held in the
6 fall.

7 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: Good technicality there.
8 Normally. But, you see, somebody didn't normally do this.

9 MS. SONJA CODERRE: And you're correct. For four years
10 they weren't normally held in the fall.

11 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: We should do it right the
12 first time. We shouldn't be having this discussion.

13 MS. SONJA CODERRE: Yes, sir, Mr. Quintanilla.

14 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: To -- then again, let's address
15 this as an item to put back in writing so the new members in
16 their next election will be aware of that.

17 MR. TIM SUELTFUSS: Can you restate that for me, sir?

18 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: To put down in writing that the
19 elections will be held in October for the next round of
20 elections.

21 MR. TIM SUELTFUSS: I captured that as a recommended
22 action item as put down in writing that the next round of
23 elections be held in October. Is that right?

24 Let me verify this last action item here. Add
25 consensus declaration pertaining to the draft letter to Mr. Phil

TRS 02/08/05

1 Bynum on agenda at the next RAB. Is that right?

2 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: Yes.

3 MR. TIM SUELTFENFUSS: That's all I have.

4 DR. DAVID SMITH: Okay. We are full -- we are through
5 the administrative section of the agenda, having recognized that
6 we have moved the approves to the next meeting.

7 The RAB workshop, which has been discussed a couple
8 times here, just say to you out loud is scheduled for
9 February 19, 2005, 8:00 a.m. in the GKDA Offices. Lunch,
10 however, is your own.

11 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: How come that -- on what date
12 does that fall? Is that during the week?

13 MS. SONJA CODERRE: That's on a Saturday,
14 Mr. Quintanilla.

15 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: On Saturday?

16 MS. SONJA CODERRE: Yes, sir.

17 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: That's my weekend, you know.

18 MS. SONJA CODERRE: We offered it at the RAB meeting on
19 the 18th of January for the RAB members to vote on which date
20 they would prefer to hold it and Saturday was the date that was
21 chosen by the RAB committee.

22 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: How much votes?

23 MS. SONJA CODERRE: Sir, I'm unaware of that number.

24 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: Okay, that's fine. Now, are
25 you going to have an agenda item on the RAB rule on -- at that

TRS 02/08/05

1 workshop?

2 MS. SONJA CODERRE: Yes, sir. That was one of the
3 things we will absolutely go through and discuss.

4 DR. DAVID SMITH: Okay. Next TRS scheduled for
5 March 8, 2005, at 6:30.

6 MS. SONJA CODERRE: Which raises another issue. Sorry.
7 The reason the location is to be determined is because Brentwood
8 School now has an after-school care program that makes that
9 facility unavailable for any other use until roughly 7:30 at
10 night.

11 Mr. Silvas, there was some discussion at one of our
12 meetings that you were going to make contact -- I don't remember
13 if it was through Brentwood, but that means that that's an issue.
14 So we need to discuss location with for future meetings and kind
15 of consider that as action item for the future meetings.

16 DR. DAVID SMITH: How about we put that on the action
17 item list, please, for the executive committee.

18 MS. HENRIETTA LAGRANGE: Are you specifically tied to
19 this area?

20 MS. ABBI POWER: Yes.

21 MS. SONJA CODERRE: Yes, ma'am.

22 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: This is where the
23 contamination is.

24 MS. HENRIETTA LAGRANGE: Because I wonder -- St. Mary's
25 has a room where a lot of people meet and you're able to put your

TRS 02/08/05

1 PowerPoint. They have desks and it's open and it's free to the
2 community. It's by the SBC Center.

3 MR. RODRIGO GARCIA: That's a little out of our
4 jurisdiction.

5 DR. DAVID SMITH: Okay. Next RAB meeting is scheduled
6 for April 19th. Location still remains on that list.

7 Next item I have on the list is question of
8 adjournment.

9 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: Before you adjourn, I just
10 have a question. In the past when we've had workshops, we've
11 also had lunch. Why are we not having lunch now?

12 MS. SONJA CODERRE: Sir, we are certainly having lunch.

13 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: I thought you said, lunch on
14 your own.

15 MS. SONJA CODERRE: It is lunch on your own. We will
16 be breaking for lunch. Yes, sir.

17 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: Yes, but the lunch was
18 provided by the Air Force.

19 MS. SONJA CODERRE: Again, the lunch previously was not
20 provided by the Air Force. The lunch previously was provided by
21 generous members of the Air Force community who dug into their
22 own pockets.

23 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: Again, referring back to the
24 law. The law says that there be funding for -- to ease the
25 participation for RAB members.

TRS 02/08/05

1 MS. SONJA CODERRE: Yes, sir.

2 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: Why is there no funding for
3 this workshop?

4 MS. SONJA CODERRE: Mr. Quintanilla, the Federal
5 Acquisition Regulations do not allow us to purchase meals.

6 MR. NAZIRITE PEREZ: I'll bring my lunch. It's okay.

7 MR. RODRIGO GARCIA: If we can't get them to fund all
8 our cleanup programs, Armando, how can you expect them to fund
9 lunch?

10 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: Oh, we got funds for cleanup.
11 They're cleaning up the golf course ahead of ours.

12 MR. DAVID PLYLAR: I just want to -- there's some
13 unfinished business here. I just wanted to let you know that I
14 called Patty Radle. She said that she had received the reports
15 on Friday from Dr. Guerra's office, but she had not told me about
16 it. She said that they were available. She's going to have her
17 secretary reproduce copies for any member of the RAB who wants
18 those answers to Dr. Guerra's question.

19 I wouldn't try to get a hold of those things tomorrow
20 if they're going to be printing them up. But it's my guess is if
21 you call Thursday or Friday and then went down to Council
22 Chambers -- not to Council Chambers, but to her office at City
23 Hall, you could get copies to the answers.

24 DR. DAVID SMITH: Thank you. I'm still entertaining
25 that --

TRS 02/08/05

1 MS. HENRIETTA LAGRANGE: Could I call and get it faxed?

2 Could I call and get it faxed?

3 MR. DAVID PLYLAR: I didn't hear you.

4 MS. HENRIETTA LAGRANGE: Could I call and get it faxed?

5 DR. DAVID SMITH: Can it be faxed?

6 MR. DAVID PLYLAR: Sure. You can call. I don't know
7 if they could do that. I work out of my car.

8 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: They could mail it to you.

9 DR. DAVID SMITH: Guys, we're kind of moving off the
10 RAB activity here and into something else. I'm looking for that
11 motion to adjournment.

12 MR. PETE MUZQUIZ: Motion.

13 DR. DAVID SMITH: Thank you, sir. Second?

14 MR. NAZIRITE PEREZ: Second.

15 DR. DAVID SMITH: Thank you. Any opposed? Meeting
16 adjourned.

17 (8:26 p.m.)

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

TRS 02/08/05

1 STATE OF TEXAS)

2 COUNTY OF BEXAR)

3

4 I, Vickie-Lee Garza, Certified Shorthand Reporter, do
5 hereby certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript, to the
6 best of my ability, of the proceedings held in this matter.

7

8 4/14/05
DATE

Vickie-Lee Garza
VICKIE-LEE GARZA, CSR

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

FINAL PAGE

ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD

FINAL PAGE