



KELLY AFB  
TEXAS

---

ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD  
COVER SHEET

AR File Number 3266.1

TRS 12/13/04

1 \* \* \* \* \*

2 KELLY TRS MEETING

3 \* \* \* \* \*

4

5 MEETING TO DISCUSS

6 ATSDR REPORT

7 DECEMBER 13, 2004

8 6:30 - 8:43 P.M.

9

10 ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH & WELLNESS CENTER

11 911 CASTROVILLE ROAD

12 SAN ANTONIO TEXAS

13

14

15

16

17 APPEARANCES:

18

19 Dr. David Smith; Ms. Esmeralda Galvan;

20 Mr. Robert Silvas; Ms. Leigh-Ann Fabianke;

21 Mr. Armando Quintanilla; Ms. Robyn Thompson;

22 Mr. Tim Sultenfuss; Ms. Abbi Power;

23 Mr. Michael Sheneman; Ms. Norma Landez;

24 Mr. Gary Miller; Ms. Ashley Allinder;

25 Mr. Mark Weegar; Ms. Sonja Coderre;

Mr. Jeff Neathery; Mr. Glenn Wilkinson;

Mr. Don Buetler;

And others in attendance who were not identified.

TRS 12/13/04

1 (6:33 p.m. MEETING CALLED TO ORDER)

2 DR. DAVID SMITH: If you all will have a seat, we'll go  
3 ahead and get started.

4 Okay. I'd like to welcome you to the December 13th  
5 meeting of the Technical Review Subcommittee for Kelly  
6 Restoration Advisory Board. My name is David Smith.

7 And just real quickly, RAB members, folks, we'll run  
8 through the agenda. RAB members, you have little packets in  
9 front of you and we'll run through that packet real quickly and  
10 then talk about this meeting per se.

11 The packet that's put back in here has primarily the  
12 information regarding the presentation for tonight, the Zone 2/3  
13 CMS. That is followed by information on RAB recruitment.  
14 Followed by the summary for the TRS meeting of August 10, and the  
15 meeting minutes of the June 8th meeting. So that makes up the  
16 bulk of the packet you have in front of you. We'll be addressing  
17 all of those things we go through this evening.

18 The agenda itself calls for us to do a review of the  
19 Technical Assistance for Public Participation for Zones 2/3  
20 Corrective Measures Study. Mr. Jeff Neathery from Neathery  
21 Environmental Services, you'll recall is the person you  
22 contracted to do that review, and he will make that presentation  
23 and then we'll follow that question and answer with a community  
24 comment session as it pertains to that TAPP review.

25 Administrative issues. Standard ones. We'll go

TRS 12/13/04

1 through them quickly. The BCT update, the Spill Summary Report,  
2 the transmittal of documents to the TRS and the RAB, comments on  
3 the RAB recruitment, a review of the Action Items from the  
4 previous meeting, and of course, we're going ask you to look at  
5 the meeting transcript and summary of the June meeting minutes  
6 that we mentioned to you before. So somewhere in there if you  
7 can make a point to look at those.

8 And we'll then go through the closing activities and  
9 pick up anything we need to, do the Action Items to the upcoming  
10 meetings and continue to move in that direction.

11 As I said, the purpose of this meeting is to receive  
12 the report on the TAPP reviews, Zones 2/3 CMS, and to give you an  
13 opportunity to raise questions, make comments, and to respond to  
14 those.

15 We have that followed by a question and answer  
16 session, community comment period, on the TAPP review. We'll do  
17 that the same way we have in the past. Before that presentation  
18 is made, we'll ask if you have questions right off the top that  
19 you know you want to ask and Tim and Robyn will try to get those  
20 on the board. If the presenter can respond to those during his  
21 presentation, he certainly will. When we get done with the  
22 presentation, we'll ask you if there are any additional questions  
23 and try to give you a chance to make additional comments to those  
24 also.

25 Mr. Silvas, I have a request here that one of the

TRS 12/13/04

1 community members, Mr. Wilkinson, has requested a three-minute  
2 comment period that is not on our agenda. Do you want to do that  
3 or save that for later?

4 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: Let's do that right before the RAB  
5 vote.

6 DR. DAVID SMITH: All right. We'll hold on to that.  
7 Okay. With your permission then, we'll get started on the real  
8 beat of the meeting.

9 I asked Mr. Neathery if there's anything special he  
10 wanted me to say about him and he said no. He said he's a lucky  
11 person to do this work and he'd be happy to explain it to you as  
12 much as he could. Jeff Neathery from Neathery Environment  
13 Services. You've heard him before.

14 Jeff, do you want to step up and we'll give you the  
15 show.

16 MR. JEFF NEATHERY: Are there any questions?

17 DR. DAVID SMITH: Sorry about that. Are there  
18 questions from the audience that you know that you want to ask  
19 Mr. Neathery that you want to have on the list before we get  
20 started?

21 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: Yes. I think there's one that  
22 needs to be addressed. The concern of benzopyrene and the above  
23 safety workers limits. Has that been an issue with this draft  
24 final? Has it been taken up?

25 DR. DAVID SMITH: Okay. Are there more?

TRS 12/13/04

1           Okay. That's enough to get started with. We'll go  
2 ahead and start.

3           I asked Mr. Neathery to make his presentation and I'm  
4 going to ask you to save your questions until the end of his  
5 presentation. So if you have any, jot them down real quickly so  
6 we don't lose them in the process.

7           MR. JEFF NEATHERY: Thank you. I guess, as he's  
8 already stated, what we did was we reviewed the CMS study for  
9 Zones 2 and 3, which was a draft final. The purpose was to  
10 conduct a review of this and then report our results. The report  
11 was prepared by Science Applications International, SAIC, to  
12 include -- basically what we're doing is a simple explanation of  
13 what they did. And then a technical review of the document. So  
14 there's two parts of this.

15           And the first part, we're just going to kind of go  
16 through the report, what they presented, how they presented it,  
17 and kind of give you an English version of it, and then we'll get  
18 into the technical review of it later.

19           The reviewers of the document were myself and  
20 Dr. Chris Mathewson from Texas A&M University.

21           This report was reviewed as a stand-alone document.  
22 In Section 3 of the this report, which is a description of the  
23 current conditions and the conceptual site model. There's a lot  
24 of work in there that -- that obviously a lot of investigations  
25 have been done on these sites and it was not really our job to go

TRS 12/13/04

1 back and see if any of that investigative work was correct or  
2 whatever. We just assumed that the information that was used in  
3 this report was accurate. And so we just reviewed this report as  
4 a stand-alone document.

5           Basically, the report -- this is pretty much the  
6 table of contents. There was an executive summary. It got into  
7 the introduction and purpose, which we'll go into. They had to  
8 come up with what the media cleanup standards were going to be.  
9 Again, the description of the current conditions and conceptual  
10 site models. Then they went in and did a detailed development  
11 and analysis of the source area alternatives.

12           Then they also looked at groundwater. And what they  
13 did was they separated groundwater out as a single unit and did  
14 an area-wide groundwater analysis, and then they came up with  
15 their recommended alternatives.

16           The purpose of the CMS is to evaluate and recommend  
17 soil and groundwater final remediation alternatives for Zones 2  
18 and 3 sites determined to have chemicals of concern that exceed  
19 the Risk Reduction No. 2 criteria.

20           There were 14 sites that were originally looked at.  
21 Eight sites were found to exceed the Risk Reduction No. 2  
22 criteria. There were two of them in Zone 2 -- Site E-1 and  
23 building 522. And then there were a number of them in Zone 3.  
24 Actually in the report they combined Building 360 as one source  
25 unit, but they talked about the north west corner and the

TRS 12/13/04

1 basement separately.

2           Media cleanup standards were calculated for the  
3 chemicals of concern for each of the sites that exceeded the Risk  
4 Reduction 2 standards. These cleanup standards were calculated  
5 for both the soil and the groundwater. The soil cleanup, again,  
6 for the eight sites were addressed individually, and the  
7 groundwater plum was addressed as one whole unit.

8           The evaluation and criteria, there were several  
9 things. Number One, they were looking at the overall protection  
10 of human health in the environment; the attainment of media  
11 cleanup standards; control source of releases; compliance with  
12 applicable standards for management of wastes; long-term  
13 reliability and effectiveness; the overall reduction of the  
14 toxicity, mobility or volume of the waste or contaminants; looked  
15 at short-term effectiveness; and they also looked at  
16 implementability and costs.

17           We'll take the first site here, which is in Zone 2.  
18 This is Site E-1. They looked at a total of eight different  
19 alternatives. I won't read through each one of these; they're  
20 listed in the packet that you have. But there's some -- there's  
21 an existing collection trench that's on there. They looked at  
22 some of the technology soil vapor, heating, vitrification,  
23 bioaugmentation. So there are a number of different sites that  
24 they looked at or different alternatives that they looked at.

25           For each of the alternatives, they came up with an



TRS 12/13/04

1 estimate for the capital cost for the operation and maintenance  
2 costs, for the total cost, and then also came up with duration,  
3 an estimated time duration to achieve the cleanup standards. And  
4 as you can see, they've done this for each one of the  
5 alternatives.

6           Having done this and having gone through it, there  
7 were tables that were in the report. They talked about each of  
8 these criteria that we just discussed. They came up with a  
9 coding system. Basically the open circle means that it does not  
10 meet the criteria. The close circle means that it does meet the  
11 criteria. And where you see the half circle, there's going to be  
12 somewhere in between. It's moderately effected. So for each one  
13 of the alternative listed across the top, and each one of the  
14 different categories, you can see just in a visual manner, about  
15 how each of these alternatives pans out.

16           And having looked at this then, for Site E-1, their  
17 recommendation was Alternative 5, which was Vadose Zone soil  
18 excavation and continued trench operation with some limited  
19 excavation of the contaminated soils. So in this one they picked  
20 a combination of two alternatives.

21           Again, Building 522 -- I'll just kind of go through  
22 these --

23           MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: Is that the one that's going  
24 to take 120 years to do?

25           MR. JEFF NEATHERY: Let me back up. You're talking

TRS 12/13/04

1 about E-1?

2 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: Yes.

3 MR. JEFF NEATHERY: Yeah. Here one of the alternatives  
4 is 120 years.

5 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: Thanks for pointing that out, sir.

6 MR. JEFF NEATHERY: Well, I haven't gotten to the  
7 technical review part of this yet. I'm just going by basically  
8 what they presented.

9 Again, for Building 522, they came up with five  
10 different alternatives. Again, they came up with a capital cost,  
11 operation, maintenance and total duration. They came up with a  
12 comparative analysis and they came up with bioaugmentation and  
13 soil vapor extraction.

14 Building 301, these are the six alternatives that  
15 they came up with. The cost and duration, the comparative  
16 analysis, and then their alternatives. And, again, this one was  
17 maintain the permeable reactive barrier and also do some  
18 six-phase heatings.

19 Now, when I get into the technical review we'll go  
20 back and look at some of the nuts and bolts. So I'm just kind of  
21 glossing over this. This is what just was presented in their  
22 report.

23 The northwest corner, Building 360, they had four  
24 alternatives that they looked at. Again, the cost and duration,  
25 the comparative analysis.

TRS 12/13/04

1 MR. GLENN WILKINSON: Can we go back to that one with  
2 the heater.

3 DR. DAVID SMITH: Let's save the questions, please.

4 MR. JEFF NEATHERY: Comparative analysis, and they  
5 recommended soil vapor extraction.

6 Building 360 basement, again, there's four  
7 alternatives. And if you'll notice, alternative one is the  
8 always the "no action." This kind of give a baseline if they  
9 didn't do anything, what would happen to it, and that's just  
10 standard.

11 The capital costs, operation costs and duration. And  
12 then once again, the alternatives for the Building 360 basement.  
13 And they came up with bioaugmentation for Building 360.

14 Building 528 (sic), they had some different DNAPLs  
15 Again, they came up with seven different alternatives. And you  
16 can see here, there's one that's 1000 years in this one. So for  
17 Building 528, again --

18 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: 258, isn't it?

19 MR. JEFF NEATHERY: This is the comparative analysis,  
20 and they came up with Alternative No. 2, which is not the 1000  
21 year one.

22 Building 348, there were four alternatives that were  
23 listed. They came up with the cost and duration, and, again, the  
24 comparative analysis and the alternative, and they came up with  
25 Alternative Four, which is soil vapor extraction and passive

TRS 12/13/04

1 bailing.

2 Building 324, there were four alternatives. The cost  
3 and duration for those. Here they came up with a comparative  
4 analysis and came up with alternative for soil vapor extraction.

5 That's the last of the sites. Then we have the  
6 groundwater, which was considered as one large area. It had five  
7 alternatives that they looked at for that. They have their cost  
8 and duration. Again, you're looking here, everything's in the  
9 20, 25-year range. The comparative analysis and then their  
10 recommended alternative. The recommended alternative also had  
11 the caveat and chromium bioremediation, but I didn't really see  
12 that discussed as one alternatives, so I'm not really sure where  
13 that came from.

14 Okay. As far as the technical review goes, what I've  
15 done is on each of these -- the pages are well numbered in the  
16 report itself, so I go by the page number and whatever the  
17 figure. But on Pages 3-5 and 3-6 there are two figures there.  
18 There's the same pattern difference, the soil boring and the  
19 interpretation. What I'm talking about is right here, here is  
20 figure 3-2 on this side, and here is figure 3-3 over here. These  
21 are the same patterns here, but you can see the pattern shows up  
22 different in the two diagrams. It might be just a factor of the  
23 scale, but they really need to be consistent so that someone  
24 looking at the two diagrams doesn't get confused that they're two  
25 different things.

TRS 12/13/04

1           Also, if you look at this boring right here, B-115, the  
2 lithology in this one is consistent down here at the bottom, but  
3 if you notice here it changes. And so I don't know which one of  
4 these is right, but it's the same boring but there's two  
5 different lithologies.

6           MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: And why is that?

7           MR. JEFF NEATHERY: I don't know.

8           MR. MICHAEL SHENEMAN: One thing is --

9           DR. DAVID SMITH: I need to ask you to just hold  
10 questions.

11           MR. JEFF NEATHERY: The scale is the same. I mean,  
12 I've made these two, but the scale comes out the same on both.  
13 It's a change in lithology; it's not change in scale. And I  
14 don't know if it's just whoever did the drawing, did something  
15 incorrect or what. I don't know.

16           MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: This study was done by what  
17 company?

18           MR. JEFF NEATHERY: SAIC.

19           MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: SAIC.

20           MR. JEFF NEATHERY: Here's another area where there's  
21 some geological things that are not correct. You'll see here  
22 there's a boring here and there's a geological mention that comes  
23 here and it seems to stop at the boring. It doesn't go through,  
24 and you see the same thing here at the top. So there's some  
25 busts in some of the geologic interpretation and in some of the

TRS 12/13/04

1 creations of these drawings. So they're just not right.

2           Again, in the next one, this gravel strata right here  
3 looks to be inverted. If you know about how gravel channels  
4 work, it should be turned. And if that's what the interpretation  
5 is, it should be turned the other way around.

6           In the text of the thing they talked about PCE in the  
7 subsurface soil being the only contamination present, as shown in  
8 Table 3-7. In Table 3-7 they spell it as tetrachloroethylene.  
9 And I would just recommend getting consistent. We call it TCE  
10 here and TCE there. It can be confusing if someone doesn't know  
11 what that is.

12           MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: Is that in your  
13 recommendations?

14           MR. JEFF NEATHERY: Yeah.

15           Here in this figure they talk about three borings,  
16 but they're not shown and it just looks like this slide had been  
17 produced by some type of a model or something. But it seems kind  
18 of odd that the contamination area is perfectly circular and  
19 there's no containing point around there to support that. So I  
20 would just recommend that those points be added so we can get a  
21 better idea of what's happening.

22           This one, I put this in red. They're recommend using  
23 8,000 gallons of vegetable oil to help with the remediation of  
24 the site. I initially thought that sounds like a lot; one gallon  
25 for every 3.4 yards of soil. Then I got to thinking about it,

TRS 12/13/04

1 well, you know a dump truck holds about six yards, that's two  
2 gallons per dump truck so maybe that's not so much after all. So  
3 I'll probably withdraw this comment, but I went ahead with the  
4 presentation because I had it in the report.

5           Figure 4-2. We may have to go back and forth on this  
6 one. It talks about how those groundwater trenches continue to  
7 operate, that they excavated out. If you look at it right here,  
8 this line, this existing trench -- it's here, but it looks like  
9 they're talking excavating it out. And there's no provision in  
10 the report for, is it going to be put back? Is it going to be  
11 left? Are they going to try to protect it? There's nothing  
12 there, but it looks like they're going to be excavating through  
13 it.

14           And you have the same thing on -- go back one -- on  
15 4-17. If you look on 4-17, it talks about soil vitrification and  
16 how vitrification is going to impact that trench.

17           Figure 4-11, here they have permeable reactive barrier,  
18 which is this line right here. Again, they're talking excavating  
19 these soils out. What happens to the trench? Do you excavate  
20 out the trench? Do you protect the trench? Do you replace the  
21 trench? There's nothing in the report that addresses those  
22 issues.

23           MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: And those are critical to  
24 you?

25           MR. JEFF NEATHERY: Well, yeah.

TRS 12/13/04

1 MR. MICHAEL SHENEMAN: Yeah, they are.

2 MR. JEFF NEATHERY: What's going to happen to this? I  
3 mean, the trench is there -- the barrier is there for a reason.

4 MR. MICHAEL SHENEMAN: For a reason.

5 MR. JEFF NEATHERY: And if you take out part of it,  
6 you're going to lose the effectiveness for that area. So, again,  
7 what happens to the trench? And, again, you know, are there  
8 going to be additional costs associated with protection of it?

9 Here again, this is the same area, but we're looking  
10 at these borings here that they're going to be using for  
11 bioaugmentation. There's nothing -- Area D -- is not addressed.

12 Again, this is the same area. You're looking at soil  
13 vapor extraction. Again, you've got soil vapor extraction and  
14 you've got a permeable reactive barrier. And the question I have  
15 is that: Has anybody looked at how is the permeable reactive  
16 barrier going to effect this -- effectiveness of the soil vapor?  
17 It may not effect it at all. I don't know, but I think that  
18 that's something that needs to be addressed in the report,  
19 whether it will effect it or not.

20 Again, the same thing, permeable reactive barrier,  
21 here. They're looking at doing some heating. And again, what is  
22 the heating? When you start heating up the barriers and heating  
23 this area around it, is that going to have any impact on the  
24 effectiveness of the barriers?

25 It's talking about here, on lines 11 through 13, the



TRS 12/13/04

1 estimated time required for the treatment of six-phase heating is  
2 six months. Industrial activities in the immediate area of the  
3 six-phase heating will only be temporarily disrupted during well  
4 and electrode installations.

5 Here they're going to be installing the wells and  
6 electrodes vertically, which means you're going to have the wires  
7 and the piping and all that stuff at the surface. So I would  
8 imagine that that area is going to be unusable for the whole  
9 duration.

10 MR. MARK WEEGAR: No. They're -- they're actually  
11 doing this -- have done this inside of Building, I think, 181 at  
12 Air Force Plant 4 in Fort Worth. It's an active facility and  
13 they're building aircraft.

14 MR. JEFF NEATHERY: In another part of this report,  
15 they talk about installing horizontally to alleviate this  
16 problem, but then they turn around and say that they do it here.  
17 So unless there's some other way that they're going to be doing  
18 it and talk about it one way in one area and then another way in  
19 another.

20 MR. MARK WEEGAR: Just to answer the question.

21 MR. JEFF NEATHERY: Yeah.

22 MR. MARK WEEGAR: This is being -- has been done inside  
23 a building that was actually being used while they're doing it.

24 MR. JEFF NEATHERY: Okay.

25 MR. MARK WEEGAR: So don't I think it's rendered an

TRS 12/13/04

1 unusable area.

2 MS. ESMERALDA GALVAN: But it's good that you brought  
3 it up. It is a concern when you have loved ones working there.

4 MR. JEFF NEATHERY: Again, on this one here, this  
5 little diagram here is for sheet piling. They're going to be  
6 excavating. Here's the contaminated area. They have sheet  
7 piling on this side for this excavation, but it doesn't appear  
8 like they've got sheet piling on the other side for this  
9 excavation. I don't know if that's an omission, but it looks  
10 like there needs to be sheet piling along this portion as well.  
11 This is a slurry wall that goes through here. So obviously they  
12 want to maintain the integrity of the slurry wall, they don't  
13 want to dig through it. So again, if you're going to protect it,  
14 you have to put sheet piling on this side.

15 The same thing here. Here they're looking at, you  
16 know, doing some excavation again, but there's no sheet piling at  
17 all shown on this one. And they're also talking about doing some  
18 of the soil heating on this side, but there's nothing shown on  
19 this side, so I don't know if they plan on excavating that or  
20 not. It wasn't really clear in the description of what they did.

21 Here it says the calibration fluid has not been  
22 characterized chemically. Only fingerprint and total petroleum  
23 hydrocarbon analysis have been performed. Thus, there are no  
24 chemical contaminants that exceed site cleanup criteria.

25 It just seems odd if it hasn't been characterized

TRS 12/13/04

1 chemically, how can you say that there's no chemical of concern?  
2 It just doesn't make sense that you can dismiss it just because  
3 you didn't analyze for it. Unless there's some additional  
4 information not in here.

5           Again, here is another deal where we have that same  
6 one where the area of contamination is circular. And that just  
7 normally is not found in nature.

8           The other question that I had that was not addressed  
9 is: What is the criteria? What is the cost, for example,  
10 because that's easiest one to put a number to.

11           Here you have the cost. It's obviously a good cost.  
12 They're meeting criteria. This one does. This one is somewhere  
13 in the middle. But nowhere in the report is there a breakdown of  
14 what is considered good, what is considered not acceptable, what  
15 is considered -- and really that same thing goes.

16           Now, granted a lot of these things, in terms of  
17 implementability, you can't put a number to it. You can't say  
18 that four is good and five is bad. But I just wish that there  
19 were a little better explanation of how they came up -- and if  
20 you go back and you look at tables, they talk about the things  
21 and they talk about a lot of these issues, but there's just not  
22 really any way to kind of go from the tables that they had to  
23 this table here. I just wish there was a little more  
24 information.

25           Here is the chart, the comparative analysis of

TRS 12/13/04

1 groundwater. They says it's to Building 522. I think that's  
2 just a typo.

3           This is now getting into review of what their  
4 recommendations are. It says for Site E-1, Alternative 4 is  
5 preferable. Alternative 6 or 8 due to the lower assurance of  
6 contaminant removal. But if you look at the same table, it shows  
7 that Alternative 6 appears -- just looking at this table -- to be  
8 the best alternative. You know, it's in the ball park in costs  
9 and meets everything else. Yet in the explanation of why they  
10 chose Alternative 4 and part of 3, you can see the long-term  
11 effectiveness of three isn't there, the short-term effectiveness  
12 of four isn't there. But just by looking at the chart, it looks  
13 like Alternative 6 is the best one, but that's not the one they  
14 chose. And there's just not enough explanation to show why they  
15 didn't chose -- they didn't choose this one. Again, it may be  
16 because the criteria they used for coming up with these dots and  
17 circles and stuff isn't spelled out.

18           Again, for Building 522, Alternative 4 is preferable.  
19 But according to the table, Alternative 5 appears to be the best.  
20 It meets all the criteria and it's only moderately higher in cost  
21 and 10 years shorter in duration. Again, here you can see  
22 Alternative 4, you know, there's just a couple hundred thousand  
23 dollars difference and it's going to be ten years in operation  
24 and five years in monitoring. And this is just going to be five  
25 years of monitoring. And if you look at the alternatives,

TRS 12/13/04

1 Alternative 5, based on their chart, appears to be better than  
2 Alternative 4. Again, there's just not enough explanation as to  
3 why they chose 4 over 5.

4 For Building 360 in the basement area the report says  
5 there's difficulties with the bioaugmentation tests, yet it still  
6 recommends bioaugmentation. Here it says, "Based on the  
7 experience with hydraulic control aspects of the Building 360  
8 bioaugmentation test, a bioaugmentation measure may be difficult  
9 to implement successfully." Yet they turn around and recommend  
10 and that's what they do. And if you look at -- again, they pick  
11 bioaugmentation. But, again, it looks like Alternative 4, which  
12 would get you at the same place. And admittedly they said that  
13 had some problems with bioaugmentation test. So again, I don't  
14 know why they came up with the recommendations that they came up  
15 with because it doesn't really necessary match what they have on  
16 the tables.

17 Again, Building 258. Alternative 2 scores marginally  
18 in attainment of cleanup standards and reduction of toxicity,  
19 mobility or volume. Alternative 6 scores better in these areas  
20 and costs less. Again, they recommended Alternative 2. But if  
21 you look at Alternative 6, it appears to be the better  
22 alternative.

23 So basically my conclusions are, overall the report  
24 was well-organized. It was pretty clearly written. It easy to  
25 understand what they did. There weren't a lot of distractions

TRS 12/13/04

1 that were caused by, you know, production problems and  
2 typographic problems and things like that. There are some  
3 technical things that need clarification. You know, some of the  
4 cross sections with the geology and getting lithology and  
5 everything correct.

6           And then also, the recommendations for some of the  
7 alternatives in some of the areas don't seem to correspond with  
8 the best apparent alternatives that they have on the table. And  
9 I just don't have an explanation for that. I think that's some  
10 serious concerns that either those tables are wrong issue or they  
11 made the wrong recommendations or that there's -- somewhere  
12 there's a disconnect.

13           So my recommendations are to revise or clarify the  
14 technical issues that were listed in this report. And I  
15 recommend that the alternatives need to be re-evaluated or at  
16 least a better explanation provided as to why those alternatives  
17 were picked when it appears on the table that there were better  
18 alternatives.

19           MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: When do you plan to give this  
20 report to the RAB? January the 18th?

21           MR. JEFF NEATHERY: Yeah, the 18th.

22           DR. DAVID SMITH: How about if we do this: I know  
23 there's certainly a lot of questions. Are there some in  
24 particular that you know right now that you want to get on the  
25 board?

TRS 12/13/04

1 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: Yes. First all, there was another  
2 review done by Patrick Lynch on the same Zone 2 and 3, and that  
3 should have been taken into consideration. Is there a reason it  
4 wasn't looked at?

5 MR. JEFF NEATHERY: His review?

6 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: Yes.

7 MR. JEFF NEATHERY: I didn't know there was another  
8 review.

9 MR. MARK WEEGAR: He reviewed the, I think, the Zone 2  
10 and 3 R-5, not the CMS.

11 MS. ABBI POWERS: The Zone 3 area.

12 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: What I'm getting at, there were  
13 numerous, numerous problems that you're pointing out with the  
14 same company, SAIC, who in my opinion has been, you know, letting  
15 down in a lot of areas that you pointed out. And it's ongoing  
16 because Mr. Lynch apparently found discrepancies just like you  
17 have. This is an ongoing problem and I want the Air Force to  
18 have a written response to your concerns and have that put  
19 forward.

20 And also I think you need to get into that report and  
21 the Air Force's written comments on his too because you need to  
22 have everything available and I don't think you're getting that.

23 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: Well, I don't think that he's  
24 getting paid for that one. He's just getting paid for CMS.

25 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: Right. But that study Lynch did,

TRS 12/13/04

1 SAIC was also, you know involved in that. And they're running  
2 into the same problem -- inconsistency, data being mislabeled and  
3 misused and it's -- I'm really concerned.

4 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: So am I. But I think that  
5 the best place to bring up that concern that you have is at the  
6 total RAB meeting and bring it up to the attention of the  
7 co-chair, and perhaps have a vote of the total RAB condemning the  
8 Air Force for letting SAIC --

9 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: How old is that data that you  
10 reviewed?

11 MR. JEFF NEATHERY: What's the date on it? It was this  
12 year. April of this year. That's when the report came out.

13 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: Right. Okay, because repeatedly  
14 I've asked this company to have contact with the community and  
15 try to explain some of their, you know, actions and discrepancies  
16 and yet it hasn't been -- you know, it hasn't happened. And if  
17 this is an ongoing problem, I think that these studies that  
18 they're doing, like he said, need to be seriously looked at.

19 MR. MARK WEEGAR: Let me just say one thing. TCEQ and  
20 EPA have to approval all these reports. They reviewed the Zone  
21 3, R-5 Report. We've had numerous pages of comments, took into  
22 account the comments we received from the RAB's TAPP contractor,  
23 and those comments were addressed by the Air Force through their  
24 contractor to our satisfaction. We don't just approve these  
25 things on face value. We have numerous pages of comments that



TRS 12/13/04

1 they addressed.

2 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: You've never addressed the concern  
3 of the benzopyrene above level standards and safety standards.  
4 That's been ignored ongoing.

5 MR. JEFF NEATHERY: That's for workers?

6 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: Yes.

7 MR. JEFF NEATHERY: Yeah, see, that's -- that, I think,  
8 is outside the scope of what this report does. This report is  
9 just clean up of the soil and groundwater. It doesn't have  
10 anything to do with OSHA standards or -- other than the long-term  
11 overall human protective health. It does not really address  
12 the --

13 MR. MARK WEEGAR: No, you're right. We don't address  
14 OSHA standards because that's not --

15 MR. JEFF NEATHERY: Well, that's a different --

16 MR. MARK WEEGAR: That's a different area. But our  
17 cleanup standards have -- the first two feet of soil have  
18 ingestion and inhalation, dermal contact pathway, anything. You  
19 would get on you, breath in, things of that nature has to be  
20 addressed as one -- as part of the clean up standards. So it  
21 would have been addressed as part of our media cleanup standards,  
22 up to two feet of soil.

23 MR. JEFF NEATHERY: Are you talking about during the  
24 actual excavation stuff or just in general?

25 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: I'm talking about the data he had

TRS 12/13/04

1 gotten from the same corporation, SAIC, and that information was  
2 taken and given a presentation to the, you know, community  
3 members, and that information -- yet the Air Force has, you know,  
4 responded to his comments. Those comments were forwarded to the  
5 RAB members; however, it was never -- after I requested  
6 repeatedly to send those comments to Mr. Lynch and his company,  
7 it was never sent to him. Because I want to have him, you know,  
8 respond in like. And in turn, you know, I'm afraid this is going  
9 to happen again. Your comments need to be responded. I want a  
10 written response from them and I'd like for them to send them to  
11 you and have you address them and see what you think of them.

12 MR. JEFF NEATHERY: Now, this is the forth or fifth  
13 report that I've reviewed, and -- other than the comments that I  
14 get back from this committee before I do my full presentation to  
15 the RAB. I've never received any comments back from anything so  
16 I don't know if that mechanism is in place, or if it is, there's  
17 someone else that does it.

18 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: Well, I think the other things is  
19 to, you know, we had a meeting some time back for this particular  
20 issue and in time the Air Force, in their wisdom, seems to have  
21 forgotten let the community know that they a room available in an  
22 elementary school for the community to make comments. The  
23 ongoing problem is, you know, lack of information, lack of  
24 participation and a lot of data being withheld. And I got a lot  
25 of problems when I keep seeing, you know, this company putting

TRS 12/13/04

1 out inconsistent data, and I'm hoping that, you know, in time  
2 you'll get that data you need to do, you know, a thorough report.

3 MR. JEFF NEATHERY: That's kind of -- that's just  
4 beyond the scope of what I been involved in.

5 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: So as of -- how much were you paid  
6 to do this contract; to do this report?

7 MR. JEFF NEATHERY: In the neighborhood of \$5,000.

8 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: Okay.

9 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: How much was SCI (sic) paid  
10 to do this study? Put that down, please.

11 DR. DAVID SMITH: Yes.

12 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: Now, I have another question  
13 on this thing. Mr. Weegar mentioned that they review all  
14 these -- the CMS, the Zone 3 report and make their comments, you  
15 know, concerning good, bad or indifferent. Those comments never  
16 come to the RAB, why?

17 MR. MARK WEEGAR: Yes, they do. Absolutely they do.  
18 Every letter that the TCEQ sends out to Kelly Air Fore Base is  
19 copied to the Restoration Advisory Board Community Co-chair.

20 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: Oh, to the community  
21 co-chair. I haven't seen it.

22 MR. MARK WEEGAR: I have that -- the co-chair is your  
23 lead. It is --

24 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: Okay.

25 MR. MARK WEEGAR: -- every -- for years they've --

TRS 12/13/04

1 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: I'm not doubting you, you  
2 know, but in the past the community co-chair never made copies  
3 for the rest of the RAB members.

4 MR. MARK WEEGAR: There should be copies in the -- the  
5 RAB has a -- has a -- I assume --

6 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: We got a problem. You know,  
7 looking at the problem -- you done it, sent it to the co-chair,  
8 our co-chair is now Silva.

9 MR. MARK WEEGAR: Yeah.

10 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: And Silva gets it --

11 MR. MARK WEEGAR: You're getting copies -- you're  
12 getting copies of our letter, aren't you?

13 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: Yeah, but I haven't got copies of  
14 the past presentations have been before Pena was here. But,  
15 yeah, I've gotten --

16 MR. MARK WEEGAR: Yeah, that's been our -- that's been  
17 our process for -- since 19 -- you know, since '96, 7, 8,  
18 something like that.

19 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: I remember that Dr. Lenee  
20 (sp)used to get them, but he never made copies for us.

21 MR. MARK WEEGAR: Well, I assumed that there is -- I  
22 mean, there's an information repository for the RAB here at the  
23 Health and Wellness Center and there should be copies of all  
24 correspondences in there.

25 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: I'm -- somebody's at fault

TRS 12/13/04

1 because I'm not going to go to the repository or to the library.  
2 I'm a member of RAB so I think the Air Force should have provided  
3 me those copies also.

4 MR. MARK WEEGAR: The RAB --

5 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: Not only does the RAB  
6 co-chair gets them, but also the -- the community co-chair gets  
7 them, but also the Air Force co-chair gets them, and we're  
8 supposed to be provided with that. That is an administrative  
9 duty of the Air Force.

10 MR. MARK WEEGAR: That's between the RAB and the Air  
11 Force.

12 MR. GLENN WILKINSON: Excuse me. Can I ask him his  
13 name and who he represents.

14 DR. DAVID SMITH: Mr. Wilkinson, you know perfectly  
15 well who is he and who represents. Please.

16 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: State who he represents.

17 MR. MARK WEEGAR: My name is Mark Weegar. I represent  
18 the TCEQ. I'm the Kelly Air Force Project Manager.

19 MR. GLENN WILKINSON: Texas Water Commission?

20 MR. MARK WEEGAR: Texas Commission on Environmental  
21 Quality.

22 DR. DAVID SMITH: Can I bring us back to our Zone 2/3  
23 CMS study? This is the focus of this particular --

24 (SEVERAL PEOPLE SPEAKING AT ONCE)

25 MR. GLENN WILKINSON: (inaudible).

TRS 12/13/04

1 MR. MARK WEEGAR: How about you -- how about you sit  
2 down.

3 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: This was brought up --

4 MR. GLENN WILKINSON: He killed a million people.

5 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: -- the Air Force --

6 MR. MARK WEEGAR: I'm up from 20,000 to a million now.

7 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: -- the SAIC if they had been doing  
8 work allegedly for our Central Intelligence Agency, and I want an  
9 answer on that.

10 MS. ROBYN THOMPSON: I'm sorry. Can you repeat that,  
11 Mr. Silvas?

12 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: SAIC. Have they allegedly done  
13 work for the CIA and I want an answer on that. And you need to  
14 be aware of that because this company has numerous contracts.  
15 I'm just putting this out.

16 MR. JEFF NEATHERY: Well that's -- I mean, that's so  
17 far beyond -- I mean, I'm doing a book report basically.

18 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: Right. I'm just telling you what  
19 you're working off of.

20 MR. JEFF NEATHERY: I mean, it doesn't -- I don't care  
21 who did the report or what their connection is.

22 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: We do because it's our tax  
23 dollars.

24 MR. JEFF NEATHERY: Sure, it's your tax collars, but  
25 what I'm --

TRS 12/13/04

1 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: It's our tax dollars and  
2 we're demanding that, you know, the Air Force get a better  
3 contractor.

4 MR. JEFF NEATHERY: That's fine.

5 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: These errors and omissions  
6 are bad. And we shouldn't -- they shouldn't have to do the job  
7 twice. They should do it right the first time.

8 MR. MARK WEEGAR: In evaluating the media alternatives  
9 that they proposed or at least leave evaluated for different  
10 sites, did you see technologies that were not evaluated that you  
11 would have recommended that they evaluate? Or did they kind of  
12 look at what, you know, the available technologies are?

13 MR. JEFF NEATHERY: I think they did a pretty good job  
14 of looking at the available technologies. I didn't see them  
15 doing anything that I thought, man, that's a stretch. You know,  
16 we don't really don't have that technology. I mean, soil vapor  
17 extraction, you know, vitrification has been around for a long  
18 time. You know, some of the soil heating -- of course,  
19 excavation, digging holes has been around a gazillion years. So,  
20 I mean, I didn't see them proposing any, you know, black box  
21 technology and things like that. I didn't have a problem with  
22 the alternatives that they reviewed for the sites.

23 MR. MARK WEEGAR: And I guess overall you would say the  
24 biggest issue you had was their explanation of what --  
25 Mr. Wilkinson, would you please sit down.

TRS 12/13/04

1 MR. GLENN WILKINSON: Don't tell me what to do.

2 MR. MARK WEEGAR: I asked you to please sit down.

3 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: He's not going to sit.

4 MR. GLENN WILKINSON: I cannot hear. I have deafness  
5 in the ear because I worked for the railroad for ten years  
6 because I was around the machinery. I have hear people. I have  
7 to see their mouths move.

8 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: Okay. We'll hear your comments at  
9 the when we wrap it up.

10 MR. GLENN WILKINSON: This is discriminating against  
11 disabled people.

12 MR. MARK WEEGAR: In general, though, you would say  
13 that one of the problems are or one biggest issues you had was as  
14 far as the remedial alternatives that they selected, they didn't  
15 really go through a very good job of explaining what the nine  
16 criteria were and why? Maybe one criteria would have out weighed  
17 another one in selecting a remedial alternative over another one?

18 MR. JEFF NEATHERY: Yeah, that would help. I mean,  
19 why -- yeah. Why did they pick one that looked like it had a  
20 couple of areas of proficiency over another one? Was there  
21 something, you know, some major overriding value? And that's why  
22 I asked -- it would be nice if we knew what the criteria were for  
23 those because there's -- there's just a disconnect there. They  
24 didn't look at their own evaluations when coming up with their  
25 recommendations.



TRS 12/13/04

1 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: Let's talk about that circular  
2 contamination that has --

3 DR. DAVID SMITH: Just a second. Let's see if I can  
4 give somebody else a chance.

5 MS. ESMERALDA GALVAN: I want to make sure that I  
6 understand what's going on here. SAIC did the report for the Air  
7 Force. Air Force paid them, right? And then -- now the  
8 environmental comes in to do a report on how it was done. Who  
9 pays you?

10 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: No. Let me explain that one.  
11 This committee right in here went out and got a grant of 25,000  
12 in order to get people such as Mr. Neathery and others to come in  
13 and explain, you know, what's in the report. And he's done an  
14 excellent job, and so has the other people.

15 MS. ESMERALDA GALVAN: But the Air Force does not have  
16 to listen to what he says, correct?

17 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: Oh, yes, they will. Because  
18 they have to listen to us, and our job is to advise the Air Force  
19 that what they're getting from SAIC from our tax dollars is not  
20 worth a dime.

21 MS. ESMERALDA GALVAN: Yes, I agree. But what makes it  
22 -- what requires the Air Force to listen to them?

23 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: What requires -- we can go to  
24 our congressmen and tell them, you know, this is the way it's  
25 happening. We're just wasting money. Just like the Air Force

TRS 12/13/04

1 has wasted three billion gallons of water that they've taken out  
2 of the ground, cleaned it and thrown it into the creek and it  
3 ends up in the ocean. Those are the things that our congressmen  
4 take up and somehow or another gets done.

5 DR. DAVID SMITH: Let's brings it back to Zone 2 and 3.

6 MR. MICHAEL SHENEMAN: I'm seeing bioaugmentation for  
7 the first time. I'm seeing electrodes. You talking about  
8 resistant heaters.

9 MR. JEFF NEATHERY: Yeah, heating would speed up the  
10 volatilization process.

11 MR. MICHAEL SHENEMAN: Yeah, right out of the ground  
12 and into the air.

13 MR. JEFF NEATHERY: Well, you're not -- in some of  
14 these you're combining soil heating with soil vapor extraction,  
15 so you're collecting the vapor. It's not just like letting it go  
16 off to the air.

17 MR. MICHAEL SHENEMAN: Let's go back to  
18 bioaugmentation.

19 MR. GLENN WILKINSON: It's like a low-grade --

20 MR. MICHAEL SHENEMAN: It's my turn. I'm talking.

21 MR. JEFF NEATHERY: Bioaugmentation has been around for  
22 long time as well. There's a number of ways to do  
23 bioaugmentation. There's companies that sell genetically  
24 engineered microbes that go in and they can take care of the  
25 contamination. And then when -- they break down a lot of these

TRS 12/13/04

1 chemicals less ominous forms. When the food source is gone, the  
2 bugs die and, you know, things are kind of back to where it was.  
3 So bioaugmentation, bioremediation has been around for a long  
4 time. It's nothing real new.

5 MR. MARK WEEGAR: I think what they're -- when they're  
6 talking bioaugmentation in this context, what they're talking  
7 about doing is adding a carbon source, the vegetable oil, that  
8 actually gets indigenous organisms to grow in larger populations  
9 and break down the dirt.

10 MR. MICHAEL SHENEMAN: Well, the plume is also soluble;  
11 the plumes with the vegetable oil, I would think.

12 MR. MARK WEEGAR: Pardon me?

13 MR. MICHAEL SHENEMAN: These plumes, the hydrocarbons  
14 will be soluble in vegetable oil, I would think.

15 MR. MARK WEEGAR: Well, it's really there to get the --  
16 to give the bacteria --

17 MR. MICHAEL SHENEMAN: To give the bugs something to  
18 eat.

19 MR. MARK WEEGAR: -- something to, right, to grow and  
20 populate so they start breaking down the chlorinated solvents.

21 MR. JEFF NEATHERY: Yeah, there's -- I mean, everywhere  
22 there's naturally indigenous bugs that to this. Mother nature  
23 did a great job of, you know, putting them everywhere so whenever  
24 we spill something --

25 MR. MICHAEL SHENEMAN: I'm all for it.

TRS 12/13/04

1 MR. JEFF NEATHERY: And all they're doing is enhancing  
2 that deal. Like I said, also you can add more bugs to it.  
3 There's a lot of different ways to do bioremediation.

4 MR. MICHAEL SHENEMAN: There are folks luckily who have  
5 suggested it. This first time I've seen it. I was doing  
6 research last week, George, when you and I were talking.

7 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: Going back to that circular pattern  
8 of contamination. Now, you know, what chemical were they  
9 addressing there?

10 MR. JEFF NEATHERY: I don't remember specifically what  
11 the chemical was there. I think it was -- was the PCE one?

12 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: Now, you said that's a bit unusual,  
13 that you wouldn't see that typically in a report. Something like  
14 that coming up in this report is unusual?

15 MR. JEFF NEATHERY: Well, when you define a plume,  
16 okay, you're looking for the -- let's just talk about the lateral  
17 extent. You'll poke holes and if you find it here, then you step  
18 up and -- say the source is right here at the base of projectory.  
19 You know, you drill a hole here. Okay, we still have it. Let's  
20 step out here and drill it. Okay, we're out of it. So I know  
21 that the line is somewhere in here, okay, so I have control  
22 points to defined where that line goes. Okay. Rarely is it a  
23 perfect -- that line ends up in perfect circle. Usually there's  
24 a lot of things that can go down and get into the groundwater and  
25 then the groundwater can start carrying it. A lot of different

TRS 12/13/04

1 things can happen to it.

2 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: Right.

3 MR. JEFF NEATHERY: And if you're doing modeling and  
4 you put a point in and you don't have the control points around  
5 it, it can fly through the circle. But they said they had  
6 control points. There was borings 006, 007, 008 or something  
7 like that. They just weren't shown on there. Maybe it is a  
8 perfect circle, but they need to put those control things on  
9 there so we can see that besides sitting here by itself.

10 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: Yeah, a control point so they'll  
11 actually be able to back up what they're showing.

12 MR. JEFF NEATHERY: Right.

13 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: The other thing is the years that  
14 were 450 and long durations such as that. Those estimates, are  
15 those like conservative or would you -- how would you put it?

16 MR. JEFF NEATHERY: I would say that they're fairly  
17 reasonable estimates. I don't think that they're overly  
18 conservative. On the other hand, are they, you know, severely  
19 underestimated.

20 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: Okay.

21 MR. JEFF NEATHERY: You know, when you talk about 450  
22 years, what if it's only 400 years? I mean, you know, 50 years,  
23 is it going to -- I mean, really kind of start talking about  
24 non-sensible numbers.

25 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: Now who's here tonight representing

TRS 12/13/04

1 the Air Force?

2 MS. ASHLEY ALLINDER: (RAISES HAND)

3 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: Will you provide a written comment  
4 on his response and submit it to him?

5 MS. NORMA LANDEZ: I'm not sure. Sonja and I look at  
6 contracts. Because -- I mean, he has -- there's a contact in the  
7 contract and I'm not real sure what those contract requirements  
8 are for --

9 MR. JEFF NEATHERY: Like I say, you can submit them to  
10 me, but I don't -- I can't --

11 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: In the past you guys have, you  
12 know, upon request, provided, you know, responses.

13 MS. NORMA LANDEZ: When the RAB asks us during RAB  
14 meetings to comment on the report, then we will, you know, we  
15 will provide comments back to the RAB. And that's what we've  
16 done in the past.

17 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: Can you put that down on part of  
18 questions.

19 MS. NORMA LANDEZ: But we'll look at the contract. I  
20 know there's a provision in the TAPP contract for us to respond.  
21 I know that from this meeting, you take --

22 MR. JEFF NEATHERY: Oh, yeah, from this meeting I take  
23 comments from the Technical Review Subcommittee and I incorporate  
24 those into my final.

25 MS. NORMA LANDEZ: Right.

TRS 12/13/04

1 MR. JEFF NEATHERY: But once I present the final, my  
2 contract's over and I'm out of the loop.

3 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: Well, here's my quest -- here's my  
4 concern. All of you are out of the loop and they had an  
5 opportunity to submit their comments to the review committee. I  
6 mean, wouldn't you like to see what their comments were on your  
7 review? I mean, even if you would have to respond or not.

8 MR. JEFF NEATHERY: I would rather see SAIC's comments  
9 than the Air Force's because these are questions I have about  
10 their report. I mean, if I was going to review something --  
11 because, I mean, there may be some things that they did, but they  
12 just omitted from their report that may clear up a lot of issues,  
13 or there may be some serious issues here.

14 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: Okay. I agree. Can you put that  
15 down, to see if we can get SAIC to respond to the Air Force.

16 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: Yeah, we need a response from  
17 SAIC.

18 (SEVERAL PEOPLE SPEAKING AT ONCE)

19 DR. DAVID SMITH: ... so far on my scope.

20 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: Right. Well, you know, it's an  
21 ongoing issue. I mean, I've repeatedly asked this company  
22 involved for more information and it hasn't happened. And, you  
23 know, every time it finally comes on the table, it's just, you  
24 know, too late, contact this guy or whatever, and that's not a  
25 suitable answer.

TRS 12/13/04

1 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: Their contract is just to  
2 give us the technical review of it in words that we can  
3 understand.

4 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: Right. Right.

5 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: That's as far as they go.

6 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: This contractor receives a lot of  
7 contracts from the U.S. Government. There's no doubt about that.

8 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: Are you talking about SAIC?

9 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: Yes, sir.

10 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: Yes, SAIC does.

11 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: If they're doing this kind of work,  
12 it's a big concern about what else they're reviewing out there.

13 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: Well, when it's over, I plan  
14 to send all the comments to my congressman --

15 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: Yes, sir.

16 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: -- and ask my congressman to  
17 look into this, to inquire as to why they're accepting this kind  
18 of work from SAIC.

19 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: Who's your congressman?

20 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: Lamar Smith.

21 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: Okay.

22 MS. ESMERALDA GALVAN: What concerns me is that if EPA  
23 and TCEQ reviewed the work that the contractors did, why didn't  
24 they see the inconsistencies? My concerns as a community  
25 representatives is that not only is there a lot of money being



TRS 12/13/04

1 spent for this kind of work, but also for the people who live  
2 around the community, the base workers. They have a lot a  
3 questions that have been ignored in the past, especially the  
4 question on when the trenches get replaced.

5 Two three years ago when I spoke to one of engineers  
6 that was putting the PRBs at Kelly, he had told me -- I asked  
7 him, Will there be a concern if you suddenly have to replace the  
8 trenches, and he said, yes, there needs to be. And I asked that  
9 question as a RAB member and I was never fully answered with a  
10 good answer from this committee. And I don't understand why we  
11 can't get answers as RAB members.

12 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: I got one other thing I'd like to  
13 ask the board. What other future -- what other future reviews  
14 does SAIC have on this Kelly Air Force cleanup; a future review  
15 by SAIC cleanup?

16 MS. ROBYN THOMPSON: The studies?

17 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: Yes, and the future studies by the  
18 SAIC.

19 MS. ESMERALDA GALVAN: Because we do have to bombard  
20 our congressmen with our comments and get more community people  
21 out here and maybe the media.

22 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: We're not getting the most  
23 bang for our buck.

24 MS. ESMERALDA GALVAN: No. No.

25 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: Not from SAIC.

TRS 12/13/04

1 MR. MARK WEEGAR: Let me say one thing in response to  
2 Ms. Galvan's question. TCEQ has not reviewed this report yet.  
3 We are waiting to get the TAPP contractor's comments, to get the  
4 comments from the RAB, that's -- I mean, that's the purpose of  
5 the TAPP contractor; to provide review, that is the RAB's  
6 comments on the document. So we have not reviewed it yet.

7 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: You have not reviewed the CMS  
8 report?

9 MR. MARK WEEGAR: No.

10 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: And when you do, you're going  
11 to make two copies --

12 MR. MARK WEEGAR: Parts of it has just become  
13 available.

14 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: -- of your comments. One to  
15 the Air Force and one to the community co-chair.

16 MR. MARK WEEGAR: Absolutely.

17 MS. ABBI POWERS: Yeah, he gets a copy of all reports.

18 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: Yeah, and we are going to  
19 force the Air Force co-chair to make copies for us because we  
20 don't have no administrative type of machinery to do this, and  
21 the law says that it's got to be the Air Force that must do that  
22 and the Air Force has not done it. We shouldn't place all the  
23 blame on the community co-chair. If you give a copy to the  
24 community chair, the RAB should have it. It doesn't work that  
25 way. Give it to the Air Force and the Air Force should make the

TRS 12/13/04

1 copies and give it to us.

2 MR. MARK WEEGAR: That's between the RAB and the Air  
3 Force. We provide our copies to the co-chair.

4 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: This question is for Mr. Weegar.  
5 You've you had a chance to review Mr. Lynch's Zone 2 and 3?

6 MR. MARK WEEGAR: Zone 3.

7 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: You reviewed it?

8 MS. ABBI POWERS: Yeah.

9 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: And what corrections did you have  
10 (inaudible).

11 MR. MARK WEEGAR: You know, it's been long enough ago  
12 that I can't remember off the top of my head. I'd have to go  
13 back and --

14 MS. ABBI POWERS: We did have some comments on that  
15 report.

16 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: Now, were those comments  
17 forwarded to the co-chair?

18 MR. MARK WEEGAR: Yes.

19 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: Okay, we'll ask for that. We  
20 want the comments on the Zone 3 from Mr. Weegar to --

21 MR. MARK WEEGAR: Co-chair, from Hector Lynch's review.

22 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: From the Hector Lynch review.

23 MR. TIM SULTENFUSS: Sir, were those provided to the --  
24 only the community co-chair or the Air Force co-chair?

25 MR. MARK WEEGAR: They were provided to the Air Force

TRS 12/13/04

1 and they were cc'd to the community co-chair, as is our standard  
2 practice.

3 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: And we did not get them. The  
4 RAB members have not received those comments from Mr. Weegar.

5 MR. TIM SULTENFUSS: I'll try to catch up with you in  
6 just a minute.

7 MR. MARK WEEGAR: Okay, the Zone 3, R-5 comments.  
8 There would comments from the TCEQ and there would have been  
9 comments from EPA, 3 to 6 as well.

10 MR. TIM SULTENFUSS: I'm sorry, I missed the response  
11 to that. The question was: Did TCEQ zone 3 five cap report. Is  
12 that right?

13 MR. MARK WEEGAR: We reviewed the comments from -- that  
14 were provided by Patrick Lynch as part of our review of the Zone  
15 3, R-5.

16 MR. GARY MILLER: Now, I don't think -- what Mark's not  
17 saying is did he respond to Patrick Lynch's comments directly.  
18 He used his comments as part of our review, just like we did. We  
19 took those in account when we reviewed the document itself, and  
20 we may have similar comments. Or we may have decided in our  
21 review that they were not relevant.

22 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: So whatever comments are reviewed,  
23 they forwarded. Those need to be also channeled through. Can  
24 you add that? Is that what you have down?

25 MS. ROBYN THOMPSON: Uh-huh.

TRS 12/13/04

1 MR. MARK WEEGAR: Again, our intent in providing the  
2 co-chair with copies of our comments to the Air Force was so that  
3 all of our communication with Kelly Air Force Base on the cleanup  
4 are transparent. There are no communications between us and the  
5 Air Force that are not copied to the co-chair.

6 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: The last co-chair we had wasn't  
7 very community friendly. That was part of the problem.

8 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: Well, the Air Force is not  
9 that transparent as TCEQ. They have never relayed your  
10 comments --

11 MR. MARK WEEGAR: You know, I have enough trouble  
12 taking care of the TCEQ.

13 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: I understand.

14 MR. MARK WEEGAR: You know, it's a big job running that  
15 agency.

16 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: Well, I'm just patting you on  
17 the back.

18 MR. MARK WEEGAR: Well, thank you.

19 DR. DAVID SMITH: Any other questions?

20 MR. GLENN WILKINSON: I want to talk on another  
21 subject.

22 DR. DAVID SMITH: Not yet. We're still on CMS.

23 MR. GLENN WILKINSON: What are these two sides from  
24 Kelly Air Force Base?

25 DR. DAVID SMITH: We're still on CMS, please.

TRS 12/13/04

1 MR. GLENN WILKINSON: Where's these two sides on Kelly  
2 Air Force Base?

3 MR. MARK WEEGAR: Zone 2 and 3 are in the industrial  
4 park, and where else?

5 MS. ABBI POWERS: And down by the -- the south side  
6 down by the creek where the wasteland treatment facility used to  
7 be.

8 MR. GLENN WILKINSON: Does that include the (inaudible)  
9 test zone?

10 MS. ABBI POWERS: Yes.

11 MR. GLENN WILKINSON: Is the Building 171 in that area?

12 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: The 171 is in that area.

13 MR. GLENN WILKINSON: Is it?

14 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: Yes, it is.

15 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: It's in Zone 3, I think.

16 MR. GLENN WILKINSON: Why haven't they done a study on  
17 Building 171, since there was a redistribution of Agent Orange?  
18 I've done an on-ground survey. Went to this 171, went with my  
19 metal detector, picked up areas -- underground tanks that are  
20 buried that are not marked. Followed the line all the way  
21 from -- parallel greater line where that -- there's a box where  
22 they can empty the orange tanks. I worked for the railroad for  
23 ten years, I never did see them ship Agent Orange or any other  
24 toxic chemicals in drums. They proceeded to unload the tanker  
25 trains, which are connected hose to hose, which they only needed

TRS 12/13/04

1 one connection. That line would paint and all that goes all the  
2 way to Building 171. In 1979 I remember seeing that building and  
3 it was recontained -- they containerized 50-gallon drums of  
4 chemicals. And all part -- and you got four drills water sample  
5 holes all the way up to where that valve is coming off that  
6 parallel railroad track line. Yet, this couldn't be one of the  
7 agent orange storage warehouse --

8 DR. DAVID SMITH: Sir, I'm trying to get to the  
9 question.

10 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: The question is, I think he wants  
11 to phrase it as, Building 171 --

12 MR. GLENN WILKINSON: Why can't the Water Commission  
13 give us the two buildings that once stored Agent Orange and give  
14 us a latitude and longitude site of S-7 and a latitude and  
15 longitude site of S-2 instead of hints of drawn lines.

16 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: She's writing the question, Glenn.  
17 Is that close enough to what you're asking?

18 MR. GLENN WILKINSON: I'm going to have to go to  
19 federal court to get that.

20 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: Are you looking for the latitude  
21 and longitude coordinates of the building? Is that --

22 MR. GLENN WILKINSON: Of S-2 and S-7 sites.

23 MR. MARK WEEGAR: Any geological sheet --

24 MR. GLENN WILKINSON: There's no -- let me -- last

25 Thursday --

TRS 12/13/04

1 MR. MARK WEEGAR: Zone 4.

2 MR. GLENN WILKINSON: -- Thanksgiving I went and found  
3 Building --

4 MR. MARK WEEGAR: What I'm saying is, if he's looking  
5 for a latitude and longitude -- if he's just looking for the  
6 coordinates they'll be on any geological sheet.

7 MR. GLENN WILKINSON: Not S-2 or S-7 sites.

8 MR. MARK WEEGAR: The concern is: If it's on the  
9 ground, there's coordinates for every square inch of ground. I  
10 mean --

11 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: Sir, what he's addressing is we've  
12 got a site being reviewed and they're not addressing certain  
13 chemical concerns regarding Agent Orange and the storage of those  
14 chemicals and warehouses that have been converted to industrial  
15 use. And it appears SAIC has a certain role in this because they  
16 have dug wells in the fenced off area in the parking lot of  
17 Building 171 and --

18 MR. GLENN WILKINSON: In 1997 --

19 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: And I've been calling that number  
20 that's inside that fenced area. It seems that no one wants to  
21 answer the phone. That fenced-in area very well could have been  
22 a transfer area for the railroad to offload Agent Orange.

23 MS. NORMA LANDEZ: The fenced in area that's on the  
24 parking lot?

25 MR. GLENN WILKINSON: At Kelly in '79 I passed that



TRS 12/13/04

1 area and there was like -- there was like a pump station. And  
2 also they should have a reservoir station so air don't get into  
3 the pump and cut -- loses its prime. And I took my metal  
4 detector, which goes down to 14-foot, walked in that area, and  
5 it's just going off like crazy in all areas unmarked. I walked  
6 around the fence, going around there. I walked -- there's x's in  
7 the asphalt that --

8 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: Let's go ahead and press on so we  
9 can get this rounded up. You get your comments at the end and  
10 wrap it up.

11 DR. DAVID SMITH: Okay. Zone 2/3 CMS, further  
12 questions?

13 MR. GLENN WILKINSON: I've been hearing --

14 DR. DAVID SMITH: Zone 2/3 CMS further questions?

15 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: I think I'm done.

16 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: I'm done.

17 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: Mr. Neathery, we'll see you  
18 at the regular RAB meeting. And I think we have a motion there  
19 whether it's satisfactory to pay you and we'll make a motion to  
20 that effect.

21 DR. DAVID SMITH: Let's go over these questions real  
22 quick and see if we can get answers to them.

23 MR. TIM SULTENFUSS: I have that was asked during the  
24 presentation: Why are the soil borings in Figures 3-2 and 3-3  
25 different?

TRS 12/13/04

1 MR. JEFF NEATHERY: I don't know. That was my  
2 question. I mean, it should be the same boring. It probably  
3 should be the same.

4 MR. MARK WEEGAR: Probably two different jobs did the  
5 drawing.

6 MR. JEFF NEATHERY: Different CAT operators did the  
7 cross section.

8 MR. MARK WEEGAR: You know as well as I do, if you have  
9 three geologists look at the same data, you'll have three  
10 different maps.

11 MR. JEFF NEATHERY: Yeah, but you don't change  
12 lithology.

13 DR. DAVID SMITH: Okay. So no answer to that one at  
14 the moment.

15 MS. ROBYN THOMPSON: I have: Can SAIC respond to  
16 comments on CMS tech review?

17 MR. JEFF NEATHERY: I guess that's something that the  
18 Air Force would have to go back to them.

19 MR. TIM SULTENFUSS: How much was SAIC paid to do this  
20 study? Mr. Quintanilla asked that question.

21 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: Yes, I need that question  
22 because that's going to be forwarded to our congressman, along  
23 with the SAIC report. So if you have another copy of it, I would  
24 like to get it.

25 MR. DON BUETLER: I think it should be clear that this

TRS 12/13/04

1 isn't an SAIC report. This is submitted by the Air Force. It's  
2 an Air Force report. And recommendations for alternatives were  
3 selected by the Air Force and by SAIC.

4 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: Yeah, but the data they're taking  
5 is arranged by SAIC, the way they use the Air Force --

6 MR. DON BUETLER: It's an Air Force report.

7 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: But it's put out by the SAIC.

8 MR. DON BUETLER: It's an Air Force --

9 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: So it's exactly how the Air Force  
10 wrote it? You're saying all these inconsistencies --

11 MR. DON BUETLER: We reviewed the documents. We're the  
12 ones that submit it to the state. SAIC does not submit --

13 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: So you guys submitted it like this,  
14 the SAIC report?

15 MR. DON BUETLER: Have you read the report?

16 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: I don't have to. I just had a  
17 presentation. I mean, it's alarming. I've seen these reports  
18 come out before through SAIC. And if you're reading them and  
19 putting them out like they are, I mean, that's a real concern.

20 MR. MARK WEEGAR: Jeff, do you do any work -- any  
21 consulting work where you submit reports to TCEQ or --

22 MR. JEFF NEATHERY: All the time.

23 MR. MARK WEEGAR: How often do you send reports then  
24 that don't come back with comments from the TCEQ?

25 MR. JEFF NEATHERY: Well, I don't -- I mean, I don't

TRS 12/13/04

1 usually don't deal with -- I'm a very small operator so I don't  
2 do contracts of this size, but every once in a while I get  
3 comments back.

4 MR. MARK WEEGAR: I mean, it's not unusual for --

5 MR. JEFF NEATHERY: Oh, no.

6 MR. MARK WEEGAR: -- you to get comments back from --  
7 especially you're talking about this complicated of a project?

8 MR. JEFF NEATHERY: Yeah. Right. Yeah. I mean, it  
9 happens. I know the folk at TCEQ that I deal with pretty well,  
10 and they know me.

11 MR. MARK WEEGAR: I mean, the point I'm trying to make  
12 is this submission of reports and comments back, similar to what  
13 you're making, what we would make, what EPA would make is --

14 MR. JEFF NEATHERY: Let's put it this way: On a report  
15 of this size, I'd be shocked if there weren't something wrong or  
16 some comments or something. I mean, you just -- this much  
17 information, this much data, this much analysis -- I don't care  
18 how good you are or how many different sets of eyes you have  
19 looking at it, there's going to be stuff that falls through the  
20 cracks. But by the same token, I think there's still a pretty  
21 good disconnect between what was shown in the tables and what the  
22 final recommendation was. I also don't think it was very clear  
23 in the report that the recommendations were not SAIC's, but the  
24 Air Force's recommendations. But if starts off in a thing that  
25 SAIC repaired this corrective action -- or the corrective measure

TRS 12/13/04

1 study --

2 MR. MARK WEEGAR: Well, I think what Don is saying is  
3 the Air Force, because of their permit and compliance plan, are  
4 responsible party who has the obligation to do the cleanup out  
5 there. So any documentation that's submitted, while they may  
6 have a contract to prepare it, it goes through an internal  
7 review. Ultimately when that report comes in -- the comments  
8 that come from TCEQ and EPA do not go to SAIC. They go to the  
9 Air Force because the Air Force is the responsible person.

10 So I think that's what Don is saying is: This is an  
11 Air Force report regardless of who the contractor was that  
12 prepared it. They are the ones responsible.

13 MR. JEFF NEATHERY: Right. I understand that the Air  
14 Force is involved in saying what alternative would be selected.

15 MR. DON BUETLER: I mean the final selection --

16 MR. MARK WEEGAR: Ultimately the Air Force is  
17 responsible.

18 MR. DON BUETLER: Right.

19 MR. MARK WEEGAR: But in terms of preparing the  
20 report --

21 MR. DON BUETLER: And I appreciate your comments and  
22 the need to explain why -- and they're good comments that need to  
23 explain better why we selected those.

24 MR. MARK WEEGAR: Okay.

25 MR. DON BUETLER: And we appreciate that.

TRS 12/13/04

1 MR. MARK WEEGAR: I mean, that's actually a comment  
2 that think we have on a -- I wouldn't say on a regular basis, but  
3 from time and time, especially in a large complex site like this  
4 where you're drawing on from many different past years of  
5 investigation. It's almost like there's -- the people writing  
6 the contract will think it's intuitive that you will understand a  
7 lot of this stuff and we will say -- in our comments it's like,  
8 you need to explain this better.

9 MR. DON BUETLER: Right.

10 MR. MARK WEEGAR: Explain why this is such and such  
11 because --

12 MR. DON BUETLER: Right. You know, the folks that are  
13 actually doing the work -- and I mean they got their head in it,  
14 they've got all this stuff in their head and they put the report  
15 out and there may be some things that they have in their head  
16 that just don't make into the report, but may have in impact on  
17 the what the final result is and maybe they're --

18 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: You're making a lot of  
19 excuses for bad work. Let's get away from that.

20 MR. DON BUETLER: Okay.

21 DR. DAVID SMITH: Anymore questions on this topic?

22 MR. TIM SULTENFUSS: I've got, should there be a  
23 concern of the PRB trench needs to be replaced by Mrs. Galvan.

24 DR. DAVID SMITH: Can you address that, sir?

25 MR. JEFF NEATHERY: The concern would be where they had

TRS 12/13/04

1 the trench, there was -- one of the sites there they had the  
2 trench where they were going to do some excavation, is that --  
3 the discussion of the trench is not in the text of the report, so  
4 would that mean there going to be additional cost in it not  
5 included? You know, what do you do with the materials that come  
6 out of the trench itself, how were they handled. So, yeah,  
7 there's some issues with the trench that were not explained.

8 MS. ROBYN THOMPSON: By Mr. Silvas: Are there going to  
9 be any future studies at Kelly done by SAIC?

10 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: You can't answer that now. I'll  
11 wait for an answer.

12 MR. GLENN WILKINSON: Mr. Wilkinson: Why haven't they  
13 done a study of Building 171?

14 MR. JEFF NEATHERY: I have no idea.

15 MR. TIM SULTENFUSS: Is that within the scope of the  
16 report, sir?

17 MR. JEFF NEATHERY: Not within the scope of this  
18 report.

19 MS. ESMERALDA GALVAN: Which zone is 171?

20 MS. ABBI POWERS: Is it three?

21 MS. ESMERALDA GALVAN: Was that the building that had a  
22 big case of radiation?

23 MS. ABBI POWERS: It's the one that Toyota is in right  
24 now. Abbi Power, TCEQ.

25 MR. JEFF NEATHERY: But again, getting back to the 171

TRS 12/13/04

1 issue, there was previous work done at a lot of different sites,  
2 okay, and they picked 14 that they were going to look at. And  
3 out of those 14, they narrowed it down to eight. You know, so  
4 this was being reviewed as a stand-alone document. I didn't go  
5 back and review what they found at those sites or what those  
6 sites were. I just said, okay, given the sites I'm going to say  
7 let's trust that everything is correct and move on from there.

8 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: Just to touch on that again, "stand  
9 alone," can you explain that a little bit in more detail?

10 MR. JEFF NEATHERY: Okay. The areas of contamination  
11 were already established. Okay.

12 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: By the Air Force?

13 MR. JEFF NEATHERY: Right. By the Air Force. Okay.  
14 Whoever did those reports, did those reports -- I didn't go back  
15 and look at that data. I just assumed that, okay, if this is  
16 what at they say the area of contamination is, I'll buy it.  
17 Okay. Because, I mean, there's no way I can go back because  
18 you're talking a gazillion reports I'd have to look at. So I  
19 just said, all right, given the site conditions, let's go from  
20 there. But even at that, that's why you had a circular cycle.

21 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: Now, again, on all the sites they  
22 handed you, those buildings, you had eight of them.

23 MR. JEFF NEATHERY: Yeah. Now, the others -- there may  
24 be other buildings and other sites that weren't discussed in this  
25 report. I don't have a clue.



TRS 12/13/04

1 DR. DAVID SMITH: Are we there?

2 Thank you, sir.

3 MR. JEFF NEATHERY: Thank you.

4 DR. DAVID SMITH: Okay. We're kind of at an  
5 administrative session of the agenda. First item is the BCT  
6 update.

7 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: Before we start the BCT, there was  
8 an issue that we needed to bring up, and that was the letter  
9 submitted for Mr. Quintanilla to his Congressman regarding  
10 inclusion of community members on that and to further look into  
11 the document regarding the Air Force's decision not to include  
12 community involvement.

13 DR. DAVID SMITH: There's Ms. Landez for this agenda.  
14 Can we have the BCT report?

15 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: Well, I'm certain that we were  
16 going to bring this up either now or before the next meeting,  
17 that way the RAB members would have a heads up on the BCT and a  
18 commitment from the Air Force to have a community involvement on  
19 that. And, you know, just having BCT presentation, we just want  
20 to let them know that we need more community involvement. And  
21 that's -- that's it.

22 DR. DAVID SMITH: All right.

23 MS. NORMA LANDEZ: Okay. The October BCT meeting, we  
24 talked about the EPA's strategic plan. We received a letter from  
25 the TCEQ requesting our plans for both the Kelly -- main Kelly

TRS 12/13/04

1 area and also the DRMO area. We submitted our letters to TCEQ in  
2 the last two weeks.

3 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: Now, what is that strategic  
4 plan?

5 MS. NORMA LANDEZ: Make sure all of the remedies have  
6 been implemented at all the sites by the year 2007.

7 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: And you all submitted a  
8 letter to that effect?

9 MS. NORMA LANDEZ: No, we submitted a letter to TCEQ.

10 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: To TCEQ. And none of the  
11 community was involved in that, was there?

12 MR. MARK WEEGAR: No.

13 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: No.

14 MR. MARK WEEGAR: It's not something that's a community  
15 activity.

16 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: That's what you say, but you  
17 look at law and it's a little bit different.

18 MR. MARK WEEGAR: It's GPRA, it's the Government's  
19 Performance Review Act. It's something the EPA has delegated  
20 BCT --

21 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: But it is not in the circle  
22 of law that established the RABs.

23 MR. MARK WEEGAR: No, it's not in the circle. This is  
24 a -- this is for RCRA permitted sites that ongoing corrective  
25 action.

TRS 12/13/04

1 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: All right. But the circle of  
2 law that's made the RABs applies to both RCRA and to (inaudible).

3 MS. NORMA LANDEZ: And we did have community  
4 involvement in the permit issuance, prior to the permit being  
5 issued.

6 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: But it says that the  
7 community should be involved in the decision making. You know,  
8 that's going to have to be resolved. This is something that the  
9 Department of Defense screwed up on.

10 MS. NORMA LANDEZ: Okay. We also talked about --

11 MR. MARK WEEGAR: Wait a minute. Before you go on.  
12 Armando, there are -- I don't know how many RCRA permitted sites  
13 in Texas that got the letter. It is not a -- it is not something  
14 that is -- it requires no public involvement. It's simply  
15 asking, when do you propose to have construction complete of  
16 remedial actions. Not specific sites.

17 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: And the community -- and  
18 you're saying that that the community is not to be involved in  
19 that? The community doesn't may pay any tax dollars and they  
20 should -- even though the Air Force has contaminated the  
21 community's property. That's what you're saying.

22 MR. MARK WEEGAR: You need to take that up with EPA.

23 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: And I am. And I'm taking it  
24 up with my congressman. He's working on it.

25 MS. ABBI POWERS: That letter went out not only to the

TRS 12/13/04

1 DoD facilities, it went out to private facilities, publicly held  
2 companies, et cetera. And that -- the request for the --

3 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: And that's fine. That's  
4 fine. All I do -- all I'm asking for is that the community be  
5 involved in the BCT activities.

6 MR. MARK WEEGAR: This was not a BCT activity.

7 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: Then why is she giving that  
8 under the BCT report?

9 MR. MARK WEEGAR: Because she -- Norma simply asked  
10 that the BCT -- some input from me on how to -- how to this --  
11 how TCEQ wanted this response filed.

12 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: She didn't ask me and I'm a  
13 member of RAB and a member of the community.

14 MR. MARK WEEGAR: It is not -- it was not a B -- it was  
15 not submitted as part of the BCT process.

16 MR. GLENN WILKINSON: Because they're above normal  
17 citizens.

18 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: It's wrong what we're doing,  
19 and this is the reason we're having a new RAB rule come out  
20 because --

21 MR. MARK WEEGAR: Armando --

22 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: -- the Department of Defense  
23 never did do it.

24 MR. MARK WEEGAR: Armando --

25 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: That's fine.

TRS 12/13/04

1 MR. MARK WEEGAR: Pick your battles. This isn't one  
2 you want to waste your time on.

3 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: I'm wasting --

4 DR. DAVID SMITH: We're headed down --

5 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: Well, you know, he gets  
6 involved in debate when his job is to regulate.

7 MR. MARK WEEGAR: I'm trying to educate.

8 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: No. No. I'm educated. I'm  
9 trying to educate you on the law.

10 Go ahead, Norma.

11 MS. NORMA LANDEZ: This one we talked about was the  
12 early transfer guidance that TCEQ is working on. And again, Mark  
13 and I -- I discussed with Mark about how they were looking at  
14 implementing the early transfer guidance.

15 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: Now see, the community is  
16 supposed to be involved in this land transfer. It's in the law  
17 too.

18 MS. NORMA LANDEZ: Right. Okay. Then we also did  
19 updates of the different activities going on in the zones. We  
20 talked about the approval the Zone 4, R-5, status of the  
21 Commercial Street PRB and the 34th street. I believe they were  
22 still under construction at that time.

23 The Malone Street PRB, we were in the process of  
24 working out an agreement to be able to go onto the property and  
25 install the PRB.

TRS 12/13/04

1 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: That's that 34th Street, the  
2 PRB on 34th Street?

3 MS. NORMA LANDEZ: Uh-huh.

4 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: See, that's -- it's being  
5 done in the community. The community has no say so as to where  
6 it's going to be --

7 MS. NORMA LANDEZ: We talked about --

8 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: -- right of way or --

9 MS. NORMA LANDEZ: We've talked about it at the RABs  
10 and at the TRS meetings.

11 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: Yes, but they didn't get  
12 involved in the decision making, they were going to put it on  
13 34th Street instead of 35 or 36. That's what I'm saying.

14 MS. NORMA LANDEZ: Site E-1, we talked removal going  
15 for the contaminated soil at the time when they removed 8,000  
16 cubic yards, and we were also putting vegetable oil down at the  
17 bottom of excavation to help with the -- as we talked about  
18 that --

19 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: Isn't that what we got the  
20 presentation on?

21 MS. NORMA LANDEZ: Right.

22 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: And this is over and above  
23 what's on the presentation?

24 MS. NORMA LANDEZ: These are interim actions that were  
25 installed.

TRS 12/13/04

1 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: Please.

2 MS. NORMA LANDEZ: At the junction here, we were in the  
3 process of -- we were in the process of installing and it should  
4 be complete by the middle of the month. It's almost complete.

5 MR. GARY MILLER: The PRB is in place.

6 MS. NORMA LANDEZ: Right. And for Site B-10, we are in  
7 process of removing soils and should be done -- well, we were  
8 supposed to be done at the end of November, but with all the  
9 rains it was kind of delayed. It should be done by the end of  
10 summer.

11 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: You reviewed moving soils. Are  
12 those soils high in concentration of chemicals?

13 MS. NORMA LANDEZ: No.

14 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: Where are they're being removed to?

15 MS. NORMA LANDEZ: BFI?

16 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I believe they're going to BFI.

17 MS. NORMA LANDEZ: That makes sense.

18 MS. ESMERALDA GALVAN: Can I ask you a question?

19 MS. NORMA LANDEZ: Yes, ma'am.

20 MS. ESMERALDA GALVAN: You said all technologies will  
21 be in place by 2007.

22 MS. NORMA LANDEZ: Uh-huh.

23 MS. ESMERALDA GALVAN: Wasn't it earlier in -- several  
24 years ago you had said it would be in place. Each year it's been  
25 moved further and further.

TRS 12/13/04

1 MS. NORMA LANDEZ: That's due to not getting the money  
2 when we want to get the money.

3 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: We could --

4 MR. DON BUETLER: 2007 is the EPA goal for all the work  
5 in Texas. It's not -- it's a global goal of EPA statewide or  
6 nationwide.

7 MS. NORMA LANDEZ: Nationwide, correct.

8 MS. ABBI POWERS: That goes back to that letter that  
9 was issued to refineries, dry-cleaners, you name it. It was  
10 issued to any record of facility and the EPA wants them all to be  
11 cleaned up by or have something in place by 2007.

12 MS. NORMA LANDEZ: On November we did not have the BCT  
13 meeting. And for this month our BCT meeting in on Monday, the  
14 15th.

15 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: Where do you have the BCT?

16 MS. NORMA LANDEZ: In our office.

17 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: Norma, I have a question on  
18 Site E-1. You say you're putting vegetable oil and excavating so  
19 many thousands of --

20 MS. NORMA LANDEZ: Uh-huh.

21 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: I don't see it as an  
22 alternative here on the CMS report.

23 MR. MARK WEEGAR: Bioaugmentation.

24 MS. NORMA LANDEZ: It's a limited soil removal.

25 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: Bioaugmentation. Where is



TRS 12/13/04

1 it?

2 MS. NORMA LANDEZ: It's a limited soil interval and --

3 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: So it's already in effect?

4 MS. NORMA LANDEZ: We're in the process of doing it.

5 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: Bioaugmentation, that's

6 Alternative 8.

7 MS. NORMA LANDEZ: Hold on. No, there's a combination.

8 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: Bioaugmentation and  
9 excavation. And they selected -- the alternative was which one?

10 Was it 8?

11 MS. NORMA LANDEZ: It's -- no.

12 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Alternative 5 because we're  
13 going to continue to operate the trench that's in place.

14 MS. NORMA LANDEZ: It's excavation of Vadose and  
15 limited saturated soils, backfill with a layer of organic  
16 substrate and continue to operate existing system.

17 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: We're doing 4, 5, and 8 then?

18 MS. NORMA LANDEZ: No.

19 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: We're doing just eight?

20 MS. NORMA LANDEZ: Yeah, we're adding it, but organic  
21 substrate. No, we're doing No. 4.

22 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: You're excavating the  
23 contaminated soil. And Alternative 8 is bioaugmentation  
24 excavation?

25 MS. NORMA LANDEZ: No, no, no, no. Look at Alternative

TRS 12/13/04

1 4. Excavation of Vadose and limited saturated soils, backfill --

2 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: For Site E-1?

3 MS. NORMA LANDEZ: -- with a layer of organic substrate  
4 and continued to operate existing system.

5 MR. GARY MILLER: Look at the chart.

6 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: I'm looking at the chart.

7 MR. GARY MILLER: This is a very simplified version  
8 here. Look over here on this chart --

9 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: What's wrong with this one?  
10 It says E-1.

11 MR. GARY MILLER: Apparently this one was just cut back  
12 very conservatively.

13 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: This says "Recommended  
14 alternative Site E-1.

15 MR. GARY MILLER: I understand that's what it says, but  
16 if you'll look at chart, the cost summary chart, it gives you  
17 more detail of what actually amounted for.

18 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: All right.

19 MS. NORMA LANDEZ: Yeah.

20 MR. GARY MILLER: Yeah, the slide's cut off.

21 MS. NORMA LANDEZ: This is in the report.

22 DR. DAVID SMITH: Okay. Can we move on to the spill  
23 summaries.

24 MS. NORMA LANDEZ: Uh-huh. I also have the spill  
25 summary.

TRS 12/13/04

1 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: Before you go onto the spill  
2 summary, this has been repeatedly brought up that we need to  
3 leave it on the RAB meetings instead of the TRS. There was a  
4 concern that we're not doing it on the Advisory Board meetings,  
5 we're only doing it here. We had that written into the charter  
6 that we do at the RAB, but since you're going to do it here, you  
7 know, again include that for the RAB.

8 MS. NORMA LANDEZ: Yeah, we can do it at RAB meetings,  
9 just as long as we can put it on agenda. I think the last couple  
10 of times it hadn't been.

11 MR. JEFF NEATHERY: I think what we might be getting  
12 confused about is the -- you're looking at that sheet and it's  
13 not in color so you can't see which one, under "recommended",  
14 which one was highlighted. I mean, you could go back to the  
15 slide see that.

16 MS. NORMA LANDEZ: Okay. I have two spills to report  
17 since the last TRS meeting. One was on August 11th, and we had a  
18 tanker or tank on the track that had groundwater in it and the  
19 tank fell off the truck and spilled 200 gallons of groundwater.  
20 We -- there was about 60 feet of soil that were effected and also  
21 some asphalt. And so we took some samples and checked it to make  
22 sure everything -- there wasn't any contamination left.  
23 Everything was below standards, and so we didn't remove any  
24 soils. And we put in some corrective actions to insure it didn't  
25 happen again, make sure that we inspect the straps that secure

TRS 12/13/04

1 the items to the truck.

2 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: Where did you say it was?

3 MS. NORMA LANDEZ: Down by the groundwater treatment  
4 plant.

5 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: And whose truck was that?

6 MS. NORMA LANDEZ: It was the government's.

7 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: Will that report be given the  
8 RAB meeting?

9 MS. NORMA LANDEZ: It can be.

10 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: Okay.

11 MS. NORMA LANDEZ: The next report that we had --

12 MR. MICHAEL SHENEMAN: Why was groundwater on the truck  
13 in the first place?

14 MS. NORMA LANDEZ: Because it had -- it was being  
15 moved. I think that's before our groundwater treatment plant in  
16 Zone 5, if I'm not mistaken.

17 MR. MICHAEL SHENEMAN: Had it been down?

18 MS. NORMA LANDEZ: No, it just wasn't operating yet.  
19 And so we typically truck over the groundwater from Zone 5 from a  
20 tanker that's sitting at Zone 5 to the groundwater treatment  
21 plant in Zone 2 for treatment.

22 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: Can you treat that water to  
23 drinking water standards?

24 MS. NORMA LANDEZ: We treat it to the standards of the  
25 government.

TRS 12/13/04

1 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: And what does the government  
2 require there, Mr. Weegar?

3 MR. MARK WEEGAR: I'm not sure. I'm not in the  
4 permitting. I can find out what those permit requirements are.

5 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: Yes, I sure would --

6 MR. MARK WEEGAR: I think it's probably close to the  
7 surface water quality standards, which is the MCL drinking water  
8 standards, but I'm not --

9 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: It's close to the drinking  
10 water.

11 MS. ESMERALDA GALVAN: And what happened to that water  
12 afterwards?

13 MS. NORMA LANDEZ: It fell in the ground and it got  
14 absorbed by the dirt.

15 MS. ESMERALDA GALVAN: Normally what would you do that  
16 with that water? You just treat it and turn it back?

17 MS. NORMA LANDEZ: It goes into the groundwater  
18 treatment plant and into Leon Creek or it's discharged into a  
19 tank. It used to be discharged into a tank that Lackland was  
20 using to irrigate the golf course. There's no more golf course,  
21 so it just goes into the creek.

22 MS. ESMERALDA GALVAN: Why is there no more golf  
23 course?

24 MS. ABBI POWERS: Lackland no longer has a golf course  
25 because they had existing golf courses and their plans are to

TRS 12/13/04

1 turn what was Kelly Golf Course into a nature area, for lack of a  
2 better term.

3 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: Could you put a comment in  
4 there that I need an answer on as what standards is the  
5 groundwater being cleaned to and what was the date of the permit.

6 MS. ABBI POWERS: You can just put permit standards.

7 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: I think it was Permit 5-0.

8 MS. ABBI POWERS: Oh, you know what it is, then why  
9 don't you tell us the permit standards are.

10 MR. TIM SULTENFUSS: Sir, if you could write that down,  
11 I want to make sure we capture it accurately. sir.

12 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: But you got it right. You  
13 usually get it right.

14 MR. TIM SULTENFUSS: I just want to make sure, sir.

15 MR. GLENN WILKINSON: Can I get a -- ask what Building  
16 306 -- 30 -- 362, the historical study of it back to 1971.

17 DR. DAVID SMITH: We're in the middle of the spill  
18 report.

19 MS. NORMA LANDEZ: Yeah, that's --

20 DR. DAVID SMITH: Please --

21 MR. GLENN WILKINSON: I can't hear you.

22 DR. DAVID SMITH: We're in the middle of the spill  
23 report. Could you wait until we get that done. You've been  
24 promised your turn.

25 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: Could you write that down, sir.

TRS 12/13/04

1 MS. NORMA LANDEZ: The second spill we had -- well, the  
2 first time we were notified was on October 23rd. TCEQ called us  
3 and said Mr. Ruiz, who was our neighbor to the south of us,  
4 reported some fish, dead fish, in the creek. We were given a  
5 report. Everybody came back into the office and started looking  
6 at what was happening in the area. We looked at some activities  
7 that we were doing and we found that on October 20th when we were  
8 installing the Zone 2 PRB, they hit an abandoned storm line in  
9 the area, an abandoned line. And the slurry that was used to  
10 keep the PRB trench open so that the dirt doesn't fall into it  
11 when we add the iron, your not getting sluff off on the sides of  
12 the wall. That slurry went into the damaged pipe and it went out  
13 into the creek.

14 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: How many fish were killed?

15 MS. NORMA LANDEZ: I don't know. Abbi, do you know?

16 MS. ABBI POWERS: I don't know either. It basically  
17 find binds up the oxygen in the water and the fish suffocate and  
18 drown.

19 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: I'd like a copy of that  
20 report.

21 MS. NORMA LANDEZ: Okay. And when we first heard about  
22 the fish killed, we were having some really hot and humid days  
23 and then the following days we had a flood. A lot of times when  
24 we have weather conditions like that, we tend to -- the oxygen in  
25 the creek is depleted enough and sometimes the fish are impacted.

TRS 12/13/04

1 So that's -- you know, then we started going and looking at  
2 everything else happening, and we talked to the contractor there  
3 that was putting in the PRB and that's when we found out that  
4 about 20,000 gallons of slurry may have been lost. Whether all  
5 of it made it into the creek or whether some of it also went down  
6 into --

7 MS. ESMERALDA GALVAN: How many gallons?

8 MS. NORMA LANDEZ: 20,000 gallons.

9 MR. DON BUETLER: That 20,000 gallons is about five  
10 thousand pounds of water, which is actually produced in a powder  
11 from a type of bean.

12 MS. ABBI POWERS: Yeah, it's in ice cream. You eat it  
13 all the time. It's in chewing gum also.

14 MS. NORMA LANDEZ: The slurry was lost October --  
15 between the October 20th and the 21st between 6:00 p.m. and 7:00  
16 a.m. The contractors did check the creek the morning after and  
17 didn't find anything out of sorts in the creek so that was -- so  
18 he didn't inspect the site. He didn't know it had gone into the  
19 creek. It wasn't until later when we were looking at, you know,  
20 the piping was down there and that's when we found that that  
21 probably did flush water down and we could find water coming out  
22 on the other end coming out to the creek. So we went and plugged  
23 that area up before we started reworking and trench again, and  
24 then we put in measures that if they run into anything, another  
25 line down in the trench, that they would plug it up before they



TRS 12/13/04

1 would put more slurry into the trench area. So that's how we  
2 connected that.

3 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And that would require them to  
4 form a deeper pretrench.

5 MS. NORMA LANDEZ: And so we put it back to the  
6 regulators, back on the first of December.

7 That's all I have.

8 DR. DAVID SMITH: Okay. Next two items on the agenda,  
9 the documents to TRS and RAB and RAB recruitment. We have Sonja  
10 Coderre, who the public affairs officer, is here to do that.

11 MS. SONJA CODERRE: And for those of you who have not  
12 met me, I'm Sonja Coderre, the Public Affairs Officer of the Air  
13 Force Real Property Agency at Kelly USA.

14 So tonight's document reports, the Corrective Measure  
15 Study for Zone 4, as well as the August TRS audio tapes, the  
16 September special RAB audio, October RAB audio tapes, and  
17 November special audio tapes, and the transcripts and summaries  
18 from the August TRS, September Special RAB, October RAB, and  
19 November special RAB have been placed in the information  
20 repository.

21 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: And when will we get those,  
22 the RAB members?

23 DR. DAVID SMITH: You've got those.

24 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: No, no. I'm talking about  
25 the transcript.

TRS 12/13/04

1 MS. SONJA CODERRE: Oh, the transcripts?

2 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: Yes.

3 MS. SONJA CODERRE: They're made available at the next  
4 RAB meeting.

5 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: Okay.

6 MS. SONJA CODERRE: Okay. And then the next item on  
7 the agenda was the RAB recruitment. The document that you have  
8 in your packets talks about the RAB recruitment strategy that the  
9 community involvement team worked on to increase RAB membership.  
10 So at your leisure, if you'd like to look through that and maybe  
11 think about other ways that you think that we can use. As  
12 always, recruitment efforts are best when they're done face to  
13 face. So your interactions with your follow community members  
14 are going to be the best way that we can get folks involved in  
15 the RAB.

16 And it's all I have to report. Thank you.

17 DR. DAVID SMITH: Okay. One last item on RAB  
18 recruitment. For those of you who are engaged in that activity,  
19 please remember that folks who were not currently RAB members,  
20 their deadline for application is January 4, and there are  
21 applications back at the back. Please, don't hesitate to get out  
22 and tell the folks that you know about that.

23 Next item on the agenda are the Action Items from the  
24 August 10 meeting. Very quickly let me run those for you. First  
25 of all, Mr. Garcia had requested the TAPP fund presentation to be

TRS 12/13/04

1 given to the RAB members about how much money remains. That TAPP  
2 update was presented at the October RAB meeting.

3 TAPP update was (inaudible) on August 10, 2004 RAB  
4 meeting. And on the posters back in the back corner there's more  
5 information regarding that.

6 Second item was, again, Mr. Garcia's. He requested  
7 information regarding PRBs. This was entered as a request for  
8 information, and Mr. Garcia was noted to response to that  
9 August 24, 2004. I'll not that those are in the -- those just  
10 went to Mr. Garcia.

11 Okay. Mr. Garcia does have a response to that.

12 Third item, Mr. Quintanilla's. He recommended there  
13 be a once-a-month meeting and RAB be notified of TRS agenda  
14 items. Executive committee discussed these recommendations.  
15 RAB/TRS meeting schedule stands as is. (inaudible) mail a copy  
16 of the TRS agenda prior to the meeting.

17 And the final item is Ms. Campos requesting that  
18 there be more visual diagrams on the next mail outs. The  
19 response is: The posters have been created for RAB meetings with  
20 more pictures and visual diagrams. Additional pictures and  
21 visual diagrams are also being reviewed for presentation.

22 So those are the four Action Items. All of them have  
23 been responded to; three of them completely and one's got a  
24 request for information of data that's under preparation.

25 I must ask you now at the end of the discussion to

TRS 12/13/04

1 take a quick look at the TRS meeting transcript and summary and  
2 the June meeting minutes. RAB members, that's in the back of  
3 your booklet.

4 MR. MICHAEL SHENEMAN: What page?

5 DR. DAVID SMITH: There's about five pages in the back.  
6 Here's an extra couple of that. About four pages in the back.

7 These -- you all will remember, two RAB members, that  
8 copies of this transcript was mailed out for you to look at.  
9 There are, however, copies here if you need to look at that  
10 quickly.

11 What I'm asking you to do, of course, is  
12 the (inaudible) activity, take a look at it, review it, approving  
13 or correcting these items of the August TRS meeting transcript  
14 and summary and the June meeting minutes. So can you take a  
15 quick look and then I'll entertain a motion for correction or  
16 adoption.

17 (BRIEF PAUSE)

18 DR. DAVID SMITH: RAB members, everybody close enough  
19 to give me a recommendation for approval or adjustment?

20 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: Anybody got any corrections?

21 DR. DAVID SMITH: Motion for approval?

22 Second? Okay. All in favor of approving? RAB  
23 members opposed? Approved.

24 Mr. Silvas, I know you have a couple things left.  
25 Let me just say to you, because this is an important change here,

TRS 12/13/04

1 the next RAB meeting is at Kennedy High School January 18, 2005  
2 as it's always scheduled.

3 The TRS meeting, in February it's at Brentwood Middle  
4 School. Okay. So that is a change and my understanding is that  
5 will be the continuing location for both RAB and TRS meetings.

6 MS. ABBI POWERS: That was something the executive  
7 committee decided.

8 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: Have we contacted already  
9 with Dr. Squibb from the University of Maryland to do a review on  
10 the ATSDR report?

11 MS. ROBYN THOMPSON: Yes, sir.

12 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: We already contacted him?  
13 It's on the way?

14 MS. ROBYN THOMPSON: Yes, sir.

15 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: When will Dr. Squid be here?

16 MS. ROBYN THOMPSON: I believe that the executive  
17 committee decided in February. Is that correct, Mr. Silvas?

18 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: I think that sounds right.

19 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: In February we talked  
20 about -- at the February RAB -- or rather TRS.

21 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: There's one thing I'd just like to  
22 go on the record to point out an issue that was recently on the  
23 news. It's kind of far and away from what we're dealing with,  
24 but it's a concern because there was recently an was election --  
25 in the former Soviet leader who was poisoned --

TRS 12/13/04

1 MR. MICHAEL SHENEMAN: Poisoned with Dioxin.

2 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: -- with Dioxin. He was in very  
3 good health and then suddenly he lost his health and his facial  
4 expression. But if you know Dioxin, it's a biproduct of Agent  
5 Orange used in Vietnam.

6 MR. GLENN WILKINSON: He knows all about that.

7 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: And I'd like just for that to be on  
8 the record.

9 And now we can allow Glenn his three minutes.

10 DR. DAVID SMITH: Mr. Wilkinson, it's your turn.

11 MR. GLENN WILKINSON: It's my turn? I have three  
12 minutes?

13 DR. DAVID SMITH: You have three minutes.

14 MR. GLENN WILKINSON: Can I have a pen here?

15 This is the drawing of where I took my metal  
16 detector. This is what my metal detector or sounds like when it  
17 picks up metal. It's picking up the concrete in the floor there.  
18 This thing goes crazy all in this area. There's markers -- in  
19 1997 we have pictures -- Robert can verify it. He has the well  
20 number drills. All these well drills are in coordination and  
21 they lead up this. This are available tracks where orange trains  
22 came in and delivered there. You go on the internet, Building  
23 171, they're selling pumps.

24 We go to East Kelly. There's supposed to be S-7  
25 sites, railroad tracks. The real S-7 site is DDRMO, building.

TRS 12/13/04

1 This is supposed to be SR-7 sites. But I have two photographs  
2 and it does not pick that -- anywhere -- any indication in the  
3 pictures. It does coordinate with this area. Wayne Wright Road  
4 used to go through here and it just -- it had a railroad crossing  
5 that went directly to the 717 area, which takes you then across  
6 the railroad tracks and deliver materials that they didn't need.

7 Here's the railroad tracks. Down here is the school,  
8 St. Anthony. Here is a playground that is closed down. Here is  
9 SAS, San Antonio Shoes. This is area here -- I believe at one  
10 time this was all an Agent Orange storage site. This was all an  
11 Agent Orange storage site.

12 I don't know where S-2 is. They will not tell me.  
13 The Water Commission will not tell me. You have heard them at  
14 RAB meetings. They will not tell me where these building are.  
15 This building right adjacent here is building 3063.

16 Thanksgiving Day I went out there and there was a  
17 sign, "3663" on the building. On Thanksgiving Day I was jacked  
18 up by the Kelly --

19 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: Security.

20 MR. GLENN WILKINSON: -- security twice. Then I went  
21 back there that Sunday and that Building 3663 sign was missing.  
22 It was taken off. Somebody is trying to conceal these buildings,  
23 and I believe it's the water commission, Kelly security, or the  
24 EPA, or all three. And if it's all three, it's a conspiracy.  
25 And I'm wanting to become a RAB member, but I do not want to

TRS 12/13/04

1 become a RAB member and be associated with people that are  
2 conspiring because they can get sued. Because all these drums  
3 stockpiled here went to Texas Surplus Property Agency, which the  
4 Texas Water Commission -- to the Texas Watershed Project gave  
5 money to Seguin River Authority, which bought Agent Orange from  
6 Texas Surplus, which had Agent Orange had all right here and  
7 sprayed 450,000 gallons into a 36,000-acre lake, which is equal  
8 to spraying at 15 times over a five year period.

9           And yet no Dioxin tests -- they found 23 drums and no  
10 citations was issued by the Texas Water Commission for being --  
11 yet they -- yet I didn't have a permit, which I went and tried to  
12 get a \$7 permit, and they condemned an 80,000 home and I had to  
13 move. That's how far they've gone. They put my family on the  
14 street because of a seven-dollar sewage permit, which I had to  
15 best sewage permit. I had a whole lot.

16           These people are evil. They are in the biggest  
17 conspiracy --

18           DR. DAVID SMITH: Mr. Wilkinson, you're past your three  
19 minutes.

20           MR. GLENN WILKINSON: What?

21           DR. DAVID SMITH: You're past your three minutes.

22           MR. ROBERT SILVAS: Go ahead and wrap it up, Glenn.  
23 Wrap it up.

24           MR. GLENN WILKINSON: So you better watch out for the  
25 EPA and them. And since there's no longer a base commander, you



TRS 12/13/04

1 can amend your bylaw to take off the Water Commission and the EPA  
2 because that's now the mandatory on their the bylaw. Since  
3 there's no base commander to enforce that, you can take these two  
4 people off your board.

5 DR. DAVID SMITH: Thank you, sir.

6 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: Again, I want to touch on what he's  
7 talking about. Just recently -- and I want this on the record.  
8 I'll have her put it down in a minute because I have it on  
9 recording. A request was made from the Water Commission and Paul  
10 Serhan to forward the investigation, which was closed, and there  
11 was no adjudication or any law broken. And Travis DA forwarded  
12 it to Greg Abbott's office. It apparently is going to be  
13 withheld. So if this continues, which I know it will, and it's  
14 more than likely they have not assisted in gaining in this  
15 information.

16 The other one is EPA, who just recently -- I  
17 forwarded a request to gain access to Mike Haun's report and the  
18 closed investigation, which no one seems to have taken it over.  
19 If that all continues to be withheld. Again, I will again seek  
20 the Water Commission and EPA to have them impeached due to lack  
21 of communication and withholding vital information.

22 That's it.

23 DR. DAVID SMITH: Okay. We're down to adjournment  
24 phase unless there's some last comments?

25 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: What are the -- we already

TRS 12/13/04

1 received the documents, the -- now, what -- can someone give us  
2 the titles of those documents that we're receiving?

3 MS. ABBI POWERS: She did.

4 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: She did? Now, is there any  
5 one of those documents that we need a presentation on, the TRS  
6 committee?

7 MS. ABBI POWERS: Don't you still supply copies of the  
8 executive summary in these RAB meeting minutes?

9 MS. ROBYN THOMPSON: Yes.

10 MS. ABBI POWERS: Why don't you look at those and  
11 see --

12 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: I haven't gotten one. I  
13 didn't get one.

14 MS. ABBI POWERS: It's in here, it's in the pack you  
15 were handed out today. They're in the back.

16 MS. ROBYN THOMPSON: They're in the back. You will get  
17 an update at the RAB meeting on January 18th.

18 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: Yes, but we need -- you know,  
19 I need to know what they are so perhaps we can get a report or a  
20 presentation from those documents that we're receiving. See if  
21 you just give us documents, there they are --

22 MS. ABBI POWERS: No, but you -- remember when you all  
23 requested that the executive summaries --

24 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: Yes, and we also requested.

25 (SEVERAL PEOPLE TALKING AT ONCE)

TRS 12/13/04

1 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: I want to establish -- listen  
2 to me. I want to establish an agenda for the next meeting. And  
3 something in there may be interesting enough that we can have a  
4 presentation on. Which one do you think? What would you like?

5 MS. ABBI POWERS: I wouldn't know. You need to figure  
6 out what the zone --

7 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: I haven't seen them.

8 MS. ABBI POWERS: They're right here.

9 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: We want a presentation on  
10 Zone 1. But Zone 1 is no longer ours. It belongs to --

11 MR. MARK WEEGAR: Yeah, but the Lackland people --

12 MS. ABBI POWERS: They have interested activities that  
13 you can attend. Their meeting -- and their meeting will be on  
14 the 19th.

15 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: Who, Lackland?

16 MS. ABBI POWERS: Lackland.

17 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: They don't even have a -- you  
18 know, they're something else. I've been to their meetings. I've  
19 been to their meetings and this --

20 MS. NORMA LANDEZ: This is the final zone for CMS,  
21 which we presented before.

22 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: And that's a CMS -- the one  
23 that Mr. Neathery --

24 MS. NORMA LANDEZ: No, no, no, no. Zone 4. Zone 4.

25 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: Well, let's have a short

TRS 12/13/04

1 presentation.

2 MS. ABBI POWERS: You already have.

3 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: Huh?

4 MS. ABBI POWERS: You already have.

5 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: Well, all right. What's the  
6 other one?

7 MS. NORMA LANDEZ: This is the Zone 1, CMS addendum  
8 report.

9 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: Now, since Zone 1 is  
10 Lackland, what are we doing with Lackland?

11 DR. DAVID SMITH: This has been -- that just has --  
12 needs to be added to the file, but it's still on the --

13 MR. MARK WEEGAR: Lackland is paying for what  
14 Lackland's doing, but Kelly is still responsible for submitting  
15 it because it's still within their permit.

16 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: Are we using our cleanup  
17 money for that?

18 MS. ABBI POWERS: No.

19 MS. NORMA LANDEZ: No.

20 MR. MARK WEEGAR: Lackland is.

21 MS. ABBI POWERS: Lackland paid for it.

22 MR. MARK WEEGAR: It's just the administrative chore of  
23 submitting all reports falls on Kelly because Lackland didn't  
24 want their own permit.

25 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: What I'm talking about is

TRS 12/13/04

1 something that we're going to present at the February meeting.

2 MS. NORMA LANDEZ: Just to let you know, the  
3 January 2004 semi-annual compliance plan report will come out in  
4 January and be submitted and with a report on that. We usually  
5 report on that in February, but if you'd like --

6 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: Yeah, I would like a  
7 PowerPoint presentation on that for the February meeting.

8 MS. NORMA LANDEZ: On the semi-annual compliance plan.

9 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: One other thing before we close.  
10 The bioremediation, I think that's something that you can try and  
11 get the community a little more informed on. There's a person  
12 who has a PhD. who I met recently. Her name is Dr. Elaine  
13 Ingham. She's a soil microbiologist and has a PhD. She has a  
14 site called soilfoodandweb@AOL.com; www soil food web dot com. I  
15 think this would be beneficial in trying to get a little more  
16 information on these mediation actions being taken, especially  
17 the bioaugmentation. I think that if we can somehow get her to  
18 do a presentation to the Restoration Advisory Board even, you  
19 know, within 2005 timeframe, that would be beneficial.

20 Actually, Mr. Sheneman actually knows this person  
21 too. I think he can talk a little bit more about her background  
22 and what he tells her, her job and what she knows. Ms. Elaine  
23 Ingham.

24 MR. MICHAEL SHENEMAN: What, do you want me to give her  
25 phone number what?

TRS 12/13/04

1 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: I don't have her phone number  
2 available here, but I was just telling them that I think her  
3 doing a presentation on some of the actions or some of the  
4 alternatives out there.

5 MR. MICHAEL SHENEMAN: Well, for the record, her phone  
6 number is area code 541-752-5066. Her name is Dr. Elaine,  
7 E-l-a-i-n-e, Ingham, I-n-g-h-a-m. Her address is 1128 Northeast  
8 Second Street, Suite 120, Corevalis, C-o-r-v-a-l-i-s, Oregon.  
9 Zip is 97330. E-mail, all one word, soilfoodweb.AOL.com. And  
10 her web page is www.soilfoodweb.com.

11 I had a lengthy conversation with her by telephone.  
12 I had been speaking with one of our locals Malcolm Beck, whose  
13 phone number is 483-1930. Also Kate Chandler of the Texas Plant  
14 and Soil down in Edinburg. Also Bob Webster of Shades of Green  
15 over on Sunset. And they've been -- Dr. Elaine Ingham indicated  
16 that this cleanup thing using micro organism has been done. And  
17 then I come here tonight totally astounded and -- and I mentioned  
18 this to Dr. Smith, and I'm pleasantly surprised because this  
19 right here is innocuous. It won't hurt anybody from what we  
20 gather.

21 So I think this is a very valuable resource. Also  
22 then we keep get into cleaning up the environment. In the mean  
23 time, I was let down by a group of folks who have an educational  
24 site. I've asked for, like, a little course catalog it and was  
25 supposed arrive by today and it has not. So in January I'll

TRS 12/13/04

1 bring that, if it's okay with you all. I'm not selling horses,  
2 but it is a way to -- to my way of thinking, recruit. We see  
3 these folks come in and picket us, and if you've ever get sick  
4 and tired of being sick and tired. I have been. It was a  
5 20-year horrible time in my life. I learned how to handle it.  
6 And when I see those folks coming in, it grieves me. I tell you.  
7 I don't want to get on a soap box, but we've got an educational  
8 function. I think Mr. Murrah brought it up. Mr. Quintanilla  
9 actually used the word "education" and I think that's a thrust we  
10 need to do at the same time as we're doing things here. If for  
11 nothing else, to generate community involvement.

12 DR. DAVID SMITH: Well, it sounds like some there's a  
13 motion. If we could make that, it could be an agenda item for an  
14 upcoming RAB meeting.

15 MR. MICHAEL SHENEMAN: I think it'd have to be like a  
16 committee thing, Doctor. This is -- this gets pretty big and to  
17 drag people through the development of this thing might be a  
18 little bit tedious.

19 DR. DAVID SMITH: Okay.

20 MR. MICHAEL SHENEMAN: I don't care. I'm willing to  
21 put my shoulder to the wheel because I feel very strongly, as  
22 y'all probably know about this whole thing.

23 DR. DAVID SMITH: Well, as a RAB activity how about if  
24 we take it to the executive committee and let them do the agenda.

25 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: Okay.

TRS 12/13/04

1 DR. DAVID SMITH: Please. Does that make sense to you?

2 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: Yeah, we can bring that up.

3 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: Did you put down for the TRS  
4 meeting that presentation that this man has suggested?

5 MS. ROBYN THOMPSON: I did.

6 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: Is it down?

7 MR. TIM SULTENFUSS: Yes.

8 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: I have here the complete  
9 investigation and complaint on the Ackerman Road site. I'd like  
10 to submit this and have it copied and put into the files. So  
11 whoever wants to take it.

12 Before we close too, I also want to have her put  
13 this --

14 MS. ROBYN THOMPSON: Did you want to leave it --

15 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: I want copies put in the file and  
16 this returned to me. Whatever you copy, you can have them. I'd  
17 like it returned.

18 MR. MICHAEL SHENEMAN: I'll also like to get this into  
19 record, if we may Wilma's -- do you have that?

20 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: Not in front of me. We passed it  
21 in the executive committee. And then again, for the record, for  
22 the RAB, we were going to pursue this issue and present it and  
23 hopefully they'll have that report that we give them in the  
24 executive meeting.

25 But Thelma Wilma Subera, who did a review on the Zone



TRS 12/13/04

1 2/3 CMS -- she did a presentation for the Southwest Workers Union  
2 and we're trying to get her to do a presentation also to the RAB  
3 to have a balance and fair review of this closure.

4 For the record, her name is Thelma Subera, P.O. Box  
5 9813, New Alberia, Louisiana, 70562. Area code 337-367-2216.

6 Her site is: Subera --

7 MR. MICHAEL SHENEMAN: You might hand that to her.

8 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: Suberaco5.aol.com. I can't read  
9 that very well.

10 MR. MICHAEL SHENEMAN: That's a very valuable resource.  
11 I heard her speak.

12 MS. ABBI POWERS: Are we going to take this to the  
13 executive committee?

14 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: We have. We brought it up. Again,  
15 I just want to put it on the record, that way we can make sure it  
16 goes down and we can follow up on it. Because I did give you all  
17 those copies at the last executive committee.

18 I want this put on the record too, this request for  
19 (inaudible) EPA. You can listen to it.

20 (PLAYING TAPE) "... information. The due date for it  
21 is January 6th."

22 Let me stop and go forward.

23 "... calling with EPA. I'm calling in regard to the  
24 request you submitted. Just for your information, the due date  
25 for it is January 6th of 2005. I don't know if it will be done

TRS 12/13/04

1 any earlier than that or not.

2 And also there is a fee commitment that I am required  
3 to get from you with respect to that. I'm estimating that it  
4 will be somewhere in the neighborhood of 150 to \$200. Before you  
5 do any withdrawal, I need to have a commitment from you in  
6 writing that you are willing to pay for the cost of searching and  
7 reviewing the documents.

8 You have the address for (inaudible) and the EPA  
9 office. You can send that commitment to them. Thank you.  
10 Bye-bye."

11 (END OF TAPE)

12 That's all I have.

13 MS. SONJA CODERRE: I just want to back up for a  
14 second. In our executive committee meeting we had talked to  
15 Mr. Silvas about that report from Subera and my understanding was  
16 that we were going to bring that report to the technical review  
17 subcommittee and have them evaluate if for the RAB.

18 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: Who on the committee is going  
19 to do that?

20 MS. SONJA CODERRE: Well, I understood the technical --

21 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: We are the technical -- I am  
22 the technical. He's the technical, but who -- who -- who -- who  
23 is going to do that?

24 MS. SONJA CODERRE: I think the situation was going to  
25 be a make it agenda item to discuss here first. And I could be

TRS 12/13/04

1 wrong, but that is what I understood. It would be discussed here  
2 at this meeting first and then make a decision as I group to take  
3 it to RAB.

4 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: Right. We're going to give them  
5 the actual presentation that was taken off the Air Force Zone 2  
6 and 3 and hope that that will be ready, you know, you guys will  
7 have that presented at the RAB. And, again, you know, we'll have  
8 their consensus on that and go from there.

9 MR. GLENN WILKINSON: Who is coming up with the \$200 to  
10 pay for the documentation?

11 MS. SONJA CODERRE: That's in connection with  
12 Mr. Silvas's personal Freedom of Information Act request. That's  
13 not in the purview of this meeting, I'm sorry to say.

14 MR. GLENN WILKINSON: Does the RAB committee request  
15 that on behalf of RAB.

16 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: Okay. Well, it's on the record and  
17 we're going to talk about it.

18 MS. SONJA CODERRE: That's the Freedom of Information  
19 Act. I'd be happy to go into that with you.

20 MR. MARK WEEGAR: I guess I'm a little confused here.  
21 Robert, you're saying that Wilma Subera did a review of the Zone  
22 2 and 3 CMS?

23 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: For Southwest Worker's Union,  
24 correct.

25 MR. MARK WEEGAR: And you want her to give a

TRS 12/13/04

1 presentation to the TRS and the RAB?

2 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: Correct.

3 MR. MARK WEEGAR: I mean, we just had your TAPP  
4 contractor do a presentation concerning the Zone 2 and 3.

5 MR. MICHAEL SHENEMAN: I heard her talk and I don't  
6 know what to believe. She almost repeated line for line for line  
7 everything I've ever heard for a year, based on a purview of  
8 20,000 government documents. That's what I heard her say.

9 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: How much would she charge?

10 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: I'm not certain. It's no more than  
11 what he charges.

12 MR. ARMANDO QUINTANILLA: \$5000? Because this is what  
13 he charged for a written report.

14 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: Right. I'll find out.

15 MR. MARK WEEGAR: Who's paying for her review and  
16 presentation?

17 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: We'll get the funds from somewhere.

18 MR. MARK WEEGAR: Is this being done for that project  
19 regeneration, EPA funding? I mean, she's already done the  
20 review, right?

21 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: She did it for the Southwest  
22 Workers Union.

23 MR. MARK WEEGAR: That was through the EPA?

24 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: I'm not certain.

25 DR. DAVID SMITH: Okay. Yes, sir?

TRS 12/13/04

1 MR. GLENN WILKINSON: Can we get Mae Wong to show up at  
2 one of the RAB committees? She turned y'all in, the Region 6 in,  
3 in the year of 2000.

4 DR. DAVID SMITH: Excuse me?

5 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: We'll work on it, Glenn.

6 DR. DAVID SMITH: I'm searching for a motion to  
7 adjourn.

8 MR. ROBERT SILVAS: All right. Motion to adjourn.

9 DR. DAVID SMITH: All in favor? Adjourned.

10 (8:42 p.m.)

11 -oOo-

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

TRS 12/13/04

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 2/2/05  
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**