

KELLY AFB TEXAS

ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD COVER SHEET

AR File Number355.10

KELLY AR # 3355.10 (Paper 2 7fQ 35

RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD APRIL 17, 1995



KIM TINDALL & ASSOCIATES

7800 W. IH-10 - STE. 100 San Antonio, TX 78230

(210) 377-3027 FAX (210) 344-6016

Dallas, TX Houston, TX

Austin, TX (214) 720-4567 (512) 452-0011 (713) 681-9800

> Odessa, TX (915) 683-3032

Baton Rouge, LA (504) 343-2020

Laredo, TX (915) 683-3032

San Antonio, TX (915) 683-3032 (210) 377-3027

Amarilio, TX (806) 359-8734

Midland, TX

(800) 969-3027

San Angelo, TX (915) 658-4143

Lafayette, LA (318) 988-0962

(915) 683-3032

Pecos, TX

New Orleans, LA (504) 529-3355

Corpus Christi, TX (512) 949-9555

1	RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEMBERS:
2	MR. ALLAN HAGELTHORN Community co-chair;
3	
4	MR. RICHARD TREVINO Kelly AFB employee;
5	MR. GARY BEYER TNRCC, Austin;
6	
7	MR. BILLY BROWN TNRCC, San Antonio;
8	MR. GEORGE RICE Groundwater hydrologist;
9	
10	MR. ARMANDO C. QUINTANILLA American Assoc. of Retired People;
11	MR. CARL MIXON Bexar County Fire Marshal;
12	
13	MS. YOLANDA A. JOHNSON Committee for Environmental Justice - Action;
14	
15	MR. BILL SAIN Bexar Audubon Society;
16	PROF. GENE W. LENE Academic Community;
17	
18	KELLY MCCARTNEY Kelly AFB employee
19	Alternate;
20	MS. JOAN FALKENBERG San Antonio Water System;
21	MR. FLORENCIO A. MARTINEZ
22	Kelly AFB employee;
23	TOM CULBERTSON Alternate;
24	JIM CLARK
25	Alternate;

1	RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD ATTENDEES:
2	CAPTAIN EDWARD VON DRAN Kelly AFB employee;
3	MS. ADRIENNE WILLIAMS
4	Kelly AFB employee;
5	MR. TOM TEAGUE Science Applications International
6	Corporation;
7	MR. MIKE ESTRADA Kelly AFB employee;
8	MR. TOM MOORE
9	MR. TOM SMITH
10	
11	MR. SAM SANCHEZ
12	MAJOR CHARLES AYALA Kelly AFB employee;
13	MR. RAUL VILLAR
14	MR. JUAN F. SOLIS, SR.
15	San Antonio Councilman;
16	MR. PAUL LEWIS TNRCC, Austin;
17	MR. JOE EBERT
18	Kelly ABF employee;
19	JULIE A. SEAL Certified Shorthand Reporter.
20	
21	* * * * *
22	
23	
24	
25	

On the 17th day of April, A.D. 1995, the above entitled meeting came on for discussion before said ALLAN HAGELTHORN, and the following proceedings were had:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. HAGELTHORN: Ladies and gentlemen, I'd like to welcome you to the April 17th meeting of the Kelly Air Force Base Restoration Advisory Board, on behalf of myself and Mr. Larry Bailey, who is not here right He's in Washington, D.C., receiving a very prestigious award for Kelly. Kelly has been awarded the Department of Defense Pollution Prevention award. It's a pretty stiff competition and entails competition with all the other DOD bases throughout the country and Kelly won the award. So, that's a -- that's a -- a big round of applause for the environmental management section.

I'd also like to take a look -- or reiterate a few things. One thing is for everybody to remember that we are taping the proceedings of the minutes. We also have a court reporter that is recording all the minutes. Right now we all have name tags so everybody doesn't have to repeat their name

every time they speak, I think. Is that true?

Another introduction: I'd like to introduce Mr. Tom Teague. He's a contractor doing the community relations effort for the Restoration Advisory Board. And he will serve as a facilitator and moderator during any of the actions that are going on during the Board. So, if you see him stepping in with his input, that's his job.

We have a number of -- actually not a number -- We have four administrative topics that we need to get reviewed and then we'll go into tonight's program. The highlight of tonight's program will be a presentation by the TNRCC. And the first one is that I would like to get a motion to accept the minutes of the March 6th meeting. Any corrections to the minutes?

MR. QUINTANILLA: Yes. I have some corrections that need to be made. I would like to start off with the fourth paragraph of Page 2 of the minutes. My name is misspelled there.

MR. HAGELTHORN: Okay.

MR. QUINTANILLA: Then I'd like

2 7

1 to go to Paragraph D -- the second paragraph there where Ms. Williams explains that the 2 essence of what we're trying to do is to ensure 3 that the RAB member is not a contractor for 4 5 Kelly and will not be in the future. I believe that the word "environmental" should be inserted 6 7 in front of contractor. And the reason that I'm 8 saying this -- I -- my brother is a contractor 9 at Kelly Air Force Base. He is -- He builds 10 buildings at Kelly and remodels them. 11 you know, if I'm prohibited from -- from 12 attending this or my brother is, I'm in bad 13 shape. 14 MR. HAGELTHORN: Ms. Williams? 15 MR. QUINTANILLA: And I'd like to 16 have that corrected. 17 MR. HAGELTHORN: The question is on the kinds of conflict of interest which we 18 19 discussed at the last meeting. The question 20 Is, based on your quote last month when the 21 essence of what we are trying to do is to ensure 22 that the RAB member is not a contractor for 23 Kelly --24 MS. WILLIAMS: Mr. Quintanilla's 25 right. It should have been environmental

1	contractor so we can just put in brackets
2	"environmental," because I may have been
3	talking
4	MR. QUINTANILLA: I don't want to
5	get kicked out because
6	MS. WILLIAMS: No. I
7	understand. That was the intention
8	MR. QUINTANILLA: And I don't
9	want him to you know, to be ineligible for a
10	contract.
11	MS. WILLIAMS: No. I mean, it is
12	a very narrow conflict-of-interest question and
13	it is environmental. So.
14	MR. HAGELTHORN: The minutes will
15	stand corrected. Any other
16	MR. QUINTANILLA: Okay. The I
17	have another point in here and that's concerning
18	the conflict of interest. Ms. Williams never
19	did state the authority for that. Could we have
20	a copy of the authority
21	MR. HAGELTHORN: Yes. The
22	authority, I believe and you can back me
23	up is the September '94 guidance from the
24	Restoration Advisory Board, which is the
25	Department of Defense closures.
J	

1	MR. QUINTANILLA: I could not
2	find it in the law and I need a reason for it.
3	MS. WILLIAMS: It is in the
4	guidance documents and
5	MR. QUINTANILLA: Which one?
6	MS. WILLIAMS: It's what
7	Mr. Hagelthorn just answered you.
8	MR. HAGELTHORN: September '94
9	guidance on Restoration Advisory Boards,
10	Department of Defense.
11	MR. QUINTANILLA: Could that
12	specific authority be given, you know, what
13	what it is, what law it is or what FAR it is or
14	whatever it is, please
15	MS. WILLIAMS: The actual FAR, I
16	would have to get for you. I do not know that
17	off the top of my head, but there are conflict
18	of interest of rules in the FAR and we can see
19	what we can find out.
20	MR. QUINTANILLA: Yes, please. I
21	would like to have that kind of authority. One
22	more thing on Paragraph D: Again, my name is
23	spelled wrong twice in this paragraph and I'm
24	requesting that the minutes be corrected to that
25	effect. It seems like you-all are picking on

me.

MR. HAGELTHORN: Well, you just need to change your name. Any other corrections to the minutes?

MR. QUINTANILLA: Yes. I have other corrections to go on it. On Paragraph E, the minutes do not include the name and the phone number of the contact at Kelly who handles claims — this is on top of Page 5. The progress report that was sent to us immediately after the last meeting, the notice that we got of this particular meeting for today, the ad that appeared in the paper on April the 6th did not have the name of the contact person to where we may file complaints — that is, the people in the neighborhood. For instance, the people around Six Mile Creek and so forth — in there.

I had heard unofficially that the commander does not want this information to be published or distributed to the people. If this is not so, why wasn't it published in these documents?

MR. HAGELTHORN: Can somebody --

MR. TREVINO: What we can do,

Mr. Quintanilla, is: Mr. Estrada's part of the presentation can address that very issue. He

KIM TINDALL & ASSOCI

KIM TINDALL & ASSOCIATES, INC.
7800 IH-10 WEST, SUITE 100, SAN ANTONIO, TX 78230
(210) 377-3027 1-800-969-3027 FAX (210) 344-6016

1 gives his public affairs update here as part of 2 the next topic. He can definitely address that. 3 MR. QUINTANILLA: Well, he can --4 he's going to do that. But why hasn't it been 5 done? I have asked for this, you know, for the 6 past two or three meetings and it still hasn't 7 come out. 8 MR. TREVINO: He can address that 9 in his update. He will have an answer. 10 MR. QUINTANILLA: Has the General 11 said that it would not be published? 12 MR. TREVINO: No, sir. It's my 13 understanding that the General has not said 14 that. 15 MR. QUINTANILLA: Who has said that it would not be published? 16 17 MR. TREVINO: I do not have that 18 information. Mr. Estrada -- In terms of 19 releasing the actual information, Mr. Estrada 20 will be able to provide that information to you 21 as part of his presentation. I'm Mike Estrada. 22 MR. ESTRADA: 23 To just answer your point right now, it's the 24 legal office that has made that decision and I 25 can go into more detail once I --

1 MR. QUINTANILLA: By what authority? You know, can they cite the 2 authority they -- Is it in the -- in the law 3 4 itself or -- or what? 5 MR. ESTRADA: Not to my 6 knowledge. But, again, we've got a --7 MR. QUINTANILLA: Well, there 8 must some authority as to why it hasn't been published and when will it be published and when 9 10 will it be distributed to the people of the --11 MR. ESTRADA: The basic 12 rationale --13 MR. HAGELTHORN: Why don't we 14 hold this -- table this issue because we're not 15 going to answer -- be able to answer it right 16 here, right now. 17 MR. QUINTANILLA: Table it until 18 when? 19 MR. HAGELTHORN: We will wait 20 until Mr. Estrada -- We'll table it until 21 Mr. Estrada makes his presentation and we'll 22 bring Ms. Williams up to discuss it. And if we 23 need to get some additional information, we'll 24 do that. 25 MR. QUINTANILLA: I'm a little

upset about this because -- you know, the people are upset about it. They think that we're nothing but a rubber stamp here and that we're covering up something. MR. HAGELTHORN: I understand the position. But right now we're just trying to

prove the minutes. We've got a point of contention in the minutes and we'll review that.

Another correction -- Paragraph 7 -- Mr. Bailey requested that the -- several of the RAB members that were interested in the DRMO spill incident -- and this is the spill that -- where over 40 or 50,000 gallons of water was -- was used to put out a fire at the -- at the DRMO. 10,000 gallons of a hazard substance from the fire spilled over into Six Mile Creek. stated that that was not a subject for the entire RAB. The law states differently. And at this time, I want to read from the law and it comes out of Subsection C of 10 USC 2705 -- and this is from technical review committees at the United States Department of Defense installation. And the law reads as follows: Whenever possible and practical, the secretary

1

2

3

1	shall establish a technical review committee to
2	review and comment on DOD actions and proposed
3	actions with respect to releases or threatened
4	releases of hazardous substances at
5	installations. Members of any such committees
6	shall include at least one representative of the
7	secretary, the administrator and appropriate
8	state and local authorities and shall include a
9	public representative of the community involved.
10	MR. HAGELTHORN: Okay.
11	MR. TEAGUE: Excuse me for
12	interrupting. Could I get your citation again
13	on the law?
14	MR. QUINTANILLA: The law?
15	MR. TEAGUE: It's 10 USC.
16	MR. QUINTANILLA: It's 10 USC
17	2705. And I would like to have that What I
18	would like is for all spills that have occurred
19	since the first of the year to brought before
20	this entire RAB and discussed at in
21	accordance with the law.
22	MR. TREVINO: Well, if I may just
23	add one thing to that. The law specifies that
24	that is a technical review committee.
25	MR. QUINTANILLA: No, sir. Let

1	me read the following paragraph
2	MR. TREVINO: If I may finish,
3	please.
4	MR. QUINTANILLA: Okay. I'll let
5	you finish.
6	MR. TREVINO: One of the things
7	that we're looking at under the TRC format
8	The Restoration Advisory Board has superceded
9	the TRC.
10	MR. QUINTANILLA: Exactly.
11	MR. TREVINO: And under those
12	provisions, if the U.S. law says that, we'll be
13	more than happy from our standpoint to go back
14	and look at that to see where does it apply,
15	where does it not apply.
16	MR. QUINTANILLA: Exactly.
17	MR. TREVINO: And if, in fact,
18	that it does apply to a Restoration viewpoint,
19	we'll be happy to bring those to the attention
20	of the RAB. But in the event that it doesn't,
21	we'll be more than happy to discuss those
22	outside the RAB setting.
23	MR. QUINTANILLA: Let me read to
24	you what the law says. Subsection D states that
25	in lieu of establishing a technical review

1 committee under Subsection C -- which is the one 2 that I just read to you --3 MR. TREVINO: Correct. 4 MR. QUINTANILLA: The secretary 5 may permit the establishment of a Restoration 6 Advisory Board where the secretary is planning 7 on implementing environmental restoration 8 activities. So, the Restoration Board does have 9 that kind of authority. 10 MR. TEAGUE: If you wouldn't mind 11 me interrupting again. 12 MR. QUINTANILLA: I'm reading 13 from the law. 14 MR. TEAGUE: Right. It's my 15 understanding that there may have been some 16 amendments to this law that are fairly recent --17 maybe even the last session of Congress. 18 ensure that you get the kind of input that you 19 need, though, to make sure that you get a broad 20 RAB perspective, could I propose maybe that you 21 entertain the idea of a subcommittee to look 22 at --23 MR. QUINTANILLA: Definitely. 24 MR. TEAGUE: -- to look at the 25 charter and to line the charter up against the

law that -- that --

that.

MR. HAGELTHORN: I'll agree with

MR. QUINTANILLA: But I still want the minutes corrected, because I think -- I mentioned to Mr. Bailey after he talked to us here, after the meeting, that it was wrong and that it was contrary to law. And this is the reason that I'm citing the law today and I want the minutes corrected to that effect and I want any spills that have occurred since the first of the year to be brought before this RAB and discussed here.

MR. TREVINO: If I could recommend as part of that, in order for us to fully, I guess, address your concern -- if this is a major point of contention -- that we defer the RAB meeting minutes approval until the next meeting. Because what we're going to have to go back and do is to go back and take your concern, look at the public law, look at the amendments and everything else before we --

 $$\operatorname{\mathtt{MR.}}$ QUINTANILLA: I would like to give a copy of the law to Mr. Teague here.

MR. MIXON: But are we asking to

1	approve the minutes as they're spoken or as we
2	want them
3	MR. QUINTANILLA: I want them
4	changed because they're
5	MR. MIXON: The minutes only
6	reflect as they were spoken. Now, if they're
7	incorrect that can be identified. But that
8	shouldn't deter us from being able to approve
9	the minutes as being accurate and reflecting
10	what was covered at the meeting.
11	MR. QUINTANILLA: That was
12	covered at the meeting. But what the point
13	that I'm trying to make is that I was told that
14	it was against the RAB that it was not a RAB
15	matter, that it could not be discussed formally
16	during the RAB and could only be discussed after
17	the RAB.
18	MR. MIXON: And that's what's in
19	the minutes.
20	MR. QUINTANILLA: And that's
21	what's in the minutes.
22	MR. MIXON: And that's what I'm
23	saying
24	MR. QUINTANILLA: And that is
25	contrary to law.
E	

1 MR. HAGELTHORN: I believe the interpretation of the law -- and Ms. Williams 2 3 may correct me if I'm wrong -- but the interpretation of the law is the fact that the 5 RAB deals with issues which are identified 6 during the restoration process. The spill 7 during the fire is not identified right now in 8 the restoration process. It may --9 MR. QUINTANILLA: I disagree. 10 MR. HAGELTHORN: -- at some time 11 become part of that process. But as of this date, I believe that's --12 13 MR. QUINTANILLA: I think you're 14 stretching it. 15 MR. HAGELTHORN: Well, what I'm 16 saying is that we have to -- as a board, we need to ask the Air Force to investigate that. 17 18 Okay? But the point is, is that we cannot 19 change the minutes, as Mr. Mixon was saying, to 20 reflect something that wasn't said last month. 21 We will ask the Air Force to pull the minutes --22 If we want to defer approval of the minutes, we 23 will ask the Air Force to pull the verbatim 24 transcripts and present those to you for the 25 next RAB meeting. And I think that we're really

1 taking a long --2 MR. QUINTANILLA: There was never 3 verbatim transcripts in the informal portion of 4 this. 5 MR. HAGELTHORN: Well, if it's 6 not made a formal portion, then it's not going 7 to be a part of the minutes. 8 MR. QUINTANILLA: And that's the 9 point that I'm trying to make. 10 MR. HAGELTHORN: And we're not 11 going to be able to input that into the --12 MR. QUINTANILLA: Well, what I'm 13 trying to get across is that it was wrong for 14 Mr. Bailey to do what he did. 15 MR. HAGELTHORN: Well, why don't 16 we -- because we're not going to be able to do 17 what you're asking if it's an informal portion. 18 Why don't we defer this -- put this into new 19 item -- new business for next agenda and --20 well, we can get the new agenda -- we'll put 21 that into the agenda item to discuss this. 22 MR. TEAGUE: And certainly the 23 minutes of this meeting can reflect --24 MR. HAGELTHORN: That's right. 25 MR. TEAGUE: The minutes of this

1 meeting can reflect what you're saying here, 2 though. 3 MR. QUINTANILLA: That's 4 Because I have also asked for a copy perfect. 5 of the incident report and I've been promised it. 6 7 MR. TREVINO: It's right here. 8 MR. QUINTANILLA: Okay. Finally, 9 I got it. Thank you very much. 10 MR. TREVINO: You're welcome. 11 MR. QUINTANILLA: I've been 12 asking -- this since February. Go ahead. 13 MR. RICE: I'd just like to make 14 a comment about his issue -- you know, and 15 regardless of what the law says as to what 16 should be reported to RAB and what shouldn't. 17 You know, the reason all of us are here, I 18 presume, is because we're interested in 19 environmental issues at Kelly. 20 MR. HAGELTHORN: True statement. 21 MR. RICE: And these 22 environmental issues ought to be brought before 23 the RAB and -- regardless of what this sort of 24 legal hairsplitting says about whether or not it 25 properly belongs before the RAB or not.

1 I, for one -- I'd certainly like to hear about 2 these things. 3 MR. HAGELTHORN: And -- you know, looking at the law and looking the way it is 4 5 written, we can ask for anything from the Air 6 But what we are able to react to and 7 what we are able to provide guidance on is 8 another --9 MR. RICE: I'm speaking just 10 about information. 11 MR. HAGELTHORN: If it's 12 requested that we ask the Air Force for the 13 information, then, yes, they have to provide the 14 information to us. 15 MR. QUINTANILLA: Later on, when 16 the -- when the charter is on the table for the 17 revision of Ms. Williams in there, I want to 18 bring out certain points that are in that 19 charter that are contrary to the law. 20 wording makes this RAB Board nothing but a 21 rubber stamp and I want it to reflect the 22 proper -- the proper reading. 23 Now, one more -- one more point concerning 24 the minutes. Mr. Bailey also stated that the 25 minority contractor -- and contracting was

not -- this was during the informal session -was not a matter for the RAB Board. I have
researched the executive order 12580 of the
CERCLA that -- that states -- and it states the
following: That the function vested in the
president by Section 1051 of the act relating to
reporting on minority participation in contracts
is delegated to the administrator.

And it goes on further to say that minority contractor's info will be included in the annual report requested by the administrator. That means that Kelly must keep track of the minority contractors. And I have been told that, no, this is not a function of the RAB, that Kelly cannot keep track of the minority contractors because it's contrary to -- and that information belongs to the contractors themselves and they cannot be divulged. That is wrong. And I would like to have that corrected.

CAPT. VON DRAN: Excuse me. Are you talking -- concerning minority contractors or subcontractors to prime contractors?

MR. QUINTANILLA: Minority contractors -- either subcontractors -- I am talking about there.

1 CAPT. VON DRAN: Well, there's differentiations between a prime contractor 2 which we have privity with and a subcontractor 3 which we do not. And what you'll find is 4 there's certain circumstances because of the 5 6 structure of our contracts that that information is not readily available from us as a source. 7 8 That's why we provided you some information on how to get that -- that data. 9 10 MR. QUINTANILLA: You know, I've 11 been told that it's impossible to get -- that I 12 cannot get that information, that it belongs to 13 the contractor and here I have a progress report 14 that gives the name of the contractor, the 15 subcontractor and the amounts that that 16 contractor is getting. 17 CAPT. VON DRAN: Yes, sir. I 18 understand that. 19 MR. QUINTANILLA: I'm getting 20 conflicting --21 MR. TREVINO: What you have in 22 there, sir -- if I may interject so that we come 23 to some resolution on this -- what you have in 24 terms of that progress report -- a dollar value 25 there indicated is not of the subcontractor but

for that prime contractor.

 $$\operatorname{\mathtt{MR}}$.$ QUINTANILLA: But it does mention the subcontractor.

MR. TREVINO: Only because -- as we must reiterate -- as we have been doing for the last three years during the TRCs as well -- when it comes to off-base drilling, what we do is we put the name of the subcontractor -- we identify that as much as we can so that when the residents have a question or a concern and they call Mr. Estrada or Mr. Walters, they do not become alarmed if they see an individual or a company out there -- and that's the reason why we do that -- to better serve the residents. That was requested way before the RAB was even created -- during the TRCs -- as part of the C.O.P.S. organization and as well as the residents in the Quintana Road area.

We were getting calls to indicate who is this company, what do they want, what are they doing -- to better give them the information where we can provide for better community relations activities, we provide that information. That's why the progress report that you have referenced states that

KIM TINDALL & ASSOCIATES, INC.
7800 IH-10 WEST, SUITE 100, SAN ANTONIO, TX 78230
(210) 377-3027 1-800-969-3027 FAX (210) 344-6016

1 information. We still cannot provide 2 subcontracting information. 3 MR. QUINTANILLA: Right here. 4 MR. TREVINO: I'm sorry --5 CAPT. VON DRAN: That was done with the express consent through the prime 6 7 contractor of the subcontractor. 8 MR. QUINTANILLA: No. I have 9 talked to several contractors. They say, "All 10 you have to do is ask me and I'll give you the 11 information." Kelly refuses to do that. 12 MR. TREVINO: If I may recommend 13 that -- I mean, this is --14 MR. HAGELTHORN: I would agree. 15 I think this is an issue that you have brought 16 up for the past, probably, three or four RAB 17 meetings. We're at the same spot that we were 18 back then. We can reflect it in the meeting 19 minutes -- and that's my recommendation. 20 We have stated -- Our position is that we cannot 21 provide that information. 22 MR. QUINTANILLA: Okay. And I'm 23 working on that through another source. But 24 what really drives me is that this was brought 25 up in an informal discussion. It was not

1	brought as a matter of the total RAB Board. And
2	I think that this is wrong. That Who does
3	the the work the restoration
4	work, when it's done, where it's done and why
5	it's done and how it's done is all part and
6	parcel of the of this particular board. And
7	that's what I'm saying. And it should be
8	discussed in the formal aspects, not in the
9	informal.
10	MR. TREVINO: Where we can do
11	that just as a closing from my standpoint
12	where we can do that, we'll be more than happy
13	to work that. But we For those that do work
14	for the federal government, the state and local
15	governments we do have rules, regulations and
16	policies that we must adhere to, that we must
17	obey and follow. Those are our boundaries.
18	Those are our constraints.
19	MR. QUINTANILLA: What I'm
20	reading here and what I'm relating to comes out
21	of the law.
22	MR. TREVINO: Understood, sir.
23	All I can indicate is what.
2 4	MR. QUINTANILLA: That's all that
25	I have concerning the minutes.
1	

1	MR. TREVINO: Thank you.
2	MR. HAGELTHORN: Any other inputs
3	to the minutes? Do we have a motion to accept
4	the minutes with the changes noted?
5	MR. MOORE: I'll make the
6	motion. We accept the minutes as they with
7	the changes.
8	MR. HAGELTHORN: A second?
9	MS. FALKENBERG: I second.
10	MR. HAGELTHORN: All in favor?
11	(Vote by the RAB members.)
12	MR. HAGELTHORN: All against?
13	(Vote by the RAB members.)
14	MR. HAGELTHORN: Motion is
15	carried and accepted as published with changes.
16	The second issue that we have this evening
17	is membership approval of the membership of the
18	two new members. Mr. Smith Mr. Smith and
19	Ribeiro
20	MR. SMITH: Smith is here.
21	MR. HAGELTHORN: Mr. Smith?
22	Ribeiro? Is he here? Okay. Like we addressed
23	at the last RAB meeting, we will for the
2 4	member that was absent for the central
25	candidate that was absent, we'll send a letter

to them asking them to respond to whether or not he is willing -- or still willing to serve on the RAB and we'll table his -- the vote on his membership until that time. I'd like to put it before the Board to listen to Mr. Smith or give Mr. Smith the opportunity to present any information that the Board requests. So, if there's anybody on the Board that would like to speak to Mr. Smith before we vote on his membership, you have the floor. Any questions?

Okay. At this time --

MR. RICE: I'd just like to ask you a little bit about your background, Mr. Smith.

MR. SMITH: Yes. I'm -- Real quickly, I've been a policeman in Texas since '71. I've been working for Union Pacific Railroad in the capacity of a policeman and an emergency responder to chemical spills and environmental restoration cleanup for the Union Pacific Railroad. Because we are -- Union Pacific Railroad is also an affected member of the community, we felt it of interest to have someone on the Board.

MR. RICE: Have you been involved

1	in any of the environmental problems with the
2	railroad here at Kelly here?
3	MR. SMITH: Environmental
4	cleanups due to spills with the railroad, yes,
5	that is my job.
6	MR. RICE: Thanks.
7	MR. HAGELTHORN: I have also
8	talked with Mr. Smith quite extensively when he
9	initially put his application in. We talked
10	about his credentials and whatnot. As a
11	community co-chairman, I'm all in favor of
12	bringing him on the Board. I'd like to get a
13	second on that motion.
14	MS. FALKENBERG: I'll second.
15	MR. HAGELTHORN: All in favor of
16	bringing Mr. Smith on board?
17	(Vote by the RAB members.)
18	MR. HAGELTHORN: Any nays?
19	(Vote by the RAB members.)
20	MR. HAGELTHORN: Mr. Smith?
21	MR. QUINTANILLA: Yes No, no.
22	Before Before leaving this matter Go
23	ahead, sir. You're more than welcome
24	MR. SMITH: I can function
25	fine

1 Now comes the hard MR. RICE: 2 part. 3 MR. TEAGUE: Mr. Smith, what's you're first name? 5 MR. SMITH: Thomas. 6 MR. HAGELTHORN: The third item that we have is review and approval of the 7 revised RAB application. Everybody should have 8 9 gotten a copy of the application in their 10 minutes this past week. Does anybody have any 11 changes to the application itself -- which is 12 the first page of the package? 13 MR. QUINTANILLA: I do. The RAB 14 application form that we have before us says 15 that the RAB meets quarterly. We were meeting 16 every month and now every six to eight weeks. I 17 believe the wording on the application form 18 needs to be changed -- that we're meeting on the 19 first Monday of -- you know, whatever it is --20 every three or four months and -- and more 21 frequently as necessary. I think that needs 22 that bit of clarification. 23 MR. HAGELTHORN: Yeah. I would 24 agree with the -- The intent is -- under the RAB 25 guidance -- was meet quarterly -- and we're

1 eventually moving to that position. I do agree with you that it is unclear. Does anybody have 2 3 any input that -- what we should change that to in the short term? My belief is that we're --4 5 in the next four or five months, we're going to 6 go to a quarterly meeting. Does anybody have 7 any input? 8 MR. QUINTANILLA: It should just 9 have a little bit more detail. I think the staff can figure that out. You know, the first 10 11 Monday of every quarter or something to that effect with the other wording in there that we 12 13 can meet more often as necessary. 14 MR. TREVINO: We can make those 15 changes. 16 MR. QUINTANILLA: And I think the 17 staff should make that change. 18 MR. HAGELTHORN: Dos anybody have 19 any other input. 20 MR. QUINTANILLA: Yes, I do have 21 some input. The wording on the application here 22 states that the members provide individual 23 advice to government decision makers and that 24 the RAB is not a decision-making body. 25 MR. HAGELTHORN: That's true.

1 MR. QUINTANILLA: This wording is 2 contrary to the law which establishes the RAB. 3 There is no authority for the wording that is right here in this application form. I could 4 5 not find. 6 MR. HAGELTHORN: The wording 7 comes out of the September '94 Guidance on the 8 Formation of Restoration Advisory Boards. We'll 9 provide you that information. 10 MR. QUINTANILLA: I have that. 11 Let me provide you with the wording -- the 12 correct wording that is in the law. The correct 13 wording from the law which establishes RABs 14 reads as follows: For the purpose of ensuring 15 public input into the planning and 16 implementation of environmental restoration 17 activities at installations of which such Boards 18 are in operation. That's the wording that 19 should be adhered. 20 MR. HAGELTHORN: Providing 21 input. We still don't make any decisions. The 22 RAB doesn't -- isn't a decision-making body. 23 It's an advisory --24 MR. QUINTANILLA: Any time that 25 you provide input, you're making a -- into the

KIM TINDALL & ASSOCIATES, INC.
7800 IH-10 WEST, SUITE 100, SAN ANTONIO, TX 78230
(210) 377-3027 1-800-969-3027 FAX (210) 344-6016

1 planning process -- you are providing a conscious decision into that. And I don't think 2 Legal can tell us differently. 3 4 MR. TEAGUE: I think the 5 distinction here is that you're right if the RAB 6 votes on a --7 MR. QUINTANILLA: Otherwise, it 8 just makes us a rubber stamp and I don't want to 9 belong to a rubber stamp. 10 MR. TEAGUE: I don't believe 11 that's -- Certainly that's not the intent of the 12 But I think the wording in the RAB charter RAB. 13 by saying it's not a decision-making body means 14 still the RAB takes forward a recommendation, 15 decides on the recommendation, makes that 16 decision and takes that recommendation forward 17 in that Air Force is not necessarily legally 18 bound to do that. If that decision, for 19 instance, were contrary to EPA guidance or 20 something like that. 21 MR. QUINTANILLA: Well, this is 22 the EPA law. 23 MR. TEAGUE: Right -- No. 24 meant a specific decision about an environmental 25 issue.

1 MR. QUINTANILLA: I agree with 2 But, again, I think that the wording that that. should be in there -- instead of saying that 3 4 they provide this individual advice on 5 government decisions and all -- it should have 6 the wording that is in the law and it's for the 7 purpose of ensuring public input into the 8 planning and implementation of environmental 9 restoration activities at installations for 10 which such Boards are established. And that's 11 the wording that I believe should be in this 12 form. 13 MR. TREVINO: What we can do, 14 Mr. Quintanilla, is we can definitely go back 15 and take a look at that and then we can 16 change -- those wordings can be changed -- by 17 all means. 18 MR. QUINTANILLA: Are we going to 19 just say this or. 20 MR. TREVINO: No. 21 MR. QUINTANILLA: -- or is it 22 actually going to be done. 23 MR. TREVINO: As a -- From my 24 standpoint, we will make those changes and we 25 can put them back into the meeting minutes that

1 go out so that you can take a look at them for 2 the next RAB meeting; and then, therefore, you can make your recommendations for your changes 3 4 accordingly. If that is acceptable, we can, by 5 all means -- I can make that recommendation and 6 then I'll take that action on back. 7 MR. HAGELTHORN: Any other 8 input? 9 MR. TREVINO: Is that acceptable, 10 sir? 11 MR. QUINTANILLA: I do have 12 another input. It says that members' 13 participation in the RAB is strictly voluntarily 14 and members will not be financially compensated. I believe the law reads a little 15 16 bit different than that. The law states that 17 the RAB -- that this committee will be funded 18 for all administrative purposes and so forth. 19 So, it should be researched and the right 20 wording should be there, also. 21 MR. HAGELTHORN: What that means 22 is -- such as the creation of the Restoration 23 Advisory Board application -- all the paperwork 24 that these guys generate -- that's what's 25 funded. Members of the Board are volunteers.

1 MR. QUINTANILLA: Yes. 2 again -- you know, we're going into the negative 3 and say, "Hey, you're not funded." There is -say that they will be funded for administrative 4 5 purposes and it goes on to say different things. 6 MR. HAGELTHORN: That's true. Τf 7 Mr. Bailey wanted to send one of us to 8 Washington, D.C., the Air Force would fund that. 9 If we want to create something, it will be funded. 10 11 MR. QUINTANILLA: Exactly. 12 But we are not MR. HAGELTHORN: 13 going to receive compensation for being on this 14 Board. 15 MR. QUINTANILLA: Exactly. 16 it should say those words, that the -- you know, 17 that the -- that participation in here will --18 administrative activities of this Board will be 19 funded as cited in the law. 20 MR. TEAGUE: Your concern, of 21 course, is that someone would shy away from 22 wanting to join the RAB if they thought this 23 commitment -- a trip to Washington wouldn't be 24 funded. 25 Exactly. MR. QUINTANILLA: Ιt

needs to correspond better with the law.

MR. TREVINO: Right. And what we can do is, we can take exactly what you've indicated in terms of quoted by law and we can make those changes. And where, in fact, that we can make those changes, we'll be happy to put those into the RAB meeting minutes to where you can look at those -- even prior to them going out. What we'll do is -- we'll be happy to call you to talk to you about that and make sure that it doesn't go out before it's printed.

MR. QUINTANILLA: Well, not me.

But I think -- you know, someone that is smarter

than I am that can do better research. Someone

like Mr. Rice or Mr. Lene there -- in there

that -- you know, that could talk to you guys.

I am not -- I don't have all the brains in the

world, but I don't like to be, you know, used

and I -- I feel that I'm being used as a member

of the neighborhood here.

MR. TREVINO: Right. Mr. Teague had brought a very good recommendation -- I think that's one that we should follow up on -- is the use of a subcommittee to look at the RAB charter.

1 MR. QUINTANILLA: When we start 2 discussing the -- the change in there that Ms. Williams mentioned I think that -- that will 3 4 be brought into the table -- and I have some 5 recommendations on it. As I read the law and as I understand the law that some of the wording 6 7 should be changed in the charter, you know, to 8 be more closely with the law. 9 MR. TREVINO: Now, is it a 10 recommendation, then, of this RAB to establish a 11 subcommittee to look at the RAB charter and the 12 application and make recommendations to the 13 Air Force for us to -- for the Air Force to go 14 back and look at those recommendations and 15 definitely make those changes where they can. 16 And where they cannot, bring back -- again, by 17 law, by policy, by regulation that says they 18 cannot do this and this is the reason why? 19 Would that be acceptable and --20 MR. QUINTANILLA: With a 21 subcommittee, yes.

MR. TREVINO: Correct. And, now, as the chair for that subcommittee would that be yourself and whoever would want to volunteer and share --

22

23

24

25

1 MR. QUINTANILLA: I'll be happy_ 2 to chair it as long as two or three committee 3 members -- I was going to defer to the Δ co-chair. Because right off the bat here -- on the RAB -- it says that he represents the Board 5 6 here. 7 MR. HAGELTHORN: That's right. 8 MR. QUINTANILLA: And that -- Of 9 course, by seeing it that way, that means that, 10 you know, all the actions are between both 11 co-chairs and we're just here as secondary. And I'd like to have that changed. 12 13 MR. HAGELTHORN: First, I'd like 14 to -- excuse me -- I'd like to bring this up to 15 the Board because this seems to be an issue back 16 and forth between two people. Does anybody on 17 the Board have any concern about the way the RAB 18 membership application is written besides 19 Mr. Quintanilla? 20 (Vote by the RAB members.) 21 MR. HAGELTHORN: Okay. Does 22 anybody on this Board have any input to wanting 2.3 to serve on a subcommittee to revise the 24 application of the RAB. 25 MR. QUINTANILLA: I'll certainly

do it. 1 2 MR. HAGELTHORN: A show of 3 hands? Anybody --4 (Vote by the RAB members.) 5 MR. HAGELTHORN: Okay. What we 6 can do is we can go ahead and form a 7 subcommittee. As the community co-chairman, I 8 can also serve on that committee with you. 9 MR. QUINTANILLA: Yes. I'd be 10 happy --11 MR. HAGELTHORN: And that 12 would -- we can form a -- or a tie vote for 13 So, we can take that up with new business 14 about forming a subcommittee to look at the RAB 15 application and the charter. 16 MR. TREVINO: And what I would 17 recommend in that is that if, in fact, that you 18 have recommendations -- if I want to bring that 19 up to the next -- if you want a decision prior 20 to next RAB, it's important that I reiterate 21 that you bring the information up to us as 22 quickly as possible. Otherwise, what I can do 23 is bring it up at the next RAB as a 24 recommendation. We will not be able to have an 25 answer for you at the next RAB.

1 MR. QUINTANILLA: My thought was We're going to bring the charter up on 2 the table and I have some specific 3 recommendations to each paragraph in the charter 4 5 as to how they should be changed. MR. TREVINO: Correct. And --6 7 MR. HAGELTHORN: What I would 8 recommend us doing right now since there are so 9 many changes that you want to make to the 10 charter, we will table this issue until the 11 subcommittee reviews the application and the 12 charter. At that time, the subcommittee can 13 present those findings to the RAB Board for their concurrence. 14 15 MR. SANCHEZ: Mr. Chairman, I'd 16 like for the subcommittee to give that report, 17 not the Air Force. That's the way they 18 function. 19 MR. QUINTANILLA: Yeah. We'll 20 have to work with the legal office. 21 MR. SANCHEZ: But -- I mean, what 22 I'd like is for you and the subcommittee to work 23 with the Air Force, look at what can and cannot 24 be changed, whether you agree with the changes 25 or not, you give the report back to the Board in

1 general. And then, that way -- you know, this isn't going to turn into some kind of an "I 2 agree or don't agree." We have a specific 3 4 charge to make whatever recommendations you feel 5 need to be changed, but then, ultimately, you 6 come and give that report back to this Board in 7 a fair and as in an impartial manner as you can, 8 you know, given that information that the 9 Air Force will give you. I would be 10 MR. QUINTANILLA: 11 happy to do that. The problem is, we were given 12 this restoration charter without ever us looking 13 into the law. In fact, none of the members here

have a copy of law except me.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. HAGELTHORN: Oh, I disagree with that. Did you --

MR. TEAGUE: Mr. Chair, I'm taking too much time and I may be holding up your proceedings because I know we're already off time, but could I suggest that maybe to have the sanction of the whole RAB that the subcommittee get an up or down vote yea or nay just for the -- you know, so that the subcommittee feels it has a charter to go to.

> MR. HAGELTHORN: Yeah. I'd like

KIM TINDALL & ASSOCIATES, INC.

7800 IH-10 WEST, SUITE 100, SAN ANTONIO, TX 78230 (210) 377-30271-800-969-3027 FAX (210) 344-6016

1 to get a vote on that -- whether or not the RAB as a body wants a subcommittee formed to look in 3 and investigate the law on the application and 4 the charter. Do we have a motion there? MR. SANCHEZ: I move that such a 5 6 subcommittee be established. 7 MR. HAGELTHORN: All in favor of 8 establishing a subcommittee? 9 (Vote by the RAB members.) 10 MR. HAGELTHORN: Opposed? 11 (Vote by the RAB members.) 12 MR. HAGELTHORN: We'll go ahead 13 and establish that and we'll table the minutes 14 and the charter until after the subcommittee has 15 reported back to the RAB. 16 The next thing we're going to do -- in the 17 old business -- Mr. Trevino will present some 18 information on the public hearing updates. 19 MR. TREVINO: What I'm going to 20 do is to provide a status on where we're at on 21 the public hearing for Zones -- for Zones 1, 2 22 and 3. Again, we're talking about here -- is 23 predominantly just for the groundwater. From 24 our last meeting, what we looked at was -- when 25 we were talking about the public hearings -- or

where we were originally was we were looking at where we were -- right up in here. We were up right in here from the standpoint of -- again, Zone 1 is the golf course. Zone 2 is the jet engine test cells. Zone 3 is industrial complex.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Where we were in the past -- from the last -- from the last review, what I had briefed was if we were to receive the comments on 13 March -- right up in here -- our public hearing would have been held on May 1st. what we're talking about here is that currently, right now, the State of Texas is still reviewing the particular groundwater study reports -- and from our standpoint if, in fact, that -- going through the time line -- is that if we were to receive comments today, for instance, just for a time line illustration, the public hearing would be back until May. So, what we're looking about here is that the uncertainty at this point will be this date right in here. The actual date that we get the comments back from the State of Texas.

Now, based upon that -- what they're looking at currently right now is the

groundwater for Zones 1, 2 and 3. So, once we have the concurrence to proceed with the public hearing, we, at -- then, at that point will be able to provide to you those actual dates.

Currently right now, we cannot. This is just the illustration where -- what we're talking about in terms of time frame -- is we're about 30 days behind the actual -- original --

MR. BEYER: Richard, what's the time frame -- I mean, once you receive our approval, is there a certain number of days that we're looking at?

MR. TREVINO: Correct. So, let me look at it in terms of that same illustration. If you look at the -- That's a good lead-in question. Thank you. If you look at what we're talking about here -- Let me apologize for sticking my finger out. What we're talking about here is when we receive the comments from yourself, Gary, and you concur, then we basically take the maximum -- three weeks again -- to incorporate those things.

Now, let me -- added clarity in here. Even though we have not received the official letter of concurrence, we do have -- we have been

working with the State in getting draft correspondence back and forth -- referring to what Mr. Sanchez' concern was that when we do the subcommittees -- to have the Air Force and the subcommittee dialogue back and forth -- us and the State have been doing the same thing. So, it's not like we are not -- we are not talking to each other because that is not the case. So, that's why in this respect here, we don't anticipate this actually taking three weeks.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

When we come down to this here -- this is where we basically address those comments, change the report -- what we have to change, if any -- and then the public draft which goes to the public is prepared. We take about two weeks to send out press releases, progress reports and fact sheets -- that Mike Estrada will give you more information on the kinds of things that we do in terms of community relation involvement. The public day, again, is 30 days, and this is where we're talking about doing the public hearing.

Now, currently, right now, as I indicated, we cannot give dates until we have the

(210) 377-30271-800-969-3027 FAX (210) 344-6016

concurrence letter from the state. 1 MR. QUINTANILLA: Are you open 2 3 for questions now? MR. TREVINO: Yes, sir, by all 4 5 means. MR. QUINTANILLA: All right. Ι 6 7 have a question on that and this is, again, what makes me believe that we're not here as a rubber 8 stamp. Again, you said that the purpose of the 9 RAB is for the purpose of ensuring public input 10 11 into the planning and implementation process. Ι believe that the first square way up in there 12 right before the final draft should be the 13 public input, not after it has gone through the 14 15 system and all we're doing is rubber stamping it. 16 MR. TREVINO: You're correct. 17 18 And in that statement -- But one of the things that we don't --19 20 MR. QUINTANILLA: Can we change that -- Can we change that date for the next 21 22 one. MR. TREVINO: Well, one of the 23 things to keep in mind -- this is just one 24 portion of the entire process. This is if --25

[[]	
1	У	You look at that.
2		MR. QUINTANILLA: But where is
3	t	the public input? That's my
4		MR. TREVINO: Currently, right
5	n	ow, the public official public comment
6	p	eriod is right here.
7		MR. QUINTANILLA: But of the
8	R	RAB. Now, the purpose of the RAB is to provide
9	p	public input into the planning process.
10		MR. TREVINO: You are correct.
11	I	f I may
12		MR. QUINTANILLA: That should be
13	t	the first thing up there.
14		MR. TREVINO: Correct. If may
15	i	nterject and we have done that. Prior to
16	t	his process here if you keep in mind since
17	t	he very initial RABs, we have done provide
18	С	opies of proposed plans.
19		MR. QUINTANILLA: They were
20	a	lready made, though.
21		MR. TREVINO: Correct, sir. But
22	t	hat is our
23		MR. QUINTANILLA: And you already
24	h	ad dates as to when the thing was going to be
25	m	ade and they already had all the options

If I may finish, MR. TREVINO: 1 please. What my recommendation is in that, 2 though, is, we the Air Force have to make a 3 recommendation to you, the Restoration Advisory 4 5 Board, as a preferred alternative. We have a process that we go to -- When we've talked about 6 these processes in the past we have initial 7 investigations where we identify a site and then 8 if, in fact, that site poses a problem, we do a 9 study which is what -- this is one portion of 10 the entire process. 11 MR. QUINTANILLA: Yes, I agree. 12 That is for the Air Force. But for the public 13 law -- the way it states -- is that the purpose 14 of the RAB is to ensure public input into the 15 16 planning process. MR. TREVINO: Yes, sir. 17 MR. QUINTANILLA: -- into the 18 19 planning and implementation --MR. TREVINO: Yes, sir. The RAB 20 was established -- if I may interject -- The RAB 21 was established November 15th of 1994. On that 22 very day, you-all received input. At that 23 24 current stage of the process --MR. QUINTANILLA: We received 25

input?

MR. TREVINO: That's correct.

You received input. This program has been established since 1989. We have been holding technical review committee meetings for the last four years. During that process, we have been providing updates on -- at least every three months -- as well as providing information to those general public that would like to have that before this stage had even -- even begun. So, we have been doing that. But, unfortunately, from your standpoint -- your being now part of the RAB -- that is -- for at least Zones 1, 2 and 3 -- is at the tail end of the process.

MR. QUINTANILLA: And that's no good. I don't want to rubber stamp it.

MR. TREVINO: Understood. But I can't change that. Unfortunately, we're about-the RAB is about four or five years behind the power curve.

MR. QUINTANILLA: On this particular case. But next, it won't be and I think we should have the -- the RAB up in front.

MR. TREVINO: That's correct.

KIM TINDALL & ASSOCIATES, INC.
7800 IH-10 WEST, SUITE 100, SAN ANTONIO, TX 78230
(210) 377-3027 1-800-969-3027 FAX (210) 344-6016

1	MR. HAGELTHORN: We will have
2	that.
3	MR. TREVINO: And you will have
4	it.
5	MR. QUINTANILLA: Okay.
6	MR. TREVINO: You will have it.
7	MR. QUINTANILLA: That's all I
8	wanted to hear.
9	MR. TREVINO: So, from the
10	public Yes, sir?
11	MR. RICE: Have you received
12	comments from the State already?
13	MR. TREVINO: We have received
14	draft comments from the State on the
15	groundwater, yes, sir.
16	MR. RICE: Can we get those
17	comments?
18	MR. TREVINO: Sure Well, let
19	me backtrack. Let Let me defer that to
20	Mr. Beyer and Mr. Lewis.
21	MR. BEYER: I'm not sure if
22	The draft comments were I guess we're
23	still since they're still in the way
24	I I don't know I'm
25	MR. HAGELTHORN: I don't believe

he can release the draft comments. I believe
that we can get the comments from the TNRCC when
they're published. But right now, these are
just drafts.

MR. TREVINO: I'll be happy to

2.2

MR. TREVINO: I'll be happy to defer that to my colleagues in the regulatory agency.

MR. BEYER: I guess in that regard I -- I have to say no. But, you know, right now we're kind of going back and forth and talking on the phone a lot and doing this -- and it changes on a daily basis. And since it's not an official document yet, then anything that we have put out at this point in time would just be kind of nebulous and not very -- very defined, but -- So, in that regard, I think the TNRCC has been reluctant in the past to hand out lots of draft comments on lots of specific cases because -- I mean --

MR. SANCHEZ: And I think the -Mr. Quintanilla's question goes to the heart of
that issue in terms of -- and for this Board.

The -- The public input of this Board is to
ensure that a process is occurring of informing
the community -- you know, San Antonio -- and

not just the community around Kelly Air Force

Base -- but all over the community. And I guess
the point is, at what point does this input
really have any effect? Either it's in the
development of proposals, alternate strategies
or -- or in the final -- final version of
whatever proposals are ultimately decided.

I don't think this Board has the technical, you know, expertise in all -- collaboratively to really, you know, challenge you on any particular issue to any great extent. But I think that -- that -- that there are some specific concerns that everybody on this Board can easily bring to the table in terms of the community's interest and all those issues and whatever alternate strategies are being pursued by TNRCC.

Now, the very worst thing we would want to have is for the TNRCC people to tell us something -- tell this Board something and then say, "Well, that's not really what we meant. We want to change it." And, so, this is -- those are the kind of -- of developments that may -- would make a board like this lose credibility with the community.

1 MR. BEYER: Right. That's true.

And that's -- that's why we -- you know, the initial comments on draft letters a lot of times -- you know, we have several layers of management and whatever -- and sometimes if we -- you know, one person may say something that may not be legally correct for the TNRCC to say or it -- once it goes through our review process to try to work out the details -- lots of times, you know, what we want to do is make sure that all those -- a lot of those details are ironed out before, you know, we look bad and doubt something.

But those documents that have been submitted, I guess, are public information and unless there's legal litigation against the facility -- at which time -- then the file is closed. But if there's not any litigation against the facility, then the files in our central records are open. And I think the regional office may have some documents that you may be able to look at and do those kinds of things. And certainly, you know, we welcome any kind of input -- you know, your thoughts. But it would be kind of inappropriate for us to hand

out our draft comments when we're in the stage where we're not sure whether those are our comments.

MR. BROWN: Part of the issue --Bill Brown -- Part of the issue has to do with the fact that these are back and forth -- if not written comments -- in some cases they're also verbal comments -- but neither one of them is set in concrete until there's -- there's an agreement between those two parties and one is Kelly and one is TNRCC. So they're -- right now they're in the talking stage and writing stage but they're not in the final stage. And usually what the arguments that might develop are about is whether or not particular issues have been addressed -- or adequately addressed within the content of the feasibility study and so forth that's going on to try to get the right corrective action that best fits the amount of money that's available.

MR. RICE: That's all fine. I guess what -- I would just like -- is that the Air Force make those comments available, you know, as soon as they can do that.

MR. HAGELTHORN: When they're

25

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 published --MR. RICE: Well, as soon as they can do that. 3 4 MR. HAGELTHORN: As soon as 5 they're made official. 6 MR. RICE: Perhaps before they're 7 published. I don't know. As soon as we get the 8 agreement with the TNRCC. 9 Correct. If the MR. TREVINO: 10 State gives us the approval to release it, at 11 that point we can release it. That's how we can 12 basically respond from that standpoint. 13 Mr. Estrada? 14 MR. ESTRADA: Mike Estrada. Αs 15 soon as the State goes final, their comments 16 will be a part of the administrative record 17 which is maintained in copies down in our 18 information repository. As soon as it hits the 19 record, if you want to see it, I can make copies 20 available to members here. But that's the 21 final, not the drafts. 22 MR. BEYER: It would probably be 23 a good idea to, you know, go to the information 24 repository and -- you know, find lots of those 25 documents so that you can review them. Because

we're kind of -- This process -- it's been -like Richard is saying -- many years and we're
kind of rolling right along and -- but what we'd
like to do is make sure that you're up to
speed -- if you could -- that would be great.

MR. TREVINO: Any more questions on the public hearing? When we have more information, by all means, we will get that to you as quickly as possible.

If there's no more, what we'll do is we'll -- I'll turn it over now to Mr. Estrada who is our public affairs officer and he'll give you a public affairs update.

MR. ESTRADA: Is there somebody who can operate this new-fangled computer? Is this thing up or are we just going to go with paper copies?

MR. TREVINO: What I'll do is -Well, we're going to defer here for a few
minutes. We're going to move things around a
little bit. I apologize. Rather than set up
our audio visual here, if we can get a copy of
the floppy disc from Sonia, I believe -- or
Brenda. I apologize for the delay. Can I
recommend we take a five-minute break, because

it's very hot in here and I'm going to try to get the AC turned on.

(Short break taken.)

MR. TREVINO: If I could please have everyone's attention. We will continue with the rest of the -- Thank you. Mr. Estrada is now going to take it over and do his presentation.

MR. ESTRADA: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, whatever. Before I get started, I'd like to recognize a gentleman that we probably all know, Councilman Juan Solis, who's in the back of the room. Welcome.

My name is Mike Estrada. I am -- I am the environmental public affairs officer at Kelly Air Force Base. My cohort in crime is Dick Walters who is hiding somewhere back there. There he is. This evening we're going to cover a number of points, most of which were brought up at the last RAB meeting.

Mr. Quintanilla had some questions about mailing lists. We're going to cover that. There's also some questions about which news media we regularly work with, so we'll talk about that.

We are also going to talk about some changes at

the the information repositories. We'll talk about who is a point of contact for various subjects on the base and some upcoming activities, and then we'll talk about that packet of information that we handed out to folks as you were coming in today.

First of all, the mailing list. Before this RAB started, we had a mailing list of approximately 2,600 addresses. Because the RAB was forming, we hired a contractor to go out and redefine some areas. We now have a mailing list of approximately 30,000. They're listed up here. Our primary mailing list has under it another primary, which is those poor folks who for whatever reason have asked to receive everything that we produce. In a few cases, such as Councilman Solis', he didn't ask, but he's going to get it anyway.

East Kelly -- under the primary list -we have 525 addresses. The Wedge, which is that
area just south of east Kelly and north of
Fay Avenue, has 137 addresses. The Quintana
Road area has 896 addresses. The Growdon Drive
area, which is up near the 36th Street gate, has
476. And the off-base well survey as part of

our Shallow Aquifer Assessment kicked in another 2,149. One of the things the contractor had fun doing was taking out all the duplicates on this. We don't think he's found every one, so if anybody in here is getting duplicate mailings or if your neighbors are, let me know and we'll take care of that. Anyway, you can see we've got a total of 4,470 in what we call our primary mailing list.

The new areas that the contractor built for us is on the north -- this is basically north of both Kelly and Lackland -- 8,770 addresses. The northeast, which is primarily just northeast of Kelly -- not the Lackland area -- that's 2,209. The southeast, which is that area due south of Lackland, 8,182. The southwest, which is down in this area -- the Zarzamora area -- is 8,257. A total of 27,418 on that one.

The postcard that Mr. Quintanilla referred to announcing this RAB meeting -- we sent that out to 13,000 addresses this time. The primary list, which was the 4,000 and the southeast list, which was the 8,182. The reason why we're not sending to all approximately 30,000 at this point is manpower-related. Just the 13,000 took

everybody in my office three days to produce it. So, we're looking at some options to maybe get some contractors' support on that through our printing plant.

1.3

Mr. Quintanilla also asked last time about a breakdown by ZIP code -- and here it is. You should all have paper copies of this -- and I'm not going to say a whole lot on it unless you want me to. You'll notice on this one the total comes up to 29,430 which is every address we've got on the list.

In terms of news media coverage, these are the primary news media we deal with. When we send out a news release, everybody on this gets it either by mail or by fax machine. The news release I sent out last Friday announcing this RAB meeting went to all these people. I had one response this morning with the Express-News. Initially, they were going to come out to cover it and then they decided they were shorthanded and called me back and said they were not going to come out and cover it.

Generally, when we're dealing with the news media and environmental issues, at this point in time, about a third of the news releases we get

there. Mr. Quintanilla suggested last time that maybe we'd want to go out and do some glad-handing with some of the editors. I'd be more than happy to do that. If any of the RAB members would like to go out with we, that's something we might want to consider now or at the next meeting. Especially La Prensa, they're notorious for not running any of our stuff. I think they probably should be. We have pretty good coverage from the Spanish TV stations. We put a lot of emphasis on that because that's our primary means of getting the word out when we have drilling crews out in the neighborhood.

In terms of the information repositories, we still have the one going at the Kelly Air Force Base library. It's approximately 35 shelf feet of volumes, both the information repository as well as the administrative record. As of last week we've got a problem with the downtown library in that they're moving to the new facility. So, the information repository down there is no longer accessible. When they get into the new facility -- which they will call the Central Library on 600 Soledad Street --

they estimate May 20th they'll be there -- right -- well, we'll come back.

In the past, down here our documents were in the librarian's office on the second floor. They're very difficult to get at. Unless you knew they were there, you're probably never going to find them. I've been assured that under the new facility all of our documents are going to move out into the stacks with all the rest of the government documents that they maintain so anybody will be able to get access to them.

Now, we've got some alternatives. If the public comment periods that Richard mentioned occur before the central library opens, one of the options would be to take selected documents and put them into one of the branch libraries, such as Los Palmas. Another option would be that Dick and I would maintain them and anybody who wants to see them, they contact us and we'll give them whatever they want.

Since Richard isn't listening --

MR. TREVINO: I'm sorry.

MR. ESTRADA: -- I don't expect

the public comment periods to start before May

20th, so we're okay.

Now, for points of contact -- For all environmental issues, the points of contact on Kelly Air Force are myself or Dick Walters. Our phone numbers are listed there. Some of the things you can call us about are requests for information, any suggestions that anybody might have, anybody who's looking for questions -- or if they like to play Jeopardy, they can give us the answers and we'll try and come up with the questions -- although I'm not a very good Jeopardy player -- maybe Dick is.

Any complaints about anything, Dick and I will take. I handle the noise complaint program on the base, so I'm very used to taking complaints and getting yelled at by people. It doesn't bother me in the least. And claims procedures, Dick and I are also the contact for that. If anybody feels they have a claim against the Air Force, they should contact Dick or myself.

MR. QUINTANILLA: And you will provide the forms?

MR. ESTRADA: I will not provide the forms, but I will explain to them basically

how the claims process works. If they wish to 1 pursue it, I will get them in contact with the 2 claims people. 3 MR. QUINTANILLA: And would this 4 information that you are the claims procedures 5 officer be published in all the newspapers and 6 all the data and that sort of thing? 7 8 MR. ESTRADA: As of right now, my guidance from the legal office is that on the 9 progress reports and the news releases, I cannot 10 use the word "claims." 11 MR. QUINTANILLA: So, in essence, 12 13 you're not claims procedures as far as the neighborhood is concerned? 14 15 MR. ESTRADA: In my opinion --16 MR. QUINTANILLA: Nobody knows it 17 except us. MR. ESTRADA: Now, this is points 18 of contact for all environment issues, and every 19 20 progress report lists Dick and myself -- well, not Dick and myself -- one or the other. 21 MR. QUINTANILLA: What is the 22 authority by the legal office for you not to use 23 a claim? 24 MR. ESTRADA: They made the 25

1 decision based on the fact that they don't want 2 to open themselves up to a lot of people coming 3 in and saying, "We've got claims on broken windows. We've got claims on" -- you name it. 4 5 MR. QUINTANILLA: All claims on 6 environmental issues where people get sick or 7 their homes -- because of subsidence or -- their 8 foundations are cracking and that matter? 9 MR. ESTRADA: If somebody has a 10 concern like that, they need to contact Dick or 11 I. We will explain the procedure to them. 12 like I say, if they wish to pursue it, then I 13 will give them the phone number to the claims 14 office. 15 MR. QUINTANILLA: Again, that 16 will not be published and distributed to the 17 28,000 people or whatever it is? 18 MR. ESTRADA: Not specifically 19 claims. But just any point of contact on any 20 environmental issue, that will be published. 21 MR. QUINTANILLA: Isn't this kind 22 of being a weenie-type thing on this thing? 23 MR. ESTRADA: You mean we're 24 nitpicking? Splitting hairs? 25 MR. QUINTANILLA: Yeah.

MR. ESTRADA: Adrienne, would you 1 like to. 2 MS. WILLIAMS: To be honest with 3 you, I am an environmental attorney and I don't 4 make these decisions -- I'm being honest with 5 you, sir. But it is my understanding that there 6 are a lot of requirements that lawyers cannot 7 8 solicit claims and that the military has their rules and requirements on the solicitation of 9 10 claims -- and that is the underlying reasoning for this. 11 12 But I can assure you that Mike and Dick will be told on how to proceed. And if someone 13 14 does call them, if they feel they have a legitimate claim, that person will be able to 15 initiate the process. They will not be --16 17 MR. QUINTANILLA: That's very well and good. All of this is in the transcript 18 19 and I'll get it out of that transcript and 20 forward it to someone and find out why. MR. ESTRADA: Okay. I might also 21 point out that -- I mentioned I handle --22 Excuse me. Could I 23 MR. VILLAR: put a claim after a couple of years because 24 Kelly gave me the runaround and the contractors 25

gave me the run around. I put that claim in with Mr. Houston.

MR. ESTRADA: I'm sorry. I couldn't hear that last part.

MR. VILLAR: Can I put in a claim now? It's about -- It's been about a couple of years that the incident happened. When they was painting those tanks, there was automobiles ruined -- not only myself -- there was a couple of more individuals there that their vehicles got -- got -- you know, like I say, our windows got painted -- you know -- you know, the fumes.

MR. ESTRADA: The short answer is "yes" you can put in a claim.

MR. VILLAR: Because I put in a claim with Mr. Houston and I went -- we went through the procedures and Kelly blamed the contractor and Carl, the contractor, blamed Kelly and -- and the contractor was gone with the wind. Nothing happened on it. Can I still do it? I got the -- I got the original copy.

MR. ESTRADA: Yeah. But I'm not going to pull any punches with you. I'm going to tell you the same thing I tell the people who

call in the noise complaints and claim that their ceilings are cracking or their windows are breaking because of aircraft, the burden of proof is on the claimant.

If you come in and say your foundation is cracked, you have got to prove to the Air Force that it was the Air Force that cracked the foundation. And that is no easy task. It's the same thing with the aircraft going by and it cracks their window. Unless they can prove that the window was cracked at the exact same time that that aircraft flew over, the claims office is not going to pay them.

MRS. JOHNSON: Mr. Estrada, I'm familiar with what Mr. Villar is saying and on our block, we got all the spray paint from that tank over there and when we went to make a claim, we were told we should go to the contractor because Kelly was not responsible for it. And this is the whole block, including -- well, this would be two blocks because it includes him. I live on the 3800 block and it's on 39. And then -- because two of my neighborhoods -- they took the claims forms away from them and told them, you know, to go get the

car fixed wherever they bought it from, but they 1 weren't reimbursed from painting -- and those 2 cars were brand new. 3 I'm not familiar MR. ESTRADA: 4 with the specifics on that. I really can't go 5 into that. 6 MRS. JOHNSON: So, see -- They 7 went to Kelly -- I mean, they called Kelly 8 Field, they got the claim forms and they brought 9 them back and then the claim forms were taken 10 away from them and they were told to get help 11 for themselves -- for -- for insurance -- that's 12 why they had the insurance on the car. So, 13 that's not solving the problem. I mean, we 14 can't come over here and give a complaint --15 MR. QUINTANILLA: That's not 16 being a good neighbor, either. 17 MS. JOHNSON: -- give a 18 complaint -- and then we're told to use our own 19 insurance for whatever happens through the fault 20 of Kelly. 21 MR. TREVINO: If I may recommend 22 something -- I mean, you're not -- you can 23 always make a claim, but to continue the process 24 here -- if you want to definitely make contact 25

with Mr. Estrada or with Mr. Walters for that 1 particular issue, by all means, still make 2 contact with them. That's -- That's the 3 4 procedure that we're trying to implement here --5 so that if there is a claim, by all means, Mr. Estrada can put you in contact with the 6 7 right individuals. Again, Mr. Estrada -- you 8 know, we can't make any promises that you will or will not be reimbursed. What my 9 10 recommendation is here is that we have a set 11 procedure, if we could please follow that 12 procedure and go on from there. 13 MR. QUINTANILLA: Mr. Estrada, on 14 claims procedures, if we have a claim and 15 something happened to our property as a result 16 of this environmental work -- you know, they 17 drill the hole in the wrong place and they blew 18 up a sewer line and infected our house or 19 whatever and we get a lawyer to -- to process 20 that complaint for us and if we prevail, 21 will -- will the -- will Kelly pay for that 2.2 lawyer? 23 MR. ESTRADA: I cannot answer 24 that. I really don't know.

MR. MIXON: If that's part of the

25

settlement in the case --1 MS. JOHNSON: It should be. 2 MR. MIXON: -- because the court 3 can find in favor of and you make the -- the 4 other -- other side pay your attorney fees. 5 6 MR. HAGELTHORN: If you're going 7 to --I just want to MR. OUINTANILLA: 8 know what the procedure is because I think when 9 10 we go individually by our own we're not doing any good and we're -- you know, it's best if we 11 go in with an attorney and if our attorney 12 wins -- you know, they pay the attorney's fees 13 14 instead of us. In the situation 15 MR. ESTRADA: 16 that you just described, I don't think you'd 17 need an attorney. There would be sufficient 18 evidence of damage that would plausibly be traced to the Air Force that the claim would 19 20 probably be accepted. MR. QUINTANILLA: I'm just going 21 22 by what happened on this -- on this tank that 23 you-all were painting where it sprayed on the 24 cars and nothing has been done. 25 MR. ESTRADA: That happened --

l	
1	MR. QUINTANILLA: Two years ago.
2	MR. HAGELTHORN: I think we're
3	digressing here
4	MR. QUINTANILLA: I know it.
5	We're digressing. But I'm just
6	MR. HAGELTHORN: So, let's
7	any any claims questions let's just defer
8	them from the RAB and if anybody
9	MR. ESTRADA: If you want to
10	pursue that again, you know, see us after the
11	meeting and we'll see what we can do.
12	MR. MIXON: And maybe they could
13	even bring that complaint to the to the
14	membership here. If they don't feel like
15	they're being treated fairly, maybe we can help
16	to resolve that issue.
17	MR. QUINTANILLA: I agree with
18	that. I will help.
19	MR. HAGELTHORN: As long as it's
20	dealing with a restoration activity, yeah. But
21	anything that's not a restoration activity, this
22	board should not be addressing. So
23	MR. TREVINO: If I can just
2 4	reiterate we have a procedure. If we can,
25	please, work within that procedure to see that

1 it does work first -- and I will submit to you that you it will work. 2 MR. MIXON: I think what we don't 3 want to lose sight of -- and we have this great 4 5 bureaucracy and everybody feels helpless about -- If everybody realizes there's a means 6 to resolve your concerns -- and I think people 7 8 are going to feel a little bit more comfortable and at ease with what Kelly can do and what the 9 10 RAB can do as far as working with the citizens 11 and also with Kelly. It is not an unmanageable 12 bureaucracy as a lot of people see it from the 13 outside. 14 MR. ESTRADA: Well, sometimes it 15 is. I mean, working from my -- inside -- but 16 Dick and I were hired specifically to assist the 17 That's the only reason why we were 18 hired. 19 MS. JOHNSON: When were you 20 hired, sir? 21 Pardon me? MR. ESTRADA: 22 MS. JOHNSON: When were you 23 hired? 24 MR. ESTRADA: I came on in 25 January of 1990. Now, Dick is pretty much

restricted to working just environmental issues because of the pot of money that he's funded from. I am not. I work every environmental issue that comes up because I'm funded out of the operation and maintenance project. So, if you've got a question, come us to. If you've got a concern, come to us. If your neighbors have concerns, give them our phone number. We'll try and help them.

Now, some upcoming activities -- Richard already touched on the proposed plans. When we get ready to actually do it -- about two weeks prior to the start of the 30-day public comment period -- we will put out both progress reports and fact sheets in plain English that translate the proposed plans. It will also be somewhat shorter, I hope.

The public meeting -- At this point in the planning process, we're looking at having the public meeting midway through the 30-day public comment period. That's to give the public time to get the documents, to look at them, to formulate what they want to say, then they can come in, tell us their concerns and then we've still got at least two weeks left on that public

comment period to do something about it.

After the public comment period, we prepare what is called a Responsiveness Summary. Every significant comment that we receive, we are required by law to respond to it. It doesn't mean we have to accept it, but we have to make a logical response. That will be published. It will be sent to everybody who responds and all the RAB members will get it. Of course, it's also part of the admin record.

MAJ. AYALA: Are those 30 days working days or are they calendar days?

MR. ESTRADA: Calendar days.

There's also a provision that if we get into a

situation where the public requests additional time, there's also provisions in the law for that. So, a 30-day comment period could potentially be extended out to 45 or 60 days if need be.

MR. SAIN: Mr. Estrada?

MR. ESTRADA: Yes, sir.

MR. SAIN: When you said that you have to respond to significant comments, what's the definition of "significant"?

MR. ESTRADA: Let me give you an

example. Out here at the control tower in 1990, 1 there was -- well, the jet fuel spill out there 2 occurred in '88 -- but in 1990, we came up with 3 4 a proposed plan even though we weren't required by law because it was just a fuel spill. But we 5 publicly went through the whole process 6 basically just to get some experience in how it 7 worked. One of the ladies who commented said, 8 9 "Well, why don't you just pave over the whole thing?" And that was not what we considered a 10 significant comment. Because, one, the state 11 would have jumped all over us if we would have 12 13 done that -- and there was some other reasons. But that one was not commented on in the 14 15 Responsiveness Summary.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

One gentleman suggested that we put in recovery wells, treat the water, re-inject the water uphill, in effect, so that it would wash back down through the contaminated area and get a soil wash in there. We considered that a significant comment and commented on it.

Unfortunately, the State of Texas doesn't look kindly on re-injection of groundwater. So, that was basically our answer. I don't know if you folks have changed your -- since then. Like I

say, that was back in 1990. But it's -- I see your point and it's basically pretty subjective what we consider significant or not significant.

The public comment periods we have done since then -- correct me if I'm wrong, Dick -- there's been about eight of them. We have received no comments -- nothing at all.

Before we get to the next one, after the Responsiveness Summary, there would be a record of decision. That's where the Air Force comes out and formally says, "Based upon the input of the public, the regulators, our own input, this is what we're going to do," and then we go off and do that. It's not quite as cut and dry as that in that there's follow-up steps. Once that final cleanup system is put into place, you don't just turn it on and walk away from it. You've got to keep an eye on it and make sure it's doing what it's supposed to do. Hopefully, when we get to that state in a year or so, Richard can tell you everything you need to know about it.

We've got one more off-base drilling round that's still scheduled. We just completed two

of them. This one will be up on -- it will be over on the east side of Kelly Air Force Base, primarily. We're looking at putting in 10 permanent -- or 10 monitoring wells. At this point, most of them, we think, will go into public access land which translates to roads. A few of them may go into some of those light industrial plants up there. We think, at this point, one of them will probably go into the Normoyle Park area or the St. Francis Academy area. We're going to be talking to those folks about that if we decide we need to do that.

MR. QUINTANILLA: Will you talk to all the people who are -- that live in front of those houses -- those areas where you're going to pump? Because you know -- you know what happened there with KENS coming in -- the people did not know --

MR. ESTRADA: I was just going to mention that. We had a problem with the last off-base drilling route in that our progress reports went out late because the printing plant was late and the contractors came in a couple days early. This is one of those instances where we sent out a news release and all the

1 news media suddenly come running out at us. 2 it's the one time we haven't prepared the people 3 who live out there and told them what's going 4 on. 5 My boss and Dick and I got together and we talked about that. So, in the future, even if 6 7 we send out the progress reports three months in 8 advance, we're going to go out there and go 9 door-to-door in the affected neighborhood and 10 explain to them what is about to happen. 11 MR. QUINTANILLA: That's being a 12 good neighbor. 13 MR. ESTRADA: Yeah. And we don't 14 need the gentleman -- like you said -- What 15 stations was that? KENS? 16 MR. QUINTANILLA: KENS. 17 MR. ESTRADA: A gentleman got up 18 there and said, "I don't know what they're 19 doing. Nobody's told me anything." And he was 20 right. We messed up on that one. We're going 21 to make sure that doesn't happen again. 22 It's also been mentioned -- something we're 23 very proud of -- and you've got a news release 24 in your packet. Mr. Bailey and some folks are 25 up in Washington today accepting the 1994

Department of Defense Pollution Prevention

Award. Very strong competition on this. We knew all along we were going to win it, though. I won't say anything else about that. But the news release on that is going out tomorrow morning. So, hopefully, you'll be seeing quite a bit about it in the local news media -- instead of all this stuff they've been saying today about Kelly's on the closure list.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Not necessarily a part of the Restoration Advisory Board -- but we've got some environmental assessments that are out with the Alamo Area Council of Governments right now. thought -- If you're interested, I could just very quickly tell you what the four of them are and if you want additional information on them, just give Dick or I a call. But the 433rd Airlift Wing over on the west side of the base wants to put up a new building to put in a C5 Galaxy Flight Simulator. Our Combat Logistics Support Squadrons want to build a hangar out near the control tower. out in the industrial area near building 375 -which is that huge hangar out there -- want to put in a support structure to house ground

equipment. And the fourth one is a modern fire and rescue station which will be right on the flight line just south of the air base wing headquarters building. They say those four at AACOG now. They are up for public review. We generally run the review periods between 20 and 30 days on these. Again, if you're interested, I'd be happy to send you the finding of those significant impacts and you can take a look at it.

Earth Day, Saturday, April 22nd, in
San Pedro Park. Kelly will be there as will a
lot of other folks. In fact, Mr. Sain is
instrumental in getting us there.

MR. SAIN: All I know is that it's actually going to end at 6:00 p.m. -
MR. ESTRADA: Right. I just found out about that today.

MR. SAIN: -- and the breakdown will be between 6:00 and 8:00, because we have to be out of the park by 8:00.

MR. ESTRADA: Right. So, it will actually run between 10:00 and 6:00. The flyer that I received and I included in there -- apparently there will be plenty of parking

because they're going to use the SAC parking lots because this is right across the street from San Antonio College. And we would sure like to see some RAB members volunteer to come on out and help man the booth. We've got a sign-up list going around. If any of you are interested, we'd be more than happy to have you out there with us.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

Now, the last thing I've got -- As you came in, I handed you a 10- or 12-page packet of information that we pulled down off the Internet. We've been providing this to our commanders and senior people on Kelly for about a year. They've found it very useful. It's an edited compilation. It's not the entire package. I take out those articles that I don't feel pertain to the Air Force -- Kelly Air Force -- such as the Army's problem with unexploded ordnance, for instance. So, it's a compilation of the defense environment alert, the inside EPA weekly report and the daily environment report. It basically covers federal and state regulatory agencies -- not necessarily the things that have been finalized -- but also the thought processes that are going into things

that may be finalized a couple of years from now.

It talks about Defense Department planning and decisions, congressional deliberations, environmental groups, and one that we're seeing a lot of now is Restoration Advisory Board activities at other bases. The basic question is: Would you like to receive this information every other week? And I'll turn it over to you if you'd like to take a vote.

MR. HAGELTHORN: Is there anybody on the Board that would like to receive the information?

(Vote by the RAB members.)

MR. RICE: I'd just like to make a comment. I think this is excellent -- really great that you're doing this. If you were to subscribe to these newsletters -- they cost a couple hundred bucks a year just to get a weekly newsletter. So, this is excellent.

MR. HAGELTHORN: It appears that the Board members would like to receive this.

MR. ESTRADA: Then as is the case with the primary mailing list, then, even if you don't want it, you're going to get it.

That's all I've got. Any questions for me?

MR. SOLIS: Mr. Estrada, for future meetings you should provide for public address system. We can't hear back here.

MR. ESTRADA: I'm sorry. I didn't realize that.

MR. SOLIS: And some other comments -- have the people identify themselves, like members of the Board or residents or whatever, then we can all benefit from what's being said.

MR. ESTRADA: One of the last things that we're going to be discussing today -- as we always do -- is determining when the next meeting is. We also need to take a look if we want to continue using this room or go to another location. Now, Dick and I have a location that's due south of Lackland. It's in a Knights of Columbus hall. It's a lot bigger than this and it has an excellent sound system -- and I just throw that out for your consideration. It will come up later.

MR. MOORE: Yeah. As Captain Ed points out, the acoustics are better, too.

MR. MIXON: Do they serve beer

| there?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. ESTRADA: Yeah. Milk and

cookies. No more questions?

MR. TREVINO: And moving along here -- I apologize for this half-hour delay in the schedule -- so we can get to our TNRCC focus -- because that's our main topic of discussion here. Just relatively quick, there's two last issues. We had an open-action item on the RAB newsletter. One was -- we had -- the RAB was supposed to come back and provide feedback on, one, do we want to do the newsletter? And, then, two, if we can establish a subcommittee to look at and evaluate that newsletter. So, what I throw out now is: One, do we still want to continue to do that? two, if, in fact, that is the case, that we establish that subcommittee to bring that forward and look at those recommendations and how we can implement that in the most cost-effective way -- in a practical way. guess the first question is: Do we wish to do a newsletter in lieu of what Mr. Estrada has indicated -- all the level of work that we do --

1 community relations, press releases, fact 2 sheets -- everything else -- Do we still have the necessity to have a newsletter? 3 4 MR. QUINTANILLA: I would say 5 yes. 6 MR. TREVINO: Then what I would 7 like to do is --8 MR. HAGELTHORN: I would like to 9 just throw my comment in here. My opinion, 10 based on what Mr. Estrada has just said and the 11 fact that we sent out over 13,000 postcards and 12 we've got about 15 people in the audience, 13 doesn't really warrant the -- the expense of 14 creating a newsletter and sending it out, too. 15 Since I've been on this Board, I haven't 16 seen a real interest of the community becoming 17 involved here during the meetings. And, so, to 18 go through the expense of creating a 19 newsletter. I think that's just a waste of 20 money, in my own opinion. But I would like --21 This is a decision the Board has to make, so --22 but that's my personal opinion. 23 MR. SANCHEZ: I think that 24 the -- the -- that the whole history of the 25 review -- you know, the technical review

committee that was here before and then now with the RAB is that there is an enormous, voluminous amounts of information that has been put out in the community and it's -- sometimes this tends to overwhelm people and you get just this response that you just described. People -- you know, they -- they can't absorb all this. Most of it is extremely technical. And, so, I think that whatever information we have -- whatever opportunity -- opportunity we have to communicate with the community -- public -- via newsletter or whatever -- it's well worth it, you know, to get that information out.

You know, surveys are kind of a tough -you know, tough thing to judge. I mean, you can
get a return -- the actual return of the people
that are here -- I don't think is indicative of
the amount of interest that's out there or may
be out there. Certainly with the -- with the -the base closure activities around Kelly Air
Force Base, I think the interest of keeping
Kelly working and keeping everything, you know,
as is will be extremely high.

MR. TREVINO: What I would recommend, I guess, for -- Again, to close the

action item out, is the Board --

MR. SAIN: Are you saying that this newsletter would be in lieu of what's going on --

MR. TREVINO: No, sir. This will be in addition to what's currently being done. And the way I see this newsletter being -- is be done by the RAB itself with support from the Air Force. But I see it, basically, being the responsibility of the RAB and not of the Air Force. It's -- It's our newsletter. It's not an Air Force newsletter or a State of Texas newsletter. It is a Restoration Advisory Board newsletter for Kelly Air Force Base.

So, my question goes back as one: Does the RAB -- is in favor of a newsletter. And, if so, -- Well, first of all, let me -- let me get that one first. And, if so, I will be looking for a group of individuals to take on that -- that responsibility where the Air Force will be part of that team in assisting in that newsletter. So, my question goes out initially as: Are we in favor of a newsletter? If I can have a show of hands --

MR. HAGELTHORN: Those in favor

1	of the newsletter, show their hands.
2	(Vote by the RAB members.)
3	MR. TREVINO: Mrs. Johnson, is
4	that a "yes"?
5	MS. JOHNSON: Yes.
6	MR. TREVINO: I have eight.
7	Joan, is that a "yes" or
8	MS. FALKENBERG: No.
9	MR. TREVINO: Okay. For those
10	MR. HAGELTHORN: All those
11	opposed?
12	MR. TREVINO: opposed to the
13	newsletter, please raise your hand.
14	(Vote by the RAB members.)
15	MR. TREVINO: Six It stands as
16	eight to six, so we will be in favor of the
1.7	newsletter. Based upon that, I am now asking
18	for those individuals to be who would like to
19	take on responsibility
20	MR. QUINTANILLA: Huh-uh.
21	MR. TREVINO: Mr. Sanchez?
22	MR. SANCHEZ: What would be the
23	responsibility?
24	MR. TREVINO: You-all would
25	basically At this stage, for now is look

1 at those responsibilities in terms of how would I form a newsletter and actually define how you 2 3 would see the newsletter taking place. not be -- It was originally requested on a 4 5 monthly basis. Maybe that's not the case. For, 6 one -- is to look at, one, "How feasible can we 7 do it"? Yes, we agree for now that we can do 8 that or that we want to do it. How is it -- you 9 know, "Is it feasible"? Yes or no. What is the 10 level of effort that we're talking about? And 11 then, at that point, bringing it back to the 12 RAB -- making a presentation and then saying, 13 "This is what we're going to -- "This is how 14 we're going to initiate it and what our" -- "our 15 topics are." 16 MR. QUINTANILLA: A little 17 correction. We already voted that we wanted to 18 have a newsletter. 19 MR. TREVINO: That's correct. 20 MR. QUINTANILLA: Now, the next 21 procedure is how we're going to accomplish it. 22 That's correct. MR. TREVINO: 23 MR. QUINTANILLA: Is it the RAB 24 that's going to write this? 25 MR. TREVINO: Yes, sir. It is

1 the RAB --2 MR. QUINTANILLA: All right. Ιf 3 the RAB is going to write this, then we're going 4 to have to comply with the law and then you have 5 to provide for the payment of funds for this particular --6 7 MR. TREVINO: I indicated --8 That's correct. If you understand what I --9 what I indicated --10 MR. QUINTANILLA: Now, why -- at 11 this particular point in time, I want to know why is public affairs shying away from that 12 13 responsibility. 14 MR. TREVINO: They're not No. 15 shying away from it. We are part -- We are part 16 of that team. This is a RAB newsletter --17 MR. QUINTANILLA: You said 18 "team." Team means all of the RAB and P.A. 19 MR. TREVINO: That's correct. 20 MR. QUINTANILLA: Okay. 21 MR. TREVINO: We will be part of 22 that team -- we, the Air Force. But, we, the 23 Air Force, will not assume full responsibility, 24 because then it becomes an Air Force newsletter 25 and not a RAB newsletter. And that's what I'm

1 trying to get --2 MR. QUINTANILLA: It will be a RAB newsletter with -- with help and editing and 3 everything else that goes from it from P.A. 4 5 MR. HAGELTHORN: P.A. will help 6 out in the actual production of the newsletter. but the text needs to be written by the members 7 8 of the RAB. 9 MR. QUINTANILLA: Every paragraph 10 that's in there we write? 11 MR. TREVINO: Let me interject --12 Let me have Mr. Walters add -- he's been 13 looking --14 MR. QUINTANILLA: I disagree. 15 MR. WALTERS: Technical 16 comments -- I'm not a member of the RAB but I'm 17 a member of Public Affairs and work with newsletters. What the RAB subcommittee needs to 18 19 decide is what kind of articles do the RAB 20 members want to write, what information do you 21 want to share and who do you want to get it 22 to -- we've got 30,000 to pick from -- and 23 then who's going to put the labels on the 24 envelopes. If it takes three days, five people, 25 to do envelopes for 13,000, Public Affairs

cannot do 30,000 for you. Somebody is going to 1 have say, "We're going to decide who needs to 2 get it and we're going to put the labels" -- I 3 mean, it's just --4 MR. QUINTANILLA: Again, let me 5 read from the law. "The secretary may provide 6 for the payment of routine administrative 7 expenses of the Restoration Advisory Board from 8 funds available for the operation and 9 maintenance of the installation." 10 MR. TREVINO: You are correct. 11 MR. WALTERS: Mr. Quintanilla, 12 may I give you technical information on that? 13 We will pay for printing this. We will pay the 14 postage on this. We will, if you want, do the 15 compiling of it, but the writing of it is still 16 going to be the RAB members and the RAB members' 17 time --18 MR. QUINTANILLA: You're writing 19 certain things for -- you know, and continuously 20 doing that. All I'm saying is some of that I --21 things that you're writing should be part of the 22 newsletter and we'll gladly have a --23 MR. TREVINO: If I may 24 25 interject --

MR. QUINTANILLA: Do you agree, 1 Mr. Estrada? 2 MR. ESTRADA: Yeah. I see what 3 you're saying. 4 MR. TREVINO: If I may 5 interject -- so we can get closure on this --6 is that Mr. Sanchez is leading the chair on this 7 particular issue. Let a subcommittee go back 8 and brainstorm it, come back to the RAB at the 9 next meeting -- we'll take it back as a topic, 10 if that's okay --1.1 MR. SANCHEZ: Why don't I look at 12 our options for it in terms of -- you know, I 13 don't think that we're going to sit down and 14 15 write a newsletter. I think what we're going to sit down and look at is what is the content of 16 the information that we want to get out there 17 and that -- that Kelly Air Force Base is going 18 19 to put in it to get out. MR. QUINTANILLA: Very good. 20 MR. SANCHEZ: In other words, 21 we're going to be, more or less, editorializing, 22 review the what -- you're going to -- you know, 23 the information that you would like to get out 24 there and compare that with the information that 25

24

25

we would like to get out there as well to go back to the initial charge to ensure that public input is being -- you know, that we are fulfilling our job of ensuring public input. And I think this is just a very small way to do that. So, it's not instrumental -- it's not an insurmountable problem, as I see it. Now, I may be completely wrong. But it's a newsletter. You know, it's not -- we're not writing the Bible here. But I think -- to go back to our initial charge -- we would be fulfilling that charge in a very clear and -- and specific manner. You know, we would have some input into this newsletter and some degree or whatever -and not to say that we are technical experts or we are preempting the Air Force and -- but -you know, the technical content of it -- but I think that would be our role in this instance.

MS. FALKENBERG: But I hear two different things. One, the RAB members will write the newsletter and then I'm hearing Mr. Sanchez say that the Kelly Air Force personnel will write the newsletter and we will review it. Which is it?

MR. SANCHEZ: Well, Joan, I think

what I'm saying is that we're going to have to 1 be looking at all of those alternatives. 2 3 some point, we may not want to write anything else. We may not have anything to write. They 4 5 may have some information that they would like 6 to get out there and we would say, "Well, this 7 is appropriate." But there may be an instance 8 where we get into a topic where the community -- we feel -- you know, that they 9 would need specific information that maybe is 10 11 not being provided. So, as to fulfill our --12 our charge, we would say -- we would have the 13 option of writing part of that -- you know, that 14 specific part of that. But those are 15 alternatives. We're not -- I don't think I can 16 come back to the whole thing and you give a 17 product right now. 18 MS. FALKENBERG: Right. But my question is, is -- Do we have that alternative? 19 20 MR. HAGELTHORN: Do we have the 21 alternative? Uh-huh. 22 MS. FALKENBERG: What we have to 23 MR. HAGELTHORN: 24 do is, we have to look at whether or not what we 25 would be doing as a membership of the RAB -- the

1 information we would provide -- provide the 2 community would be over and above what the Air Force is already providing. In the -- I'm not 3 4 one that likes to throw away a lot of money and 5 when you talk about this -- production of this 6 thing -- that's a lot of money. 7 dollars that are going --8 MR. QUINTANILLA: It's -- It's --9 Go ahead, sir. 10 MR. HAGELTHORN: If the RAB wants 11 to take the position and the RAB wants to 12 generate a newsletter for the community that 13 would be beneficial to the community, then I'm 14 all for producing a newsletter. 15 MR. QUINTANILLA: And that's what 16 we're going to do. 17 MR. HAGELTHORN: But to say 18 the -- we require the Air Force to produce the 19 newsletter -- write it and produce it -- no, 20 because they're already doing what's required 21 under the law. 22 MR. QUINTANILLA: All I'm saying 23 is what they do is they include it in the 24 newsletter. 25 MR. HAGELTHORN: If we want to

write it and have them edit it and produce it, 1 then I'm --2 MR. QUINTANILLA: No, no. 3 don't understand why you're against, you know, 4 5 what they're already doing -- putting it in the 6 newsletter. 7 MR. HAGELTHORN: I'm only -- not 8 against that. What I'm saying is, the avenue or 9 the vehicle they are already using -- we've all 10 demonstrated --11 MR. QUINTANILLA: And it hasn't 12 been effective. 13 MR. HAGELTHORN: You're right. 14 MR. QUINTANILLA: So, let's try 15 something else. 16 MR. HAGELTHORN: We'll take it 17 back to the committee and the committee will do 18 the research and present their findings. 19 I'd be glad to look MR. SANCHEZ: 20 at the whole options -- and if anybody has a 21 specific -- you know, Joan -- if you want to 22 take a look at the information -- I would be 23 especially interested in, also, any community 24 members that actually live in the area that 25 would want to have -- you know, serve on this

20

21

22

23

24

25

as -- to sit -- to look at what's occurring. Because I think this is part of what we're talking about when we are saying that we are trying to ensure -- not that we get our viewpoint across -- but that a viewpoint that reflects, you know, that level of community concern is there and that by no means are we -something like this would be used, you know, in some kind of a manner to -- that would be inappropriate to to go out and slay imaginary dragons, you know. But I think that if -- if there is -- if maybe the RAB could do a -plausibly a better job of getting that information out to those people in a message they could easily understand, well, then we should try it. And if we fail, we can come back and say, "Well, it's not working. Maybe we can go to Plan B."

But I think it's an exciting -- and a step forward -- I mean, a step different from what -- you know, to try to give the RAB Board some type of an individual identity separate from the Air Force and to fulfill our function of advisory and also to fulfill that charge of ensuring public input. If the Board feels like it's not

working, fine, you know, we don't have to do that. But I -- at least, maybe give you -- you'd like to come back and maybe discuss with the P.R. people in depth a little bit about what, you know, they -- what they're doing, what they could do differently and then come back and give that report. Ultimately, it will be the decision of the RAB Board.

MR. QUINTANILLA: For instance, you've got an excellent article here in

2.0

MR. QUINTANILLA: For instance, you've got an excellent article here in Environmental Management and I think 40,000 copies of this have been published -- in this little magazine. Some of this could be taken out and put into the newspaper. Because a lot of people here in the neighborhood will never see this and this is the kind of information that I'm saying that should be -- this, again -- this article was developed by Mr. Estrada.

MR. TREVINO: Correct. And as part of the committee that will address those issues. I think there is a comment from the back -- a gentleman in the back.

MR. SOLIS: If the name of a newsletter to inform the public -- those that are here in the area -- I think a summary of

KIM TINDALL & ASSOCIATES, INC.
7800 IH-10 WEST, SUITE 100, SAN ANTONIO, TX 78230
(210) 377-3027 1-800-969-3027 FAX (210) 344-6016

the conclusions of this Board, actions to be taken and timetable would be sufficient. And, if you will, extraction of your minutes, saying, "The Board met. This is what was done. This is what's planned. This is the timetable."

MR. TREVINO: And Mr. Sanchez'

MR. TREVINO: And Mr. Sanchez' committee will take all that into account and what you-all see as -- as being part of the meeting minutes. So, I can continue into the next -- Yes, sir.

I'm Juan Solis, Sr., and I represent 200
families in the Brady Garden area -- most of us
ex-Kellyites and retired military. We bought
there in the late '50s. We don't plan to go
anywhere. Now, when you -- from day one, we
were at ground zero in case of a nuclear war.
We took it in stride. Don't worry about it.
But today, when we're faced with environmental
concerns -- we're the people of the area -should be kept informed and have an opportunity
to participate. At this point, if you ever have
a vacancy on the Board, I'd like to apply.

MR. TREVINO: And you're more than welcome to submit the application. Please

1 get with Mr. Walters or Mr. Estrada at the end of the meeting. They'd be happy to entertain 2 3 whatever you have. If I can --4 MR. SANCHEZ: I think -- Was 5 6 anybody else going to serve on this committee? 7 MR. QUINTANILLA: Just call on 8 me. I'm retired and I can help you. 9 MR. SANCHEZ: Really -- I really, 10 you know, ask that sincerely from all of you. 11 MR. TREVINO: What we can do --12 If you-all can please get with Mr. Sanchez --13 MR. SANCHEZ: Because 14 otherwise -- I have very strong opinions and --15 so they'll say, "Well," you know, "Mr. Sanchez 16 is ramrodding this again through somewhere 17 here." 18 MR. HAGELTHORN: Whoever's 19 interested in getting on the Board -- or on the 20 subcommittee with Mr. Sanchez, please get with 21 him after the meeting. Can we go to the next 22 item? 23 MR. OUINTANILLA: I would also 2.4 like to have on this subcommittee some technical 25 advice from the staff -- from either Mr. Estrada or Mr. Walters.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. TREVINO: Yes, sir. All that will be part of the process. Even though they'll be one of the team members, they'll have technical support, as well.

The next issue prior to the TNRCC will be visual aids. Again, at the last RAB, Mr. Bailey and the RAB as a whole looked at what can the RAB do -- or bring back recommendations to every one as part of how can we better visually provide the information to the community or even to yourselves. And the action item was to have all the RAB members come back to us with recommendations on types of visual aids -- and when I throw that out -- if you have something -- in the interest of time -- if you want to just get with Dick, Mike or myself, or if you want to just put them down on paper or give us a phone call later or bring them to the next RAB -- what I would do at this stage is just -- let's table that for the next RAB -- if nothing else -- if I can have concurrence from that standpoint? Prior to the next RAB, please give us your input. That way we can better help support you. From my standpoint, we are -- we

are -- conclude with my portion. And without further ado, we are now going to have the Texas Natural Resource Conservation

Commission -- Paul Lewis, who heads up that organization from a technical and for a facility standpoint, to provide a presentation for us now on the risk reduction rules. Mr. Lewis?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. LEWIS: I'd like to thank the co-chairs of the Kelly RAB for inviting me to attend this meeting and give a brief presentation on basically how the agency decides what -- or procedures by which we determine levels of cleanup. I'll have to presume a certain amount of knowledge on the part of the audience in the remediation process that's going on at Kelly. But just for a quick recap -- at a regulatory agency -- where we interact with Kelly is in the review of work plans or reports that they turn in that describe the investigations that they will do to determine what kind of contaminants may have released from past operations and how far have they gone and at what rate might they be moving.

They also need to determine what kinds of exposure situations would be appropriate to

assess the -- the nature of the release. And then they ultimately have to design some type of remedial action to clean up the release or judge if it is severe enough to warrant cleanup. And you've heard tonight discussion about where the RAB fits in for the interaction and the review and comment on this process.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

1.4

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Well, the agency also interacts with Kelly Air Force Base at various steps along the way. One of the -- the more scientifically oriented parts of this entire remediation process, though, is deciding what is the appropriate level of cleanup. And as with many other things at the agency, we do have a set of regulations that come into play, commonly known as the Risk Reduction Rules. These are a set of regulations that apply to virtually all industrial types of operations throughout the state, and that can include military bases such as Kelly, and they spell out a process by which these facilities will come up with cleanup It's a combination of what we call levels. Risk Assessment -- a scientific process to come up with a site specific number with risk management requirements. That is, what kind of

cleanup will you do? What reporting requirements are necessary? What interaction with outside advisory groups might be required or public notification requirements? All that's rolled up into this set of regulations that we

call the Risk Reduction Rules.

But at the core of those rules are the actual three cleanup standards. And within the the packet that the RAB members have, there should be a one-sheet double-sided copy that gives you a matrix of the risk reduction standards. And I'll largely talk from this. We also have copies available which Mr. Gary Beyer from our staff will pass out to the members of the audience.

Well, we have, as I said, three risk reduction standards. What they do is specify levels of cleanup and corresponding risk management actions that go with those levels of cleanup. But the basic objective here is that any level of cleanup will be protective of human health and the environment. We just go about attaining them by different means and we have three main means that we call Removal, Decontamination or Control Measures. And in

KIM TINDALL & ASSOCIATES, INC.
7800 IH-10 WEST, SUITE 100, SAN ANTONIO, TX 78230
(210) 377-3027 1-800-969-3027 FAX (210) 344-6016

using those different combinations, there may be varying amounts of ongoing obligations.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Our first standard, closure or remediation to background, basically requires that any contaminants released from these activities regulated here or at any given location would be removed to background or pre-existing conditions. The reward for doing that is that there are no further regulatory obligations, because there basically will be nothing left there to regulate. It's considered a permanent remedy. Hence, there's no requirement for any type of post-closure care or ongoing operation such as monitoring or maintenance of any protective caps or fencing or anything of that sort.

Our second standard combines certain elements of this first one. The second standard is closure or remediation to health-based levels or standards. The federal government has promulgated standards for levels that of contaminants primarily in water and we utilize lots of these pre-published standards because they are already established as law and they're wildly accepted as the performance measure to be

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

attained. Those are used in surface water and groundwater as two examples of media that would need to be addressed. There really are virtually no standards for soils. So, within our rules, we define procedures to go by to calculate a cleanup number. And for Standard 2 -- it was designed to be applied to many facilities throughout the state in a self-implementing manner. So, we had to be very specific about how that value is determined. So, within our regulations, we even spell out the equations that would be used to calculate a There is some additional information number. that has to be factored in that can be obtained from various other sources. The calculation itself is really fairly simple. In fact, we had also tabulated examples of many of those values for users of the rules.

Standard 2, upon attainment, is also a permanent remedy. That is, there's no requirement for any ongoing maintenance. The land should be usable for any foreseeable use, be it considered residential or industrial. The only difference here is that in contrast to Standard 1, Standard 2 requires a notice be

placed in the deed to the land to reflect that there's some minor amount of residual contaminants still in place but at levels that are protective of human health and the environment.

Standards 1 and 2 because of their very specific nature -- and our rules can be self-implemented after providing that -- a certain amount of notice to the agency -- usually a minimum of 10 days in advance of undertaking an action. Here at Kelly and at other major military installations -- they may want to attain that level of performance but because of the interactive review by the agency on their work plans, they -- tend to submit all their plans to us in advance rather than self-implementing.

Our third standard involves all three types of measures, removal, decontamination and control measures in contrast to the first two standards which are primarily just removal of the contamination operations. Standard 3 is one that would use a lot more site-specific information in determining a cleanup level as opposed to the generic approach in our Standard

No. 2. It is not meant to be self-implemented. We do prescribe in the rules that a lot of information be provided to the agency in advance for review and approval prior to undertaking the actual cleanup.

(RAB member Quintanilla exits the room.)

MR. LEWIS: And then, as with all three standards, once the work is finished, there has to be a report submitted to the agency to verify actual attainment of cleanup.

Now, I had mentioned removal,

decontamination and control measures. Though

Standard 3 can use controls -- and these are

such things as wells to pump out groundwater or

engineered clay caps on top of areas of

contaminated soils or fences -- or in the case

of military installations, an order from the

commander that access to a particular area must

be restricted or no access provided whatsoever.

That's an institutional control. There's a

certain amount of maintenance that must be done

to make sure those control measures either work

or are continually effective. So, Standard 3,

by definition, then, is not a permanent remedy.

There will be ongoing obligations that could entail issuance of a permit or a continuing reporting back to the agency on some prescribed frequency.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And Standard 3 is also more amenable to your tougher problems to solve, if you will, because a greater deal of site specificity can be factored into the selection of a remedy. This is where the -- the risk assessment process plays a very integral role in the determination of the cleanup level. As opposed to what we did in Standard 2 where it's all generic, Standard 3 -- we start off at that same point, but with justification, we can accept more localized or site-specific considerations, such as who actually drinks the groundwater or how often does a worker traverse a certain area of contaminated soil. There are many standardized assumptions that EPA has developed that will give us answers, but they may not be appropriate for a particular situation.

So, this would all be factored in as part of the solutions or remedies, as they'll be called, that Kelly will be providing and for which the public will have opportunity for

review -- either at time of closure of a 1 particular waste unit or during the RIFS process 2 that's being conducted here at Kelly. 3 4 So, I realize that's probably just a thumbnail sketch of a very detailed process, but 5 I would like to just respond to your specific 6 7 questions, if you have them, and I can provide 8 you my phone number if you would like to call 9 back later with a specific question. My number 10 in Austin is area code, 512, 239-2340. MR. SOLIS: Can I have your full 11 12 name again, sir. 13 MR. LEWIS: Paul S. Lewis. 14 MR. SOLIS: L-e-w --15 MR. LEWIS: L-e-w-i-s. 16 MR. RICE: Some of the 17 alternatives that Kelly has presented for 18 cleaning up the groundwater in various zones 19 rely on the notion that somehow residents off 20 base can be prevented from either using existing 21 wells or installing new wells and using that 22 water. Does either the federal government or 23 the state government or any local government

24

25

have the authority to prevent people from

pumping water from their land if they want to?

1 MR. LEWIS: I don't believe we 2 have anything -- any law such as that at the 3 state level unless it's as part of a groundwater 4 conservation district. I understand that local entities through their zoning authorities and 5 6 ordinances can impose bans on household wells for domestic water supply purposes. I don't 7 8 know if that is the case here at Kelly or not. 9 MR. BEYER: I think it is. think the city has ordinances against -- against 10 11 use of groundwater from water wells --12 domestic -- or release -- I don't know -- or is 13 it against drilling new ones? 14 MR. SANCHEZ: The city has 15 regulations that -- that regulate the drilling 16 of new wells. I don't think they specifically 17 prohibit anybody from drinking any --18 anything -- any water from their own wells. 19 Now, I may be mistaken, but I -- I don't 20 think -- I think that's the case. 21 MR. BROWN: The problem with our 22 drinking water rules is twofold, but the primary 23 thing -- This is Bill Brown. I'm with TNRCC. 24 We don't have a drinking water person here 25 tonight, but the drinking water rules would say

that if it was going to be for public 1 2 consumption -- which means 10 or more families, I think -- I'm not even sure of that -- but 3 for a large -- a larger number of people, it 4 would have to be an approved water supply. 5 6 if it's not an approved water supply, then we 7 really have no control over the use of the water for drinking purposes. 8 MR. BEYER: That's the state 9 10 published by-rules. 11 MR. BROWN: Yeah. But I believe if it's 12 MR. SAIN: 13 not for sale and if it's for private use, you 14 can drill your own well. MR. SANCHEZ: And the actual 15 16 reality of it is that people's individual water 17 wells -- really there's very little control of 18 that. 19 MR. BEYER: Right. 20 MR. SANCHEZ: But that's the 21 reality of it. MR. RICE: I guess my question to 22 23 the Air Force or anyone else that has the 24 answer -- if that's the case -- any alternative 25 that relies on prohibiting people from using

their own wells is really not going to work.

And as I read through this, a lot of the alternatives seem to rely on just that, as we're somehow going to prevent people from consuming this contaminated water that's off base. But apparently that won't work under Texas law.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

1.9

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. BEYER: I think the way the TNRCC has been dealing with it in the past is that there's -- and they base it on two requirements. One was that -- One is that less than 10,000 TDS to define whether it's usable or not. And, two, if it comes from a producible aquifer -- if production rate is high enough. And our policy state-wide has pretty much been to protect any waters that meet those criteria. And then, when it comes to local mandates, we -you know, we don't control those -- but as far as prohibiting people from drinking wells, I think what we do is advise people that, you know, their wells are contaminated -- you know, and advise against drinking it and using it. that point, if you're a wise person, you would not want to drink water from that well.

MR. SANCHEZ: Mr. Lewis, have you done some risk assessment yourself on some of

the Kelly Field projects?

MR. LEWIS: I personally have not, if that's the thrust of your question. If the state in general does it, generally, no, as we keep that burden on whatever particular entity has to address the remediation.

Although, we can utilize, say, the Health Department for particularly problematic instances where there may not be a responsible entity to go to to begin with.

MR. AYALA: What options would a resident in one of these areas here have if they wanted to find out whether they could drill a well? And, if so, whether that water would be safe to drink? Where would they turn to for that? What source of information -- Is there a point of contact for that where they could find out exactly some of the things that we were talking about here earlier in terms of the numbers of people to be served from a well and specifics?

MR. LEWIS: I guess one of the first places to attempt to find answers to that kind of question would be the local -- probably the county level Health Department and at the

1 state level we do have one report that's 2 published annually that lists all known sites as known to us at the time it's put together --3 sites with contamination -- and if somebody were 4 5 to access that report and they know that they live in the vicinity of such a facility, they 6 7 could contact us and we could give them more 8 information. Because -- Oh, there's several 9 thousand listed in that report each year and --10 at one line each was about the limit of space 1.1. that we can give to it. It's already a pretty 12 massive report. 13 MAJ. AYALA: I would recommend 14 that the committee that's looking at that 15 newsletter -- that that be one of the foremost 16 items of consideration.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MAJ. AYALA: Information to the effect of where the citizens in the local area could find out answers to those questions like that. Because I would think that's at the fundamental core or essence of what we're all about.

MR. SANCHEZ: What's that?

MR. SANCHEZ: Well, I am with the Health Department with the -- for the City of

Health Department with the -- for the City of

2.5

San Antonio and Bexar County and I can tell you that that's a -- you know, without specific information being provided either by the state or by the regulatory individuals or by the consultants -- whoever has been working in that -- that is a very difficult question to So, we -- we usually err on the side of caution for the public that if that is an unknown water supply -- and by that we don't have -- an unknown in terms of the exact chemical content of the water -- our -- our general recommendation is, if it hasn't been sampled or analyzed, usually don't drink the water. That is considered an unknown factor. So -- I mean, that's -- and that question comes up on a periodic basis continuously to the local Health Department, not -- and this is not just specifically about Kelly Field. This comes --This same question comes up in regards to drinking water in apartment complexes, breakdowns in plumbing, other, you know, peripheral issues that deal specifically with drinking water and people's health or their perception of health or safety.

MR. EBERT: Well, last year, we

1 did a shallow water well survey in the 2 neighborhood and we went out to 3,000 3 individuals or residences in the neighborhood 4 and we did a shallow water well survey. they're aware of what's in the groundwater. 5 Ιf 6 they had a well, we went out and sampled it. 7 And, so, we've been out -- gone out there and we provided those individuals who had a well with 8 the results of what was in the water. So, 9 10 everybody that we know of in the -- that area 11 around Kelly Air Force Base has been notified 12 that we're doing a survey. We took water 13 samples and we provided them with the analysis. 14 MR. SANCHEZ: And I also think 15 you also sent copies of that to our office in 16 terms of the results of your samples. 17 MR. EBERT: Whose office is it? 18 MR. SANCHEZ: The San Antonio 19 Metropolitan Health District. 20 MR. EBERT: Yes, we did. 21 MR. SANCHEZ: Because I know we 22 have copies of that information -- and we make 23 it a point for anybody that -- that wants 24 information about this particular process -- we 25 will -- they can come down to our office. We'll

1 pull out all the information we have --2 MAJ. AYALA: I think that's 3 great. MR. SANCHEZ: -- and we do that. 5 But -- And we would be glad to put that in 6 newsletters. But this is a very, you know, 7 pertinent and germane question in terms of 8 relative risk. But to go back to what you are 9 describing in terms of the health risk process, could you -- could you elaborate more and tell 10 11 them about how that process is continuously 12 updated, how it's not a fixed position or -- is 13 it -- does it change as the body of knowledge 14 increases as the mathematical model has to be 15 changed --16 MR. LEWIS: Yes. 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. SANCHEZ: -- the deficiencies with that particular process and the strengths of that and why we -- you know, that process -- that particular process is the one -- what is ultimately decided on as the best available information that we have at this time to -- to do this?

MR. LEWIS: All right. Well, in essence, the risk assessment process looks at

several pieces of information -- and we'll just focus the discussion to groundwater because that seems to be the primary concern here. First you have what's called hazard identification and that is simply thought of as, "Well, what contaminants are here? Let's identify them."

And you have a toxicity assessment. What do we know about the toxic nature of whatever these contaminants might happen to be in this groundwater? And here is where there's continual evolvement and improvement in the body of knowledge on the toxicity of chemicals.

As a regulatory agency, we at the state and also at EPA tend to rely upon two primary sources of information and these are developed by EPA. They are data bases that come out of EPA's headquarters and are updated, I think, every other month for the first one and then annually for the second one. The first one is called the Integrated Risk Information System and it has detailed information on several hundred common chemical contaminants. The second one is the Health Effects Summary -- Health Effects Assessment Summary Tables and those are pamphlets or books that tabulate a lot

of additional information on some other contaminants. But, collectively, those two form the primary source of information.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Now, the tests that are done to develop this kind of information could be lumped into two main categories: Tests to determine cancer potency of the substance and then other tests for any other kind of illness that would be recognizable in test animals such as those little white lab mice -- those are the primary ones that are used. The results of these very complex lab studies that take several years to do for any one given contaminant are condensed down into a number -- or two numbers -- maybe a slope factor for the contaminants for carcinogenicity or cancer potency and a reference dose for non-cancer effects. that's a piece of the information we're looking for out of those data bases to plug into the equation.

Now, the equation for groundwater intake assumes generally certain standard assumptions. We assign a standard body weight for an adult, we take a standard lifetime of 70 years for a 70 kilogram adult who drinks two liters per day

every day for 350 days of those years, allowing two weeks off for vacation somewhere else for that 70-year lifetime. For cancer-causing substances, it's calculated over a -- I think it's a 30-year averaging period. For non-cancer substances, a 25-year period. So, those are all put together into an equation, then you crunch the numbers and out comes the answer at the And it would be -- For the -- The end. cancer-causing substances is expressed as a probability -- and these are very, very low numbers usually in scientific notation. times 10 to the minus six is the common threshold as being ways acceptable versus not acceptable. There's a range of values. Ten to the minus four to 10 to the minus six.

1.

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

1.6

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The drinking water standards that all public water supplies have to sample for commonly are looking at that same kind of number that is expressed as a concentration. So, for something such as -- let me think of one -- trichloroethylene, a common solvent that's been used to strip paint from airplanes -- the maximum contaminant level for that kind of contaminant is typically .005 milligrams per

liter. That's almost -- That's the sensitivity of detection of the analytical equipment. So, it indicates to you that that's a fairly low number if we can't -- if we can barely detect it with our instrumentation.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

There are other substances -- non-cancer ones -- that can go up to milligrams per liter before there's some health effect predicted if it were to have been consumed by a human under those standardized assumptions. So, remember, that's a long time to be drinking that same source of water. So, in reality, if you were to do a site specific risk assessment, you would actually measure -- well, just how much water does a person actually tend to drink from that source? And if you came here tonight and you had a Coke out of the machine or some of the punch that was served, that's not the same water that would be from the well at a particular person's residence. So, that original assumption, then, is not valid anymore. So, you have to figure out, well, just how much is actually being consumed and put that value into the standardized equation.

You wanted to know about the updating to

the process. EPA and other research bodies are continually testing new chemicals not previously tested or doing additional tests on problematic ones to improve the data base of toxicity information. Plus, the basic science of risk assessment is also evolving. And our risk reduction rules -- We committed the agency to do periodic reviews of these types of changes and revise our prescribed procedures accordingly when those changes are accepted by the scientific community.

1.4

1.5

MR. SANCHEZ: Mr. Lewis, also
you -- we might want to explain that the risk
management of that particular hazard is actually
that same process in reverse -- going back -you know, when you get that one -- one to the 10
minus six and you try to get to that standard,
you essentially -- more or less -- in general -follow that process in reverse to get to that
level.

MR. LEWIS: That's correct. You could ask the question this way: Well, if the substance in my well is at a concentration of 100 units, what is the risk? And you can crunch through the numbers and come up with a numerical

risk. You can then say, "Well, is this an acceptable risk or not?" And you compare it to some standard -- and, as I said, 10 to minus six -- or that's a .000001 -- as a probability. You know, you wouldn't want to try to win a lottery ticket with that number. But that would be a common threshold to compare it to.

You can then reverse the question and say,
"Well, if that is the acceptable level of risk,
what does that translate into in terms of the
concentration?" And you go through through the
equation again -- this time turned around -and you might come up with 50 units as the
corresponding acceptable concentration and
compare it to -- you say, "Ah. Well, I see
originally the well had 100. The acceptable
number is 50, therefore, some type of corrective
action must be performed." So, that cleanup
number basically would then become 50 -- and
that's the objective of the cleanup. Any other
questions?

MR. HAGELTHORN: Mr. Lewis, thank you for your presentation. We appreciate it from the Board.

Let's just go ahead and summarize some of

the things we've done and then we'll go ahead and decide on a date and time and our location of the next RAB meeting. In summary, we approved the March 6th minutes with changes. We approved the membership application of Mr. Smith who is now a member of the Board. We've deferred the revised application for the RAB and we referred the revised RAB charter until the subcommittee can review that and provide their input. As of right now, there is no public meeting scheduled. We should find out about that shortly and we'll have -- we'll schedule the public meeting for approximately two weeks into the public comment period and more information will come out on that.

1.5

The RAB newsletter has been deferred until the committee can come up with a decision of how they want to approach that and they should have information to us next month at our next RAB meeting. And we've tabled the visual aids issue until the next RAB -- the next RAB meeting. Anybody who has any input on that, please provide it to the next RAB -- either bring it to the RAB or provide it to the Air Force or to myself before that meeting.

Mr. Paul Lewis with the TNRCC provided us with a presentation -- a very good presentation. And -- Let's see. Other action items we have -- the Air Force will research the FAR's on the claims office and the -- the -- define the responsibility of the Air Force to provide information to the RAB with regard to spills here on Kelly. We'll also get a letter to Ms. Rubia to -- asking her to attend the next meeting or, otherwise, we'll rescind the -- her membership application.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

There's an invitation by Mike Estrada for any member of the RAB that wants to go with him, meet with the editors and news directors of local media. So, if anybody has that interest, be sure to get a hold of Mike. Other public relations-type things is the Earth Day on the 23rd, which is Saturday -- the 22nd, which is Saturday at San Pedro Park. There's a sign-up sheet over there for RAB members. I'd encourage all members to participate to the maximum extent possible. And -- Let's see here. We also decided that the RAB members would receive the Internet newsletter from Public Affairs -- and that will be a very worthwhile tool.

KIM TINDALL & ASSOCIATES, INC.
7800 IH-10 WEST, SUITE 100, SAN ANTONIO, TX 78230
(210) 377-3027 1-800-969-3027 FAX (210) 344-6016

2.5

The last thing we need to discuss is the next RAB meeting -- looking at approximately eight weeks away from today's date which would put it around the 12th of July -- or 12th of June time frame which is a Monday. There's been two locations discussed, the Knights of Columbus hall which is just south of Lackland Air Force and to keep it here at the Fire Academy. Do we have any input on the dates -- Let's go with the dates first and then we'll worry about location. Any other input besides the 12th of June for the next RAB meeting?

(Vote by the RAB members.)

MR. HAGELTHORN: Okay. Any opposed to the 12th of June for the next RAB meeting?

(Vote by the RAB members.)

MR. HAGELTHORN: Let's go ahead and schedule it as the 12th of June -- Monday the 12th of June. And the next question is:

Shall we hold it at a new location? At the Knights of Columbus which is south of Lackland or keep it here? My personal opinion is I would like to see the RAB move around a little bit.

Other opinions from the RAB?

MR. SANCHEZ: I concur. I think
we ought to have at -- at that -- either the
northern part of Kelly Field -- and give it as
much -- give the citizens as much access to
these meetings as possible.

MR. HAGELTHORN: So, we'll look
at the Knights of Columbus hall, if that's

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

1.4

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

at the Knights of Columbus hall, if that's available for us on the 12th of June. We'll get information out on that. The only thing that I would -- as a community co-chairman, I like to throw out is, I'd like everybody to go ahead and review the charter again, what the purpose of the RAB is. It's my opinion we've gone through five RABs -- six RABs now -- and we really haven't gotten into any any restoration activities because we're dealing with legalistic aspects of how a newsletter should be written. If our purpose is to provide information to the community, we really need to stay with the focus of the Restoration Advisory Board. And I'd like everybody to review the function and the purpose of the RAB, so when we come to the next meeting we have the proper perspective of what we are supposed to be accomplishing here. Any other comments from anybody? The meeting is

```
adjourned. It's 8:31. Thank you. Thank you,
 1
 2
            audience, for attending.
 3
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

KIM TINDALL & ASSOCIATES, INC.
7800 IH-10 WEST, SUITE 100, SAN ANTONIO, TX 78230
(210) 377-3027 1-800-969-3027 FAX (210) 344-6016

1	STATE OF TEXAS *
2	COUNTY OF BEXAR *
3	I, JULIE A. SEAL, a Certified
4	Shorthand Reporter in and for the State of
5	Texas, do hereby certify that the above and
6	foregoing contain a true and correct
7	transcription of all proceedings, all of which
8	occurred and were reported by me.
9	witness my hand, this the day
10	of, A.D. 1995.
11	
12	
13	Cert. No. 5160 \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\
14	JULIE A. SEAL Expires: Dec. '95 Certified Shorthand Reporter
15	in and for (210) 377-3027 the State of Texas
16	(210) 37/-302/ the State of Texas
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
	<u> </u>

FINAL PAGE

ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD

FINAL PAGE