



KELLY AFB
TEXAS

ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD
COVER SHEET

AR File Number 3353.10

**Restoration Advisory Board
Meeting
January 30, 1995**

Transcript

CAUTION: This document was transcribed from two separate recordings by secretarial staff who were not present at the meeting. The recorders were unable to pick up every comment clearly. At times, the multitude of voices made it impossible to find and transcribe the words of the person who had the floor. Despite review by staff, it is an imperfect and incomplete document. It is presented for use only to refresh memories of board members on areas discussed. Refer to the minutes as the official record of the January 30, 1995 RAB meeting.

Transcript of 30 Jan 95 RAB Meeting.
(Some portions missing when tape is being changed)

(Opening by Allan Hagelthorn already begun...)

Allan Hagelthorn: One of the first things we're gonna talk about this evening, and we'll get into that a little bit later, is which direction the community would like the restoration advisory board to go. What does the community want from us, how do they want us to work with the Air Force, what role should we take in ensuring that their concerns are met in our dealings with Kelly Air Force Base. So we'll give some time to let them mull it over in their minds a little bit. After Mr. Trevino's presentation, we'll bring that up for discussion.

Mr. Bailey, the other co-chairman, is out of town. He's in Washington, if I remember correctly, and he'll be back next week. There is something that we were planning on discussing tonight that we are going to have to delay because of Mr. Bailey's, uh, sudden absence, is membership on the RAB. We were going to discuss some additional details and we have some additional members who have applied to the RAB. It was my belief, and I passed this on to Mr. Bailey, that I felt that he should be here when we act upon those membership applications. I would like to have the Air Force co-chair here for that.

Armando Quintanilla: Do we have an agenda?

Richard Trevino: Yes, there was an agenda and unfortunately I forgot it. The agenda is going to be very important today, as Mr. Hagelthorn has indicated. There's not going to be a lot of presentations from our standpoint. Today is really for us to listen and get feedback from the RAB and from the community on how well we've basically pumped the information into you over the past few months -- how well have we done, what haven't we done, and so forth. There's a couple of things I'd like to pass out to the public and to the members of the Board. The first thing is: we're going to be tape recording tonight's session for verbatim minutes so they will have those available and all the questions and issues will be recorded for that. If anybody has a problem with that, please raise your hand and during that time we will turn off the recorder for you.(radio transmission).....
There was an agenda and unfortunately I forgot that back at the office, so we're trying to get that. But the agenda...it's a small agenda. The agenda, it's very informal today just as Mr. Hagelthorn has indicated. There's not going to be a lot of presentations from our standpoint. The intent for today is really for us to listen and get feedback from the RAB and the community on how well we basically come across in getting the information to you in the last three or four months and want to make sure that we do it in an effective manner or not do it in an effective manner. If we accomplish our goal (what we're accomplishing, not accomplishing) that's the intent, that's the whole focus of this particular session going on today with some minor administrative details.

I take it we're going to be talking about, from my standpoint, what I'm handing out here, is just some information that was requested back at the RAB workshop and also some additional information from an administrative standpoint and there will be extras for the

public in back, and we'll make them available. There's about, there's four things out here. The first one is just a listing of treatability studies that we did out here at Kelly Air Force Base. When we say treatability studies they're the technologies that we have tried. Some have worked, some have not. Here at Kelly AFB we need to clean up the soil or the groundwater. It was requested that we provide information like this as a handout at this RAB session so we have done that. The next one is: we have initially or briefly talked about EPA 17 which is one of our pollution prevention initiatives. It's a very aggressive program. There are some slides that we were asked to present and what it is that it basically just shows an Air Force goal to reduce our chemical usage by calendar year 1996 and basically because of our aggressive efforts we've already achieved that back in 1994. So this just goes through a history of what the goal is and also indicates what EPA 17 actually is. It's just a list of 17 chemicals and it gives you a breakdown of the current use in baseline 1992 and what was actually consumed in 1994. And as you can see from that standpoint, that there was a substantial reduction.

The last two things are more administrative and submitted more for the general public to use is just the meeting minutes from December 12 - the English version and a Spanish version. The last two things that I have - if you'll bear with me here - is what we wanted to do is just to remind everybody is that when we talked at the last RAB meeting that we were going to have the public hearings for the groundwater FS for Zones 1, 2, 3, and that's still going to take place. The FSs are the feasibility studies that will determine our preferred alternative or the recommended alternative for cleanup of groundwater for Zones 1, 2, 3. Again, Zone 1 is the golf course, Zone 2 is the Jet Engine Test Cells, and Zone 3 is the current maintenance complex, Quintana Road area, so from that standpoint those will go out in the latter...again those hearings will be taking place...the earliest will be the last part in February or the first part in March, so I wanted just to give you a friendly reminder that we'll have more updates as that comes up, but that's just again to remind you that those those public hearings will happen. So that as part of the public hearing process having inputs from the RAB will be very critical because we want your feedback on those preferred alternatives. So that's just more an administrative function to let you know that those will be coming up and that we will provide additional feedback when that comes closer to the time. The last aspect is when we have our next RAB meeting and then prior to the end of March we will need to have the RAB consensus and a concurrence from all the relative risk ratings. We did that initially last month. We went through an exercise where we basically listed all the sites that had a rating attached to it so from our standpoint by the end of March so we can give that to our counterparts or our hierarchy in the command structure within the Air Force we'll have to have RAB concurrence. So what we will be doing by no later than the end of March timeframe is getting back with yourselves for additional look at that... we'll get back for concurrence of those ratings. Again, the rating is just a high, medium, or low. So at that point we will looking at that for at least in the March timeframe. So those are things to mark it off of your calendar that are administrative things but it's your input that's required before we can take the next step. Are there any questions? Yes, sir.

George Rice: I had something I wanted to brief and maybe this isn't the time, but it has to do with your use of proprietary models through groundwater studies. I don't know maybe you want to get into this later on rather than right now....

Richard Trevino: I can answer that right now. From a modeling standpoint that the question, basically, is usually when we utilize the models to come up with decision-making practices, what we can do, what I had recommended, or what we're going to recommend to you is that -- and this is for not just yourself, but also the entire RAB members -- is that any type of model that we view we'd be more than happy to have you come in, we'll be more that happy to bring the contractors down. We've done this with our regulatory folks where we actually sit down with yourselves and everyone here to go through the model that we did, the Assumptions that we used, and the data that we utilized so that in order for someone to use that model, they would have to have five years worth of the data that we've already generated. So it's easier for us to bring yourselves in, bring the contractor down and after our questions, you can answer them at that point in time. Would that be helpful?

George Rice: Yeah, I think that that would be a big step in the right direction and I'm thinking of something a little further. For the folks who may not be familiar with models, Kelly AFB hires contractors to model groundwater flow and they use the results of those models to make decisions. In a couple of instances when I've asked for information, Kelly employees have told me that the contractors are using so-called proprietary models and they won't even allow the Air Force access to assemble the model. And what they're in effect saying is 'you have to take our word for it that these solutions that we are presenting to you are correct because we're not going to allow you access to the code that we actually use because that's a trade secret.' So what another part of my question is, is are you addressing that what I see is a problem and will you continue to allow contractors to use proprietary models?

Richard Trevino: To answer the best that I can from that standpoint, the models that we do have with the contractors... They are the technical experts but we do question them from the standpoint we have to ensure as an investment to the Air Force and also to the general public that whatever information they provide to us is in fact correct, valid and technically correct. Proprietary from the standpoint that there are some instances where information is proprietary to even from the Air Force if it's a contractor's specific stuff that we have that's within the Air Force there are some ways that we can get that if it's for a specific product. To say specifically, what is and what's not, I can't answer that right now, but we can discuss that at a later date.

Allan Hagelthorn: Richard, correct me if I'm wrong, before any contractor's awarded a contract using these groundwater studies or any other site remediation so it's technologies or techniques that are used to model things to be delegated by the Air Force senator Bryan _____. That's why they have that right to...they have proprietor..._____ in state proprietary responsibility over their models. It's been validated by the Air Force; therefore, the Air Force and EPA have agreed that it's a valid study and therefore they're allowed to use that.

George Rice: I understand that, but it still leaves the very real fact that as often as not, the contractor will claim proprietary privileges in order to cover up what may or may not be pro work and I think that that's the issue here. If we are going to have confidence in the work that contractors do, we cannot allow contractors, in my opinion, to say 'sorry, we

will not show you how we did this because that's a trade secret.' That's my position..(unintelligible-people interrupting)

Armando Quintanilla: They're doing that. That's a little arrogant. That's just like saying that the minority contractors with a _____ if they're _____. The subcontractor they have that information because it's proprietary rights. I agree with your points.

Capt Van Dran: But let me interject one thing. I recognize what you're talking about with respect to certain proprietary models that have been purported to be proprietary models. However, we're not just taking everything at face value. We have other contract effort on the way through another contractor to independently validate and conduct their own independent models - as a method we've been using is a check and balance for our system. We're not just relying on one contractor to model this for us. We have another program, another contract that has been presented to you here. Basewide remedial assessment and under that we're doing entire basewide modeling and that is being done under Flowpath. And it's not a proprietary model. That information will be available later on this year, so we're not just accepting it at face value. We have gotten some checks and balances built into our system. So, if we show large disparities between what was presented by another contractor in the results of our upcoming model then yes, we will readdress those.

George Rice: If I just may make a final point is that I don't want to beat this horse...OIt's on three legs I don't want to beat it to death, but ...that's all it is. What I would like to do is because as part of my work, I love these models and part of my question, and the reason I ask it is I want to as a member of the public and a member of the RAB, I'll get a hold of these problems to come to my own assessment as to whether or not the contractors have the work properly. As long as you have contractors refusing public access to those models, then I can't do that.

Richard Trevino: And that's part of the recommendation will come back is that we'll be more than happy to cover and more than willing to do that and to better assess and ascertain our standpoint...just those questions and that's why we recommend that we open this up to every RAB member here to bring the contractors down here and all the concerns you may have and lay them on the table who we get _____ by. If there's a valid concern there that they have overlooked, with your expertise we can find it.

Unknown voice: Hopefully we would have the input parameters. We'll probably have departures of...we'll probably have access to the input parameters if you want to plug it in to other models and just to see if you come up with the same answers...to correct the data.

Richard Trevino: And a lot of the input parameters that you will see will be in the feasibility study report that you will be given here during the public hearings. So does that answer your question?

George Rice: Well it answers the question, not really the answer I hoped to hear, but it's an answer.

Allan Hagelthorn: There are some limitations that we just have to deal with. There are enough checks and balances in the system with all the particular regulatory agencies that

overseeing the remediation efforts, but it's just one of those things that we have to deal with.

George Rice: No, I understand that many people with these models are still reported to have an open process - they ought to give the information to the public

Armando Quintanilla: Especially \$98 million been expended so far and how effective were those \$98 million expended.

Richard Trevino: What we'll do is we will recommend that if we ___ a tax ___ for the RAB members you want to give us a time as ...or if you want us to write when time is suitable to get everybody together and reconvene.

Armando Quintanilla: Next weekend would be perfect.

Richard Trevino: If we could do that as an item, cause it will take more than just one or two hours to go through this. That's what I'm saying.

Armando Quintanilla: So we won't have a meeting this Friday. Well this ain't important enough, \$98 million has been expended - how will those \$98 million will be expended.

Richard Trevino: The thing is not all this involves the modeling portion; the modeling is a very small money portion of that. But we can sit down with you all and we can go through that model if that'll make things better.

Tom Teague: Could you restate the issue you are going to deal with?

Richard Trevino: What we're going to do -- the request is proprietary of the use of modeling in terms to our Center program -- what we're going back and do is recommend to the RAB a time, a date that we will reconvene and have the contractor come down and basically do nothing but look at these models and go through them in more detail. Is that acceptable?

George Rice: Well, Richard, I think that's good, but I don't want to mislead you to think that that will satisfy me because what I want is I want the information in the models they use so that I can run them. That's what I want.

Richard Trevino: OK, if we can agree to take that first step, I'll work with you. OK? Thank you. Anything else?

Armando Quintanilla: Something else for the agenda for today, you all told me that you were going to talk about the rights of capture of the ground water for the people who live in South San and that is even being drawn out by Kelly AFB. You know, who has the right to that water that's being taken out from underneath those people's homes that you're drawing out from the wells. And that was part of the agenda that I saw. The other part of the agenda that I saw was minority contracting - we were supposed to talk about that, and where there's going to be any damage to these homes here in the South San area as a result of you drawing that water out, well it's going to cause the foundations to sink -- those answers are supposed to be given at this meeting today.

Richard Trevino: That's off my recording...

Armando Quintanilla: You know, those three items of the capture of the groundwater, the foundations, the minority contracting that you were going to tell us who they were or giving us some personal information, and I have one more additional point that has been brought to my attention. There was a fire on East Kelly - do you want to talk about that - a about the fire - did any of that ground water seep into the sewage or Six-Mile Creek or anything like that?

Richard Trevino: My knowledge on that is some of it is lacking somewhat in details. All I can tell you is that none of the water went through groundwater to the suburb. It was all contained on the surface and was treated and stored accordingly. So from that standpoint, I can sday that. What we can do is ... We're pretty sure that the water was captured.

Armando Quintanilla: I've heard a little different - this is the reason I want to verify it.

Richard Trevino: We can get those specifics for you...I'll be honest, I'm not up on that tonight.

Armando Quintanilla: We need the information.

Richard Trevino: We can do that.

Getting back to my administrative things. Again, quick reminder is the Public Hearing will be taking place. We will have those definitely by worst case the first part of March, so we will be looking at your input from that standpoint. Again the end of March - Relative Risk. We'll be looking at your concurrence on the ratings from each site here on base that was rated. So, from that standpoint that's what we ...that's what we ..there're two main things to get our process going from an administrative standpoint.

Armando Quintanilla: I have one more question that needs to be answered, perhaps at the next meeting. If I want to sell my property there in South San, do I need a special environmental certificate saying that the ground is OK to sell? And if I want to buy, must one be provided to me?... just, you know that that area is contaminated?

Richard Trevino: Anything else?

Yolanda Johnson: Did you answer him?

Richard Trevino: He asked that we get back with him on that.

Yolanda Johnson: Get back to him? I remember when Mr Dale Johnson was here.

Richard Trevino: Right.

Yolanda Johnson: ...And he had something similar to that.

Richard Trevino: Correct. From my standpoint, I've yielded to Mr Hagelthorn, and I guess the next portion will be to ask a lot of questions like to see how well we are doing our job, or we're not doing our job for that matter, and this is for us to sit and listen and find ways to do it to make it better. That's the intent. Thank you.....

Allan Hagelthorn: One thing I'd like to bring up in answer to Ms. Anthony's question. I think there was a very good question about the legal responsibilities and legal aspects. Richard. You guys could work for the next meeting -- work it with Mr. Bailey. You may not be able to do it in the March meeting, then maybe the following meeting. To have an attorney either from the legal office or the Air Force Center for Environmental Excellence, to give a briefing on legal responsibilities and legal actions that the community is entitled to under IRP and CERLA. I think that would help out and answer a lot of those questions and you'd get it firsthand from the legal community instead of passing it back and forth.

Armando Quintanilla: And we also do want answers to the minority contracting, the captured groundwater--if it's my ability to sell my property that I had in the South San or to buy additional property. Do I need an environmental certificate ...

Allan Hagelthorn: OK. I would like to address the minority issue. What are you actually asking, sir?

Armando Quintanilla: I want to know when are they going to have a minority contract? They showed me eight contracts. There's four contractors for architect and design (A&E) engineering. None of those are minority. They're the same...they pass those contracts to each one every time--a different for every different design, whatever it is that comes out.

Allan Hagelthorn: I would like to refocus on what the purpose of the restoration advisory board is. We're here to advise the Air Force, to provide our input to the remediation activities. We're not here to act as a contracting source or provide any information in regards to contracting. That shouldn't be our responsibility as a board. It should never enter into our responsibilities.

Armando Quintanilla: I'm looking at this for personal reasons as a taxpayer...

(Unintelligible, both talking at the same time.)

Allan Hagelthorn: Then what I would like to say is...

Armando Quintanilla: The population here in San Antonio is 60 percent or better Hispanic. The population here in South San is over that amount. How come a minority contractor or subcontractor has not come out to do some of that work out of \$98 million?

(Unintelligible, both talking at the same time.)

Allan Hagelthorn: I cannot answer that question, and what I'm trying to say is that there are other avenues to pursue that information. I do not think that the RAB is the avenue to present that. OK, our purpose is to look at remediation activities, solely looking at remediation. That's it.

Armando Quintanilla: We're looking at remediation or restoration of the property as it was before and \$98 million. And how is it being done? And by who is it being done? This question about the...

(Unintelligible, both talking at the same time.)

Allan Hagelthorn: 'Who' shouldn't be an issue for us. How it is done should be an issue for the RAB. And I'd like to ask, go ahead and bring that up to the members here.

Armando Quintanilla: I want to bring this up to some of the people that are here. Is it an issue or isn't it an issue?

Allan Hagelthorn: I would just like to bring it up to the Board to find out which direction they would like to go as a Board -- if we should discuss contracting and who's awarded the contracts under this activity.

George Rice: My opinion is that, and what I thought this was, was a place to understand community concerns. And if contracting is a community concern, then I think this is an appropriate place for addressing it.

Richard Trevino: OK. Any other input?

Tom Moore: Well, I know the military when they solicit the contracts, they take small businesses, minority businesses, and everybody into consideration when going out for a contract. Possibly because I don't deal directly with these contracts here because I'm on a different part of the installation, we have legal requirements that contracting officers must follow and probably one of the most stringent requirements are on military installations because we're using federal funds. They've got strict guidelines and I'm sure they've got to be following them. If the minority or a small business contractor is not capable of fulfilling the scope -- see also when the contractor goes out or our contracting officers solicit for bid for contract, they look for the primary contractor. If he subcontracts then we have absolutely zero authority to tell him who to use as a subcontractor. So probably what's happening here is because of the scope of the work that's involved in a restoration project, possibly either the minority or small businesses do not have the capabilities to fulfill the contractual requirements that they're asking for. That can be a large possibility why you don't see one.

Armando Quintanilla: That's the reason for bringing up the question. You're bringing in contractors from San Diego, California. There are contractors right here in San Antonio that are contractors -- minority contractors. In New Mexico and in other places and they do this. How come they weren't invited to participate or how come notified of this?

Allan Hagelthorn: Everybody is invited to participate. When a contract was let out, it's let out in the Business Daily -- it's there for everybody to bid on the contract. It's not the Air Force's responsibility to go and address small businesses and say, "Do you want to?" They publish it (an announcement) in the Federal Register and the Business Daily of all contracts they're going to be letting out. That's a matter of law.

Armando Quintanilla: And that's possibly alright. They've expended \$98 million in the last.. since...1987?

Richard Trevino: 1983.

Armando Quintanilla: \$98 million have been expended. Not one single dollar that we know of has gone to a minority contractor. Or a subcontractor. I can't get that information. Maybe it has. That's all I want to know.

Bill Sain: I happen to be working in contracting at Kelly and I'm not familiar with these specific contracts at all, but I do know that there are a lot of regulations that you were saying that we have to follow to try and get as many contracts awarded to small minority businesses. I'm not sure who actually submitted proposals, who make these contracts, and all that information. May or may not need to get a copy of the contract that was drawn out but as far as the subcontracting - when somebody submits a proposal they have to sign a subcontracting plan to tell how they're going to go about awarding subcontracts to minority and small businesses.

TAPE ENDED

Allan Hagelthorn: It should not be up to us to decide where that money's going. If the community decides that you want that placed in number one priority, we should put that as our number one priority. We should not be concerned with it. It's up to the Department of Defense - it prioritizes based on budgets and money available - what sites are allowed the priority and they're able to come up with funds. Does anybody have any input on that?

Armando Quintanilla: Number one, I think, should be the main course - the groundwater is the main course.

Raul Villar (from audience): That's the real issue here - contamination. ***(THIS IS HARD TO HEAR)*** ... in San Antonio... I'm retired ... here in Kelly, they have... technology there ... I went over there to check on valves... I check on them barrels, all that dirt they were bringing out of there.. ***(PIECES MISSING)***

Allan Hagelthorn: OK... Let me tell you what they talk about there. Any time that they do any soil borings. At any time they're doing any site investigation where they have to bore in to the earth, they treat that soil as if it's contaminated soil - whether it is or not - they don't know - it is treated as contaminated soil because they're doing a site investigation, they're going in to find out if there is a hazard there. OK? So they don't want to pull the soil up in the bore and just leave it laying around. They've got to treat it, take care of it and treat it as if it is contaminated.

(Victoria Wark's voice)

Allan Hagelthorn: OK... Let me ..I've got the expert here that deals with those two different sites that are out there. And it's two different activities that are going on and she might be able to let you know what is happening...why it is happening.

Victoria Wark: My name is Victoria Wark and I've been working on the radio frequency soil decontamination demonstration which is the technologies that you were talking about. It was initially done out at that site, and we had two activities going on at that site. The first one was an activity that the Department of Energy and EPA and several different contractors trying to find a new way to decontaminate soil using radio frequency energy. And we had two different demonstrations of two different contractors out there so we could look at the results and compare the results. And EPA also looked at those results. Well, the the technology worked out there maybe not as well as we want it to work, but it was only demonstrated on a very small plot of land - we're talking about 10 feet x 15 feet x 20 feet deep. So this was not anything that was meant to go and clean up that site. This was a demonstration to see if this technology would work to clean up the entire site, basically. And we had input from lots of different people as far as funding this and because we have to do treatability studies to see what works the best on Kelly sites to clean up the Kelly sites. As part of the overall cleanup of that site, Site S-1 is what we call it, next to the fuel storage tanks. Mike Patterson's out in the audience. He's the project manager on that project. That is a groundwater containment project and interim remedial action is what we go out to do right away to clean up groundwater as soon as we know that there's a problem out there. So that was not associated with the soil. The radio frequency was to clean up was just the soil. What you see going on right now - the wells that are being drilled - those are going to be groundwater extraction wells that'll pull the groundwater out of the ground so it can be treated. So they're two entirely different projects. I just wanted to clear that up.

(man is speaking-unable to hear what he's saying)

Allan Hagelthorn: Anytime you have any question about what the technology is being used out there - if you have a concern about how it's being handled, give the office a call, they'll take you out there, they'll show you what's going on. They're not going to hide any information. They'll give you first hand tour of the site and show you what's going on.

Yolanda Johnson: Sir, it says these new wells are going to catch the contaminated shallow underground water at the base and this is known as Site S-1 and the area was impacted by leaks, and spills and waste and petroleum and cleaning solvents from the early 1960s and 70s to 73 so she says that nothing was drawn up while they were making this test. I want to know, you say they're testing to see if it's contaminated. These solvents, this contamination has been there since 1960. How much of it is still left there?

Richard Trevino: Yes, as part of the workshop we went into detail on where we are. That's in Zone 5. In terms of IRP issues that portion is in what we consider the remedial investigation stage which is still the study stage--where it goes out there and it looks at answering just that very question. How bad is the problem and is this problem considered bad enough where we need to go and do something really quick. And before we complete that, what we decided to do is go out there and do something to prevent it from going off the base any further, so the construction that you see out there is that to prevent it from going off the base anymore. I can't take back yet whatever's out there, because I haven't fully assessed what the problem is, but I can prevent anything future from going out there. Just like we've done along Quintana Road, along this other part, apart for the base. So

we've done the same thing there. Instead of waiting until we get to the final cleanup we're going out there right now and we're putting something in the ground. That's the fundamental question. When the study is complete, we will be able to answer that question with a high degree of certainty that says we know exactly what's in the water, we know exactly where it is and where it's going. And that's part of the entire cleanup process. When I've said down here, back when we were explaining the process, is that we have to follow a procedure to identify just that. Is it a problem, and how bad is the problem? And then the next step is to decide what we have to do to clean it up. To answer your question, we're doing that by doing what we considered a Phase II, which is the remedial investigation. We're not going to wait until that it's done; that's why you see the construction going on. This one is focused on the shallow groundwater, while the demonstration was focused on the soil. Two separate things both relate together in terms of the overall cleanup, but the technologies address two separate issues. Because the soil will have one treatment process done to it, while the groundwater will have something different. So that's what we're trying to do.

Richard Hirsch: So what you're saying on this thing the lady's talking about is that you have been able to determine a point where the contamination has not gone beyond anyway otherwise you wouldn't be here. In my mind, it stands to reason, you wouldn't put a barrier there if you didn't know, you follow what I'm saying?

Richard Trevino: Right.

Richard Hirsch: I know it's gone out so far because you have your wells that you can draw all the water out and you check the water, you check whatever.

Richard Trevino: Yes.

Unknown voice: Where you're putting those barriers at, at that point, you know that there is not contamination between the place and there. And that is being put in there to stop it.

Richard Trevino: No, No. Where we're putting the actual barrier is at the base boundary to prevent it from going further. We know that it's off the base already.

Richard Hirsch: You're just trying to keep whatever's left on base on the base?

Richard Trevino: Exactly. Correct. As a real quick measure. Because this...what we try to do is like what Mr. Quintanilla's talking about in terms of funding, we don't want to spend money twice for the same cleanup, so what we try to do...Following the regulatory laws that says you have to do an RI, or a study, determine what your cleanup action is and then you design it, then you do it. That's a long drawn-out process of several years. So we don't wait for that to happen. The laws allow us to take a quick response action, to go out there and do something right now. That's what we're doing. To prevent any further shallow groundwater from going off the base.

Yolanda Johnson: Have these wells on the outside of the fence been tested this year yet?

Richard Trevino: Yes, ma'am. We have had people go out there and we have them tested.

Yolanda Johnson: Well I haven't seen anyone out there. What I was seeing is that they were putting them in drums and carrying them off. I thought they were just moving that micro thing that we have they're just moving it out of that area or what. Are they moving it out of there?

Richard Trevino: No, it's been moved out for quite a while. The drums that you see...

Yolanda Johnson: They're working on the open site that used to be there?

Richard Trevino: Right, we're working on the groundwater, the shallow groundwater now and the drums that you see, as Mr. Hagelthorn has stated, is just by law we have to containerize and put the soils in a drum, and we're required to do that until we find out 'Is it hazardous, is it nonhazardous, what is it?' And we have to basically take that based upon the samples that we get to see what kind of chemicals are in there and what levels. That will tell us how we can dispose of that. If that soil is clean, then we can basically use it as regular backfill.

Armando Quintanilla: The area you're talking about is the Growden Road area, near Gen. McMullen?

Richard Trevino: Yes, sir. That's correct. Off of 36th Street Gate, in that area... So that is part of the Zone 5 investigation. As part of the workshop we went down through those areas, we briefed the results and stuff so as the RAB continues a lot of those results for Zone 5 in particular and let's say that particular site will become available. Right now, we're in the preliminary stages of the study so instead of waiting, we get the interim action.

Another man: Mr. Trevino, I was going you...this... going on right now ... is there any effect ... city project? **(HARD TO HEAR BECAUSE OF BACKGROUND TALK)**

Richard Trevino: I'm sorry, I didn't catch that...In which project? Is that the drainage ditch project that you're talking about?

Yolanda Johnson: Right.

Richard Trevino: I'm not unaware of one, I mean, we can find out from that standpoint, but I was unaware that there is a drainage project off McMullen...

Yolanda Johnson: It's been going on for about a month and a half.

Richard Trevino: OK. Where does it ...

Yolanda Johnson: On...starting from Growden Road all the way down to Cupples... **(Two people talking quietly while other people talking out loud—unintelligible)** ...No this is on the north side of the base.

Frank Vega, COSA: It's been going on for several years, it started out near the side of Cupples Road, across the railroad tracks. It's been all the way over there. _____ right up there at 36th and Growden. That is being coordinated. There will be the engineers _____ the contracts, but before they do any work there, it will be coordinated with Kelly Field to ensure that they know ___other work that is going on___.

Yolanda Johnson: Are you a ...

Frank Vega, COSA: I'm with the City of San Antonio.

Yolanda Johnson: City of San Antonio... Also, I hate to be doing this to you all, but I heard that there is contamination about 200 feet behind this elementary school and I don't know what it is; I just heard it about three days ago from one of the people that lives in the neighborhood and from somebody that works in the base. So I was wondering was...this contamination from the drums that are being hauled out from our site there on Growden and Barney and taken...I don't know where they're taking them. I can't see that far. I just wondered that.

Richard Trevino: Yes. The drums themselves are taken by another contractor. Our contract has the contractor dispose of the waste. Right now it's probably just in the storage area if it's...*(Someone is talking at the same time)*

Another person?: Correct. It's on base right now. Right.

Richard Trevino: (Continuing to talk) on base until the determination of what hazard that soil may contain. Then if it's hazardous, then it will be disposed of in accordance with the law. If it's not hazardous then it's used backfill. But right now it's just in storage here on base. And from some point of the drums that you're seeing, not knowing too much specifics on the contamination behind Winston Elementary, the project from S-1 would not go that route. Because what we're required to do, you know, by law and I'll look to my regulatory counterparts. We had to take as short a path as possible *(with the waste according to guidance)* from the Department of Transportation. We just can't go on public access roads. The northwest 36th Street gate is open right there, so there's really no reason for us to drive all the way down towards Winston Elementary when we can just drive an extra 200 feet and go into 36th Street gate. That's the path that we take and when we're talking soil borings, then we're talking probably a third or half of a 55-gallon drum which -- because of the shallow groundwater -- we don't suspect that the soil is contaminated because it's not a soil problem. That's a shallow groundwater problem. So if there's any kind of problem it would be at the lower depths. Most of that soil that we're looking at is relatively clean. So I don't see there being a relationship, but if you want to talk to us in greater detail we'd be more than happy to sit down with you, just to verify it. We'd be more than happy to do that because that is close to home from our standpoint.

Another man: Has this question been asked? Have any test wells been drawn around Winston Elementary school?

Richard Trevino: No, sir.

Another man: Out by Kelly, that you're aware of?

Richard Trevino: That's correct... And part of it is because we've had no reason to. We have nothing, based on our current data, showing that there is a problem in that area. Now we have enough data right now that shows that there's not a problem out there.

Bill Brown: (addressing Mrs. Johnson) Excuse me, I don't know whether you got the information as passed through word of mouth...

Yolanda Johnson: It was word of mouth, sir. But it was from somebody that works on the base ...then somebody that works at the school, so I don't know. I would have to ask them...

Bill Brown: If you could get those people into direct contact -- by the time they go through two or three people it's like you don't have very much -- with the agency ...the person that knows exactly what they saw, when they saw it... I guess they'd call...

Richard Trevino: They can call myself.

Bill Brown: ...call our agency, but we probably won't be able to get around to look at all the things going on...something I could drive by to look at if I knew exactly where it was. If you talk to the person that called...the regulatory agency...in San Antonio (*It would help us to know*) whether you're talking about a drum or whether you're talking about somebody went out and dumped a quart of oil or gallon of oil. But "contamination" isn't very specific.

Someone speaking: (*IT'S HARD TO HEAR WHAT THEY'RE SAYING*)

Richard Trevino: Around Winston? Around the school itself? In that area?

Someone speaking: (*STILL DON'T UNDERSTAND WHAT THEY'RE SAYING*)

Richard Trevino: I didn't catch...what

Someone else: In your site investigation, did they find anything that would lead you to suspect there would be any contamination around the school?

Richard Trevino: No. Based upon our investigation that we've done from a preliminary assessment, record search, everything that we shelled out, we've basically taken the remaining portion of the base as part of the Zone 5 investigation and have gone out there, - - even in the base housing -- and literally sampled the entire base and there's nothing that indicates from our preliminary data that says that it's anything that will relate any impact to Winston Elementary. Because if it would show that, that would be a major (*issue*) because it directly impacts the elementary school. That's without question.

Mr. Lopez (from audience): Can you tell us how many years the groundwater has been contaminated?

Richard Trevino: It would depend on what sites you would be talking about.

Mr. Lopez (from audience): The Site S-1 ther on Growden Drive.

Richard Trevino: Again, as Ms. Johnson has indicated, that that typically would go back to all all the way to who was there back in the early 1960's. The only thing that we can go back to say is it may have happened as far back as when it was built in 1960.

Mr. Lopez: All these people have been living out

Armando Quintanilla: What does this contamination do to the property values of their homes.

Richard Trevino: I couldn't answer that, sir.

Armando Quintanilla: We need that answer, also, for the next meeting.

Allan Hagelthorn: Yes. I think when we get the attorney out here we'll discuss that. Why don't we go to an example so you can gain a little bit of a perspective. If you have a site the groundwater contamination. Perhaps, you're looking at three parts per billion. It's a site that needs to be cleaned up. What is three parts per billion. If you take the superbowl stadium this past weekend, throw three black tennis balls in there, fill it up with tennis balls, that's three parts per billion. You think you can find it? It's going to be pretty tough to find. It is a hazard--a potential hazard. It needs to be cleaned up by the law, if we have to clean it up. But a lot of what we're talking about as far as the environmental hazards and sites, a lot of it is fear - fear of the unknown. And you know if you try to put it into perspective three parts per billion is not that big of a concern. It is a concern - so don't take me wrong; I'm not saying that we're going to blow it off and not going to worry about it. But a lot of what we talk about is fear. OK? The community has a lot of fears about what is out there because they don't understand and that's the whole purpose of this RAB is to try to get the information out so you understand what is going on out there, how we're cleaning it up, and what the liability is. Mr. Quintanilla had a great idea, a good concern about looking at the legal liability and I think we should bring an attorney in here to discuss that because there are a lot of concerns that you homeowners in the area probably have about that. That's something that should be brought out and we'll do that. Hopefully for the next meeting; if not, then after that.

(IT'S HARD TO HEAR WHAT THEY'RE SAYING)

Richard Trevino: Yes, the investigation will better determine what the groundwater flow is, what the sampling shows is that portions of it is migrating off base where it's moving off base. I'd say north to northeast from that standpoint. It's in the if you look at a lot of the fact sheets that we have a lot of that information is in there, that gives a real good illustration and a good example of that data that we do have.

Yolanda Johnson: Going from Dahlgreen until Weir, from Barney. ***(IT'S HARD TO HEAR WHAT THEY'RE SAYING)*** formed like in a V-shape_____

Dick Walters: If I could step in, Mrs. Johnson's remembering the map that's in the **(focused)** feasibility study **(for Site S-1)**. And this is almost like a snake and the head of the snake is on base. Based on the preliminary sample, your high concentrations are on the base. When you get to the fenceline, you're looking at parts per million around ten and you get across the street you're in the fives and the lower levels. But we're stopping at the fence because inside the fence there are 50 parts per million or 100 parts per million in that hot spot that used to be the storage yard. And so these wells are going to cut that off. But the maps are available and this is the point I want to make. The feasibility study is in San Antonio Public Library. For those who have base access, it's in the Kelly Base Library and the maps are there and they're there for anyone to see and if you can't get to one of those places, you can call us at 925-1812 and we'll be glad to share that with you. Also, we're talking about **(contamination)** in the shallow underground water so, for instance, the city projects don't go down below the water table in most places.

Frank Vega, COSA: In most cases we do not, that is correct.

Allan Hagelthorn: OK, I'd like to go back a little bit and go over a few things that we've discussed and see if we get a consensus. The first one I'd like to do is present the minutes. Is there any corrections to the minutes that need to be made?

(IT'S HARD TO HEAR WHAT THEY'RE SAYING – Comments regarding attendance)

Richard Trevino: We'll correct that. That's why I would always - all we can go by from our standpoint is if you signed in, that's what we can go by. So, we apologize and we'll correct that, but all I can say is it would help us to give you a better product if you could please make sure that you do sign in and the roster is here so if you have not signed in (circulate that) please do so. Our quality is only as good as the input we use.

Allan Hagelthorn: OK, can we get a motion to accept the minutes with changes?

The minutes have been accepted. All in favor? I should say...

Armando Quintanilla: I'm not in favor of anything because they didn't answer my questions that I had originally.

Allan Hagelthorn: The minutes are only reflecting what the questions are that you had, not requiring the answers to your questions.

Armando Quintanilla: I requested information on which minority owned and local contractors have received environmental work...

(IT'S HARD TO HEAR)

Armando Quintanilla: I saw that, but they didn't answer my question... **(SEVERAL PERSONS SPEAKING)** OK, that's fine.

Allan Hagelthorn: All in favor? Opposed? Carried. These?...Richard? These were mailed and on January 5 they were passed out also. OK, the next thing we need to discuss is the next RAB meeting. It's been brought to our attention that the 6th of March, this facility is available. It's the first Monday in March. We can do it here again at 6 p.m. if that's convenient for everybody. Anybody have a problem with that date? Anybody else? OK. 6th of March will be the next meeting at 6 p.m. Pass on - number one reminder again on Risk Ratings that by the end of March we're going to have those kinda pushed. If you have any questions about that, give Richard a call and they'll help you out on that what you need to look and provide any support.

Richard Trevino: If I can just bring up one point, and now we talk about a lot of things that we'll be looking at for the next RAB meetings that there is no confusion from my standpoint if we could get the consolidated topics...I guess as per the charter so we don't get too much confusion is that if you have questions that you want to have presented at the next RAB is to have them go through the co-chairs and I guess that's the reason why I'm saying that is we can have ten different topics presented here that we all want to have addressed at the next RAB or subsequent RABs and we have to find some way to prioritize those because some of these things will take quite a bit of time. And from our standpoint, we want to make sure that we put our time onto your greatest needs first. And that's our concern. I want to make sure that we don't come across the situation where we're supposed to bring something and we did not. That's why it's important from our standpoint because we want to better serve this RAB and the community to be quite frank. If it is -- you know--somehow we're going have to come - I throw this out to the RAB members - how's a way to prioritize this from the standpoint that you know if you had the topics given to the co-chairs either one and they establish their agenda,
(TAPE ENDS)

(Tape resumes)

members can find a way to come to some type of agreement on what's an acceptable means to determine what is the next RAB agenda topics. I don't want to spoon feed you and I don't want to force feed this to you. I'm looking for input.

Armando Quintanilla: I thought we had that squared away at the last meeting for this meeting. We had provided it, you all had come up with an agenda on it on what we were going to discuss today. I thought we were also going to discuss the incoming or the forthcoming meeting on Zone 3 groundwater, you know, the public hearing that's going to be held.

Richard Trevino: That's correct. And that's...from that standpoint was just basically providing the briefing that we will be giving you, the formal public hearing - this is not a formal public hearing - we will be providing a formal public hearing providing notice that it will take place. This is giving you that update.

Armando Quintanilla: Is it going to be on February 17 or close about?

Richard Trevino: No, sir it'll be the latter part of February or the early part of March.

Armando Quintanilla: .. because some of the notes that you have given us said February 17.

Richard Trevino: That's correct.

Armando Quintanilla: That's February 17...

Richard Trevino: That's why..

Armando Quintanilla: A lot of us prepared for that and had studied that and I thought we were going to discuss this--the difference of sharing which is this --you know, where the Quintana Road area.

Richard Trevino: Correct, and that's why from our standpoint so we can prevent this from happening again, is that we get a consensus to where the co-chairs have the RAB topics. Again, it's one thing to present them here, but it's another thing to minimize the confusion because whenever the agenda topics come up, two weeks before the meeting takes place at a minimum we have that. And that's why if we have ten concerns, we can't do all the ten concerns if they're all requiring a high level of detail. So, that's all I am asking, if this the forum and we continue to do this then that's fine.

Armando Quintanilla: I certainly don't want to have another one like this today. You know, I want to see it more structured. You know, today, I thought, 'this is a fiasco'--the way it worked ... We didn't have an agenda, no way of going... and some of the items that I thought were going to be on the agenda that I was ready to discuss weren't on the table. I don't want to see that anymore.

Richard Trevino: That's correct. I don't want to see it either.

Armando Quintanilla: (unable to hear)...I understand that too, but again, don't put it all on the shoulders of the board, here. You know, some of it's the staff.

Richard Trevino: I'll be more than happy to do it..I'm asking for recommendations. I don't mind taking the initiative, but I don't want Kelly AFB to be looked upon that we are forcing our agenda topics onto this board. That's not what my intention is.

Unknown voice: I don't have the solution. I may not even have a partial solution, but one thing I think is very important is the topics that are decided however we decide to discuss them, the ones that are left over, we need to make sure to keep continuing with the ones that are...

Richard Trevino: Exactly. And that's what I've just gone over -- the items we still want to cover and that were on the table for actual discussion. Now the...

Unknown voice: The answer on how to figure what we talk about next ...

Allan Hagelthorn: If everybody...I just want to pass on again, if you look at the charter, you look at the way the RAB is set up, OK. And if we follow that charter, in the next two

weeks, it's the responsibility of each RAB member to get with the co-chairman and discuss with him the topics he wants to bring up. In two weeks from today's date, Mr Bailey and myself are going to get together and we're going to go over those topics and discuss which we want to bring forth to the next meeting. OK? We will let you know the reasons why we tabled the other items. OK? We're not going to blow it off and say we're not going to discuss it. Just in this last month, though, Mr Bailey's been out of town quite a bit, and I've been out of town quite a bit. And it's just one of those unforeseen circumstances that have happened that a lot of the administrative details have fallen behind. We talked about a few things that--items that we had to talk about tonight. And that was the membership and talking about the risk ratings and trying to establish what direction we want to go. We've spent an awful lot of time talking about specific items and specific details and concerns about the community and that's great, but what I would like to do is I'd like to spend some time focusing on which direction we want to go as a RAB -- what do we want to look at? As opposed to bringing each individual item in. What is the purpose? What are we looking at accomplishing here as a membership?

Armando Quintanilla: Does that mean that the questions that I have concerning the topics... that I've got to come back and talk to you about it? (unable to hear)

Allan Hagelthorn: What I would appreciate you doing...No, the minority contracting -- that one I'm going to take to table. I think we need to table that one. I don't think that's within the purview of this board and I'm going to ask Mr Trevino to set up a meeting for anybody who wants to go to that meeting with the legal department and the contracting office to try to get that information for you. I don't think--my personal opinion is I don't think that's something that the board needs to discuss.

Armando Quintanilla: So that won't be on your agenda for next week?...How about the capture of the groundwater?...injuring the foundations of the people's homes..

Allan Hagelthorn: Capturing the groundwater--we'll provide that information to you. When the endangering the foundations, we'll talk about liabilities when we have the environmental attorneys out here to discuss that.

Armando Quintanilla: Are we also going to discuss the plastic part and any of the water from ...

Allan Hagelthorn: We will get you, and correct me if I'm wrong, but we'll get a copy of the report that was issued so that you'll have a copy of that report.

Armando Quintanilla: Would a copy of the report state whether any of the water that was used to put out the fire went into Six-Mile Creek or not?

Richard Trevino: Yeah, we can get you specifics on the fire itself. That'll be a report or written document, not a topic for the RAB. Is that in agreement?

Armando Quintanilla: Listen up! When are we going to discuss the alternatives that are going to be taken for the remedial action for Zone 3?

Richard Trevino: For the groundwater, we've done that at the last RAB and we even reinforced it during the RAB workshop, and then the next time we'll discuss it in greater detail will be during the public hearings.

Armando Quintanilla: And we discussed all the alternatives, also?...And now all that's left is just adding the public hearings?

Richard Trevino: Yes, sir... Yes, sir.

Armando Quintanilla: And what was the groundwork for that, or how is that going to be handled?

Richard Trevino: The way that it will work is that prior to the public hearing we'll have a RAB meeting, that's why we intend to have it by March 6 is to give you, from my understanding is, we'll get the co-chair and the RAB copies of the report. How many copies? I think it's what - three, or so many copies to be looked at and you'll have copies of those reports and once that is done, between the month of March, the public hearing will be scheduled, it will be the RAB members will be notified of the date, where it'll be held, and from that standpoint it'll be just a matter if there's any input that this RAB has or the general public has during that 30-day public comment period, it will be forwarded over to our office and we will respond to each and every comment.

Unknown voice: What about the growth of hazard ranking--do we now have the information that we'd like to _____??

Richard Trevino: No, the overall ranking is in there. Now, if you would like to see specifics by site, we can provide that to you prior to the March timeframe. The guidance by how we come up with the relative list is also in your black notebook. It's relative risk primer. That gives examples and we also have given you Kelly's specific examples for certain sites and we've listed the entire sites that were ranked high, medium or low. And what our gameplan is for the March 6 timeframe if you want to see the specific details for all the sites prior to that and provide that to you, otherwise we're just going to have you look at it and ask do you agree with it? And then basically, get the concurrence of the RAB and then go on.

Armando Quintanilla: Are you going to have a list of all the high priorities of sites?...And we can make our own recommendations based on that?

Richard Trevino: It's already in your black notebook....Correct. Out of 32 sites we're talking about, all with the exception of six were rated high. The others - the six - were rated medium. So other than that I don't know how much higher we can go unless you want to go lower on the relative risk. So we can provide that if you would like that...just call me and let me know.

Yolanda Johnson: Can we talk about the health risk because there are people who are sick in my neighborhood?

Allan Hagelthorn: We can, whether or not we bring it up next time, that's a real good topic. We could have somebody from the public health department.... Sure. There's a lot of different agencies we could have come out and talk about health related issues, health hazards, human issues? There's a lot of people we can bring out and give that as a presentation. We can do that. I think that if we're going to have the environmental attorneys out next time, or try to, then we shouldn't do both of them at the same meeting. One heavy topic like that at a time I think would be more than enough because there's a lot of other issues to discuss so I think we can pass that on or move that down within the next two or three RABs. We can definitely get the Health Department out to discuss health hazards. We sure can.

Yolanda Johnson: My second question has to do with...I'm just trying to understand what's going on with this issue of minority contracts. We agree that the RAB does not decide, you know, how many minority contracts are allowed and all that and I don't think Mr Quintanilla was proposing that. I thought he was asking for information about minority contracts.

Armando Quintanilla: That's correct. That's all I want to know-are minorities included.

Allan Hagelthorn: Yeah, minorities are definitely included.

Armando Quintanilla: Not according to what was in the presentation that was made.

Allan Hagelthorn: If they're qualified for the job, they have this equal chance to do it. And that's what I'm saying. We'll set up an appointment with the contracting office and the legal department so you can learn about the process. And anybody else that wants to go to that...I think we're really digressing from the direction this RAB is supposed to go and that's what I'm trying to...

Armando Quintanilla: I'm just trying to be sure that minorities included in the contract. So far, after \$98 million they have been excluded. I'm just wondering, is all.

Allan Hagelthorn: An example -- I worked for a minority contractor on Air Force contract... If you don't have a list of contractors how do you know they haven't been included?

Armando Quintanilla: They gave me the list. They're all ...

Allan Hagelthorn: What're you asking for now; I don't understand?

Armando Quintanilla: We're into the subcontractor's minority--we can't get to that information, because that information belongs to the contractors.

Allan Hagelthorn: OK. So you don't know whether they're included or not by subcontractors?

Armando Quintanilla: I think if these are our tax dollars...I should know where this money is going to. On whether it's going to our friend in California in San Diego because they told me. I know that there's a firm here in San Antonio...

George Rice: I'm in full agreement.

Allan Hagelthorn: We keep digressing ... This board is never going to be able to answer your question. OK? We don't have the power or authority to do that. (Mr Quintanilla is talking at same time.) ... Well that's what we're saying--we will set up, we can get you in contact with the people who, if the information is available, can make that information available to you. I really don't think we need to continue to digress on this subject when it's taking away from the real purpose of this meeting. The real purpose...

Armando Quintanilla: It's important that contractors start hiring people from our community. We have a high unemployment rate, we'd like to see to it that they do hire people from here in San Antonio.

Unidentified Board member: I think there's time after some board to discuss this and I think the idea of setting up an appointment to discuss how generally how contractors are selected is nowhere nearing that discussion. I think you'll soon find out what proprietary information contractors to protect when they propose to do work for the government. I think instead, and this is my position, that instead of asking them to contact you or Mr Trevino, to come that meeting, perhaps it would be best to be announced to the group - we'd set a special half hour, one hour work session on that topic and this award in it's responsibility to the spokespersons, not spokespersons but liaisons back with the public. That then determine whether that's an issue that needs to be addressed today.

Armando Quintanilla: I like that idea. I'll go along with that.

Tom Moore: A few minutes ago, we were discussing the agenda. When we set up an agenda, the whole purpose of the agenda is important and I think we've learned a lot of good topics are very important. But my concern with an agenda is that we set up a timeframe with some times. If there's a timeframe associated with the agenda, we stick with that timeframe. But when I see that we have meetings gathered from 6:30 to 10 that's cool, that's wonderful, that's great. But at 10:15, I'm going to start getting annoyed and at 10:30 I'm going to get real mad. So, I guess the whole point I'm trying to make is if we're doing some very productive things in these meetings, but we need to stick with the timeframe as well, because I guarantee that all of us combined with the ideas we have easily can stand up or sit here half the night discussing different things that are our own concerns. And that's good. We need to bring those up, but we've got to have a time frame to deal with so we can all keep our wits and sanity about us because otherwise you get four and five hour meetings. That's just a suggestion, so if we do it in the next agenda, and it's got a timeframe, I would try to stick with it.

Allan Hagelthorn: We'll try to do that, which brings us back to what we've been trying to get on the table here, is which direction we want to go here as a board. Do we want to look at the information that's presented on priority organization of sites looking at what we as a board and as a community feel should be the number one priority? Then start looking at how we're going to accomplish that or do we want to use the board as we've done tonight just to bring up different things? I think it would be a lot more productive if we start

looking at the purpose of the board, and that's to provide input to the Air Force on what their plan is and how they're ...

Armando Quintanilla: I think we need to have a format.

Allan Hagelthorn: Exactly. That's what we're doing is trying to discuss it.

Armando Quintanilla: This is one of the meetings, and I think it was the January 5th meeting at Kelly AFB. What the people really wanted was to know where is the contamination? When will it be cleaned up and how much is it going to cost?

Allan Hagelthorn: Right, and that's the purpose of the membership of the board is to get out into the community and let them know where that information is. OK? If there's members of the community at large, you can go out Rotary Groups, Kiwanis, schools, etc. You can get that information out to that - that's part of being a member of this board. You are the conduit to the community to get the information out. If you have something that needs to be presented. The staff here will give you that information for you to present. It's not that...the whole purpose of the restoration advisory board is to provide, foster that communication with the community. That's what we're supposed to be doing.

Armando Quintanilla: Just a little side thing, now this a pat on the back, I think the Public Affairs Office has really been doing its job. It's put out a little bulletin on this Growden Street project. That's great, but I think the Public Affairs Office ought to go a little bit beyond that. I think it ought to put out a newsletter to the people, especially in the neighborhood - this is what's being done in your area, this is how much it's going to cost, this is when it's going to start, this is when it's going to end, and this is the process we're going to use. I think if we do that with a newsletter it would help a heck of a lot.

Allan Hagelthorn: Is there anybody from PA here right now? Dick (Walters), you're from PA. What's the current plan? I know what's required under CERCLA? and everything else, what is the current plan of an open base?

Dick Walters: Our philosophy has been to do a Progress Report driven by this: when we have something coming, we do a Progress Report on that one thing. What happens with a newsletter is that you're driven by a calendar. There's a day it has to be done, so you write something because it has to be done by that day rather than writing something because you have something to say. But if this board would like us to do a monthly newsletter, and if we can come up with useful things that you think the community needs to know, then certainly we can do that.

Armando Quintanilla: That would be nice - form a newsletter so that all the people know how well you handled the fire, how well you contained the water from going to Six Mile Creek, if this was the case. Those kinds of things. The things that are being accomplished by this Board. This Board's going to (words lost on tape) tremendous presentations were made out there. A view of all the contaminated sites was being done at each site. That ought to be in there, also. Some of your accomplishments ought to be in that little newsletter. Along with some of the things to look forward to. These public hearings that he has coming up.

Dick Walters: If this is the desire of the Board, I can bring this up to Major Ford, who's the chief of PA and tell him that this is something that the Board would like us to do.

Allan Hagelthorn: And just a matter of coordinating that, I don't see that and that's a good idea...

Armando Quintanilla: Well, you guys are going out to the community and knocking on doors, and telling people about it. When the fire was out there on East Kelly, they went out and talked to some of the people that were here in this meeting I believe in November that were concerned about the DRMO.

Unknown voice: They went knocking on their doors and calling those people.

Allan Hagelthorn: We can take that back and we can look at that, by all means. That's the positive attribute. Is that an issue the Board would like to discuss right now?

Allan Hagelthorn: Can we have a motion? What is it?

Board Member: I move that we have a newsletter that goes out the community regarding the status of current events of the IRP Program and any incidents or anything related to it.

Dick Walters: What should the focus be between these million people? Where should we focus on?..... We're just looking at-just playing Devil's Advocate. The current mailing list that we have which is a very extensive list. Our current list is 10,000 so, from the standpoint of spending taxpayer's dollars, I would hope that that would be sufficient.

Armando Quintanilla: Instead of mailing it to everyone you could give it to the Southside Reporter and another copy to La Prensa.

Dick Walters: The standard media -- we can get that and what we're looking at is we send it out to over 10,000 residents ...

Armando Quintanilla: You could also send a copy to Westside Sun.

Dick Walters: We can do that. So, we'll look at the mailing list plus the media list that we have.

Mrs. Johnson: I would think anything environmental...

Allan Hagelthorn: We can talk about those issues that there is - we can make that a standing agenda item to discuss newsletter ideas, any topics that you would like to incorporate into the following newsletter. So, that could be one thing we could put as a standard question to ask, so if you have input that you want into it, be prepared to talk about it at that point. So, we'll look at doing it as monthly and to the mailing list that PA has and see how that goes. We have a vote on that? All in favor?... Opposed?...It's carried.

Yolanda Johnson: I would like to ask when I first went to meet Mr. Trevino, Mr. Bailey -- and you were not there -- and asked for the immediate cleanup of the soil and underground water contamination and also for medical assistance for residents and former residents of the area and financial compensation for the property owners in the area whose property has been devalued as a result of this contamination. I've been to three meetings now for answers from Kelly. And nothing has come, nobody's shown me anything...Do I have to wait until that lawyer is here so that I can speak up and tell him what I want in our area?

Allan Hagelthorn: Do you have to wait until he's there? No. Yes, we're bringing in an environmental attorney to discuss those issues. If you want to discuss those issues at an earlier time, we can

Yolanda Johnson: That was the purpose of my meeting with the Kelly people. That was in November and so I have not heard or nobody has ever told me what I want to know.

Allan Hagelthorn: Clarify for me what exactly do you want me to do for you?

Yolanda Johnson: Well I want to know if they're going to go out there and do a health study on the people. I did a health study on them. I walked all that mileage around that area and I found that there was a lot of people there that had suffered from headaches, mostly. I don't know if they breathe those vapors? but you hang your clothes, for those people who have to do wash and hang their clothes out, so I brought that to the table on that particular day that I went and I haven't heard anything right up to this meeting. And it seems to me like those three meetings we've had we rehashed the same things over and over again.

Allan Hagelthorn: You're right, you're absolutely correct. And that's what I'm trying to change. If you, did you have your questions written down right now.

Yolanda Johnson: I do.

Allan Hagelthorn: OK, if you want to give me those questions, we will get answers to you. We can do it one of two ways. We'll have the answers forwarded to you the questions to the best that we can do in the arena that we're in, those answers given to you in writing or we can set up an appointment with the attorneys so that we can come in and discuss your concerns with the attorneys. It's up to you which way you would like to do it.

Yolanda Johnson: I'll discuss it with the attorneys.

Allan Hagelthorn: OK. We'll get with you after the meeting and we'll see if we can - we'll exchange your ideas.

Yolanda Johnson: I have the phone ringing at my house up to 10:30 at night sometimes of people that want to know or other people who have heard from their neighbor and they want to know... people that have just recently... because people are selling their house and people are buying houses and they didn't know this was going on. Now the next door

neighbor has told them about it and you know... And so, even in your printed letter that you sent, my name is there, so they call me.

Allan Hagelthorn: That's because of your being on the Board.

Yolanda Johnson: So, you know, I would like some answers because really I don't know what to tell them. I've been to these meetings...

Yolanda Johnson: You're exactly correct. You're supposed to be the conduit to the community. We need to get you the answers so that you can give that information out. We'll do that, so after the meeting we'll get with you and we'll see what we can do to satisfy that. OK?

Yolanda Johnson: Thank you.

Allan Hagelthorn: Well, kinda guiding back toward our original focus here. I suggest here is that on our agenda we have some very key critical items we've got to - the reason for this RAB is to make these priority determinations. That's our initial primary goal.

Board member: And provide our input to the base.

Allan Hagelthorn: Right. Secondary, though, and this is basically right alongside of it -- neither one of them has a higher priority, is to keep the local community informally informed on all of their concerns.

Mr. Trevino: Absolutely correct.

Unknown voice: I think we ought to sit down and I agree with you, I don't want to stay here past 9 o'clock. If it's a three hour meeting I'd like to...

(IT STOPPED RECORDING)

FINAL PAGE

ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD

FINAL PAGE