



# FORMER NAVAL STATION ROOSEVELT ROADS

## Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Meeting Minutes

Club Cívico La Seyba, Ceiba, Puerto Rico

Meeting No. 13

May 13, 2009

*Note: This meeting summary is based on informal notes taken at the meeting. It is not intended as a verbatim transcript, and portions of some discussions may not have been captured. If comments or additional notes are provided within 30 days of distribution of these minutes, they will be added as an attachment to this summary.*

### I. Order of the Day and Welcome

---

The meeting began at 6:20 PM. Susana Struve (CH2M HILL) welcomed RAB members and members of the public in attendance (see Attachment 1).

Susana invited members of the public in attendance to sign in if they want to receive information via mail or e-mail.

### II. Cleanup Update – Mark Kimes

---

Mark said that two months ago one of the RAB members asked for more information on the sites. He also wanted to go over what has been done in the field and what reports have been submitted since the last RAB meeting.

#### Field Investigations

Mark said another round of quarterly sampling was completed at Area of Concern F. The Annual Sampling Event was conducted at all of the sites on the former base that are part of the monitoring program. The laboratory has received the samples and they are beginning the analysis. Following the analysis, the data will be validated by a third-party independent validator. Next, the annual report will be created for Area of Concern (AOC) F to determine if the levels of contamination in the groundwater are decreasing over time. This is the only fieldwork that has been completed since March 2009.

#### Remediation

Since March, the Navy has been developing work plans for the cleanup of three sites with groundwater issues: the Fuel Farm, Site 54, and Site 55. Once those work plans are approved, site remediation will begin.

Note: This summary is presented in English and Spanish for the convenience of the reader. Every effort has been made for the translations to be as accurate as reasonably possible. However, readers should be aware that the English version of the text is the official version.

Nota: Este resumen se presenta en inglés y en español para la conveniencia del lector. Se han hecho todos los esfuerzos para que la traducción sea precisa en lo más razonablemente posible. Sin embargo, los lectores deben estar al tanto que el texto en inglés es la versión oficial.

## Reports

The Navy submitted a final work plan for a Phase 1 RCRA Facility Investigation (RFI) for Solid Waste Management Unit (SWMU) 76 to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and Puerto Rico Environmental Quality Board (EQB) on March 31, 2009 that addresses the regulators' comments on the draft work plan. The investigation for this site will determine if operations conducted by the National Guard at this building have had a negative impact on the environment. This work plan proposes the collection of soil and groundwater samples from the site.

In addition, the Annual Land Use Control Report, which provides an annual listing of sites on the base that have a land use control issue, was submitted on April 22, 2009. Some modifications were made to this document, based on comments from EQB. Recently, the Navy received notification that EQB has approved the document.

Documents that are currently under review by EPA and EQB:

- AOC F: Year six-third quarter Monitored Natural Attenuation (MNA) report submitted to the EPA on January 9, 2009. It is one of the sites where The Navy performs groundwater sampling every quarter. This report provides the findings from the groundwater samples that were collected to determine whether the cleanup at the sites is working.
- Draft Phase 1 RFI Report for SWMU 62: Submitted on February 6, 2009. It still a draft document and will be available to the public once it is approved by the regulators. The investigations showed that there has been an impact to the environment at SWMU 62. There is metals contamination in the surface and subsurface soils (limited and low levels–potentially of lead, mercury and zinc). Action item was posted to announce what the specific metals were that were found at the site. The recommendation is to move it to a full RFI (a more in-depth investigation) to further define the contamination and delineate the contamination.

Current reports that are being worked on:

- AOC F: Every three months there are additional samples taken at that site. Currently they are working on the year six-fourth quarter groundwater sampling to determine if the contamination is under control. The samples were collected last week and the contractors will be working on the next MNA report once that data comes in.
- SWMU 68: Located at the end of the air field out on the base. The final Corrective Measures Study (CMS) Report, which recommends that technology be used to clean up the metals contamination at that site, was sent to EQB and EPA in May. There are a couple of hot spots of some metals and the CMS recommends digging up that contaminated soil.
- SWMU 71 (Quarry Disposal Site): The Draft Final Phase 1 RFI Report is being developed. Comments on the draft document have been received from the EQB and

2

**Note:** This summary is presented in English and Spanish for the convenience of the reader. Every effort has been made for the translations to be as accurate as reasonably possible. However, readers should be aware that the English version of the text is the official version.

**Nota:** Este resumen se presenta en inglés y en español para la conveniencia del lector. Se han hecho todos los esfuerzos para que la traducción sea precisa en lo más razonablemente posible. Sin embargo, los lectores deben estar al tanto que el texto en inglés es la versión oficial.

EPA and the Navy is addressing those comments. There appears to be environmental impacts at the site from polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) (a semi-volatile compound) and metals contamination in the surface and subsurface soil, along with metals contamination in the groundwater. The Phase 1 RFI Report recommends a further investigation (move into a full RFI) to make sure that all contaminants are being completely identified.

- SWMU 78: Comments have been received on the Draft Phase 1 RFI Report, which are being addressed. PAH contamination has been identified, along with metals in the surface and subsurface soil. The Phase 1 RFI recommends moving the site into a full RFI to further delineate the area of contamination at that site.
- SWMU 76: A revised Final Phase 1 work plan is currently being developed for Building 2300, in response to comments made by the EPA and EQB on April 23, 2009.
- Solid Waste Landfill, SWMU 3: Comments made on April 23, 2009 are currently being addressed. The Draft Semi-Annual Groundwater Report for sampling at the landfill that was done in March is being completed. Every six months, the wells around the landfills are sampled to make sure there is nothing coming out of the landfill into the groundwater.
- SWMU 9 (Area B, Tank 214 Sludge Disposal Pits): In January 2009, there was a full RFI investigation at that site and the draft report is being developed.
- SWMU 60(Former landfill at the marina): In January 2009, the Phase 1 RFI investigation was completed. They are currently working on the draft report for that site. The sampling completed in January was of the soils and groundwater and the adjacent open water sediments around the bay.
- SWMU 70(Disposal area northwest of the landfill): The Navy and its contractors are reporting on the findings of the Phase 1 RFI investigation completed in January 2009, in which they sampled the soils, groundwater, and the adjacent wetlands and open water sediments out in the bay.
- SWMU 74: All the bulk fuel lines at the base that moved the fuel from the pier to the airfield were initially investigated to see if there have been any releases from those operations. The first phase of the CMS investigation was to get an indication of what (if anything) has been released. The Draft Phase 1 of the CMS Investigation report will help to determine what and where the releases are on that site.
- SWMU 1: We are in the final phases of an ecological risk assessment (ERA), steps 6 and 7. This report is on the findings of the field verification and investigation of the upland soils at the site and the open water sediments adjacent to the site.
- SWMU 2: Work similar to SWMU 1 is being completed at SWMU 2, which is in the ecological risk assessment stage as well.

**Note: This summary is presented in English and Spanish for the convenience of the reader. Every effort has been made for the translations to be as accurate as reasonably possible. However, readers should be aware that the English version of the text is the official version.**

**Nota: Este resumen se presenta en inglés y en español para la conveniencia del lector. Se han hecho todos los esfuerzos para que la traducción sea precisa en lo más razonablemente posible. Sin embargo, los lectores deben estar al tanto que el texto en inglés es la versión oficial.**

- RCRA Quarterly Progress Report: A summary of all of the work done under the RCRA program at Roosevelt Roads from February 1 through April 30, 2009. It will be submitted to the EPA and EQB this month.

## Questions

Lirio Marquez (RAB member): I have two questions. The first one is about SWMU 1, the upland soils and open water sediments are being analyzed; I thought there were wetlands in SWMU 1.

Mark Kimes: Yes, there are wetlands, but in all the investigations we have not found any impacts in the wetlands. The results of the SWMU 1 reports are going to show that we don't have a risk from the sediments in the open waters either; all contamination is on the upland habitat for SWMU 1.

Lirio: My second question is that most of the documents are in the draft stage. What is the timeframe between the report and a remediation process to be approved and any kind of work starts?

Mark Kimes: It takes around 12 to 16 months from preparing a report on the field investigation to getting the approval on that report.

Susana Struve (contractor): There's a flyer back there showing the process that Mark just explained.

Dali Avila (visitor): I am giving two suggestions, and then a question. I would like to see in the next meeting the specific areas that are being work showed in a map, because most of us have never seen those areas, or work there. The other one is related to the metals found, I would like a list by area, which metals have been found by specific areas. The question is how can the Navy sell some of this land when we don't know what contamination is out there?

Mark Davidson: What we do is carve out the contaminated site; if there are ten sites in a parcel with ten acres, there will be ten holes (carved outs) in the property that we're getting ready to transfer. The Navy will hang on to these sites until the cleanup is complete and the EPA and EQB are satisfied and we get their blessing on the closure of the report. Then we can transfer the carve outs.

Dali Avila: Fifteen years from now when the Navy is gone, what happens when they go to put a house somewhere and find drums in the ground?

Mark Davidson: At that point it is the Navy's responsibility to clean up whatever is found later, if it is determined to be Navy contamination. The number of contaminated sites is so small compared to the actual sites that are clean and ready to be sold. There is a reuse plan that is developed and agreed on by the Navy and the Commonwealth to decide what land to maintain for what type of use. (If something is to be used for industrial use, then it only needs to be cleaned up for industrial use, not, for example, for use by a homeowner). This is

**Note: This summary is presented in English and Spanish for the convenience of the reader. Every effort has been made for the translations to be as accurate as reasonably possible. However, readers should be aware that the English version of the text is the official version.**

**Nota: Este resumen se presenta en inglés y en español para la conveniencia del lector. Se han hecho todos los esfuerzos para que la traducción sea precisa en lo más razonablemente posible. Sin embargo, los lectores deben estar al tanto que el texto en inglés es la versión oficial.**

on a site-by-site basis and is evaluated per site by cost effectiveness, to determine if there will be any land use controls on specific sites.

Dali Avila: Was any sampling completed during the period covered by the above discussion?

Mark Kimes: After the break, I will show photos and maps to show where the sampling has been done in the forest.

Visitor: We are worried about the fact that a person or developer would be offering millions. Why don't you finish identifying and cleaning the contamination and then dispose of the lands, it's dangerous because you can leave something contaminated and that worries us.

Mark Davidson: We feel confident that we know what and where the contamination is. We are going to finish up the cleaning of these sites. We are not trying to sell the contaminated sites; we are hanging on to those sites until the cleaning is complete.

Luis Velazquez (RAB member): You are receiving a photo that shows our greatest worry about the mangrove area where the bridge was built. We are worried about what contamination is there that is killing the mangroves. Three of the mangroves are dead. We want an investigation because that can be Agent Orange, and the question is what is going on there? We want to know what's happening at the next RAB meeting or the next one after that, if it takes too long.

Mark Davidson: We put the bridge in at the Los Machos mangroves as a mitigation measure for a spill that took place within the airport. Los Machos was not affected by the airport spill, and we know of no spills or dumping within Los Machos. Now the mangroves are getting more water because of the bridge. We talked about that in another meeting. Every six months we come and monitor the mangroves and will be doing that for five years. We don't know about any contamination there. I don't know if they were dead prior to putting the bridge in, but we are going to monitor for five years.

Luis Velazquez: By any chance did you take samples from sediments and sample for that site? When the spill occurred one of the mangroves died. I know because I was there. What's happening there?

Mark Kimes: You asked the question on the sampling. During the break you and I can talk about that.

Rafael Montes (RAB member): The contamination investigation is based on information provided by the Navy and people that have told you about possible contaminated sites, but there might be other contaminated areas without you knowing it. If the Puerto Rican government has or had a zoning plan, they should take into consideration this information. We found out that the zoning plan was cancelled, and I want to know if Portal del Futuro told you that. Without a zoning plan a developer can do whatever he wants to the land.

Mark Davidson: If there's a land use control there, we will inspect the site every year [until the cleanup is completed] and we will know if there's a house there. An agreement between the Navy and the Commonwealth specifies which areas are industrial and which are residential and by law that's what we need to clean up.

Visitor: My worry as a citizen is not having a zoning plan, which is one of the most important parts in this stage where parcels are going to be sold. The last I heard is that the zoning plan was eliminated. Toa Baja's Mayor was talking about endangered species (i.e. coquíes).

Mark Davidson: We are the environmental division - you have to talk about that with the Local Reuse Agency (LRA). We talked about the endangered species in our last meeting. The biological assessment addressed those sites where the endangered species are, and the assessment goes to the LRA, to the new owners.

Juan Solís (visitor): We should go to the point, there are some contradictions here. I have been in two other meetings where representatives from the Commonwealth have said that Puerto Rico's development will start on the East side of the island, specifically from Roosevelt Roads. That's in the short term, but what you are talking about is between 10 to 15 years. What happens with the buildings and houses? I have evidence that there are incoming activities in the short-term. I want to know about the existing buildings, if they are contaminated or not.

Mark Davidson: Again, we are not transferring anything contaminated. The hospital parcel is clean and will be transferred without any kind of restriction. The people who buy each property will know where the contamination is, it's going to be carved out, and we'll do our cleanup. Again, we will transfer only what is clean and we will clean up what is needed.

Visitor: Our questions on the zoning plan should be directed to Portal del Futuro instead of to the Navy. We are not worried about when you sell the property. Our worry is for the long-term, when a bidder gets the auction and there's no zoning plan, the law requires that person to comply with the minimum.

After the break, Susana Struve asked the RAB members if they received the previous meeting minutes. Lirio Marquez made clarifications on the minutes.

### III. What's New – Mark Davidson

---

- **Site 69:** This Site is out at the airport with land use control. The Navy had previously delineated the soil contamination, knew exactly where the Navy needed to dig, but then the Port Authority did some trenching through the site. In the deed it clearly spells out what the boundaries are, but they missed it. For the past six months they (Navy and Port Authority) have been deciding what will happen. The Navy has decided that they (the Navy) will now step forward and re-delineate the contamination at the site to determine what soil needs to be removed by the Navy. The Navy also sent a letter to the Port

**Note:** This summary is presented in English and Spanish for the convenience of the reader. Every effort has been made for the translations to be as accurate as reasonably possible. However, readers should be aware that the English version of the text is the official version.

**Nota:** Este resumen se presenta en inglés y en español para la conveniencia del lector. Se han hecho todos los esfuerzos para que la traducción sea precisa en lo más razonablemente posible. Sin embargo, los lectores deben estar al tanto que el texto en inglés es la versión oficial.

Authority to say they owe the Navy \$500,000 to redo the investigation. The land use control process failed at SWMU 69, so the Navy has decided to go out (with Port Authority representatives) on a quarterly basis and inspect the sites on the airport property to make sure that nothing has been disturbed on the sites, and most importantly, reinforce to the Port Authority where the sites are and to remind everyone of the restrictions and boundaries of the sites. To keep the cleanup moving, the Navy will fund the reinvestigation for now and will take all means necessary to get reimbursed.

Ramón Figueroa (RAB Co-chair): We know that the airport was open, but there's no potable water at the airport. I did a legal investigation on the airport and it is in the list of Military Airports. I sent a complaint to the Federal Aviation Administration to initiate an investigation because how can it be that an airport is operational without water? Portal del Futuro, Port Authority and the Puerto Rican government are operating an airport without water.

- **Property Auction:** Three parcels the Navy wants to put up for sale through an auction process – totaling approximately 2,500 acres. Those bids should come out around August 2009. There will be a minimum bid, but it has not yet been determined.  
*[Note: the sale has since been postponed until December 2009.]*

Luis Velazquez: The third bullet on your presentation says “three additional sites in the base will be evaluated for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Properties.” We would like to know which those sites are.

Mark Davidson: I can't tell you exactly where the sites are, because we don't want amateur archeologists going out there. I will just say this, these three sites were originally supposed to go to another federal agency and under that scenario the Navy would just transfer the protection of these sites through a memorandum of agreement. That particular federal agency does not want this property anymore, so now the Navy has these three sites to investigate before they are transferred. We were out there with an archeologist two months ago.

Lirio Marquez: You say that there are three additional sites, so which original sites are included?

Mark Davidson: We have looked at a lot of them already. When we say additional, we have known about them for a long time, but again we thought this property was going to another government agency. These areas containing these three sites are now going to be sold, so now, the Navy will have to complete the culture resources investigations. Again, the sites are not really new, but were not previously on the Navy's radar screen to investigate.

Ramón Figueroa: I wrote a letter to the Secretary of the Interior about information received that 19 possible archeological sites were identified in Roosevelt Roads eligible for the National Register. The reason for this being ignored is because there's an

**Note:** This summary is presented in English and Spanish for the convenience of the reader. Every effort has been made for the translations to be as accurate as reasonably possible. However, readers should be aware that the English version of the text is the official version.

**Nota:** Este resumen se presenta en inglés y en español para la conveniencia del lector. Se han hecho todos los esfuerzos para que la traducción sea precisa en lo más razonablemente posible. Sin embargo, los lectores deben estar al tanto que el texto en inglés es la versión oficial.

agreement between Portal del Futuro and the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), since there's no facility in PR that meets federal requirements for preservation, etc. Our government allowed those artifacts to be taken somewhere in the U.S., probably Florida, but I don't know for sure. The letter also indicates that there's another alternative, there is a program that with some federal help, a museum might be established in Puerto Rico in order to keep those artifacts. SHPO told that if a place that meets the requirements is available, to let him know in order to make arrangements for the transfer of the artifacts.

Lirio Marquez: These meetings are every three months; I am asking the same question I ask in every meeting. Is Punta Puerca included in the parcels being auctioned?

Mark Davidson: That's the Dry Forest, yes, it is in Parcel 3 -- it will be sold.

Lirio Marquez: And Piñeros Island?

Mark Davidson: Piñeros Island will go as a conservation transfer, but the Navy will not transfer Piñeros until we are satisfied with the unexploded ordnance (UXO) cleanup out there.

Lirio Marquez: The island is full of people every weekend.

Mark Davidson: The Coast Guard is out there. There's danger out there, so until we are done with the UXO removal, we don't recommend anyone going out there.

Teodoro Mata (visitor): I represent a community of fishermen and artisans in Punta Figueras; we have a map in which we are identifying some lands. This area is divided into maritime zone, parcels and mangrove. What timeframe did you give to the Puerto Rico government to give the titles for these lands to the fishermen, and if that is not the case, how can the fishermen get that land now, who is the owner of those lands? I have the map here if you want to see it.

Mark Davidson: I know we have already transferred 150 acres to Ceiba on the beach, but I think is a little bit further on the south of where you are talking about. I don't know if this parcel you are taking about is already transferred to the Department of Natural and Environmental Resources (DNER), but I can find that out. If it's the DNER or Puerto Rico Conservation Trust who owns the property, or it will be transferred to them in the future, you will have to talk with them; we (the Navy) don't have much to say about it. In any case, I would like to see your map.

Dali Avila: I am worried about the archeological artifacts; it would have been good if the Ceiba Mayor was here at the meeting to find out his position on this matter, because the municipality should start immediately identifying an area, a building to claim those artifacts and have the museum here in Ceiba before someone else claims it. We keep on fighting for the lands not to be sold but be transferred to Ceiba and Naguabo communities.



The other thing that worries me is the lack of access to the base. We can't enter those places. There's no way for us to go into the base. How can the community gain access to the base?

Freddy de Jesús (Portal del Futuro): I'll take your message to el Portal.

Mark Davidson: There are two processes: (1) You can go through the company (Colliers) that is marketing the property and request access, although they are more interested in the people who are bidding on the parcels; (2) There are two phone numbers listed on the LRA's website that say they will help gain access to visit the sites. The Navy can arrange a visit to take RAB members out there.

Luis Velazquez: I ask why they are saying now that, if people go into the base, they will start touching the artifacts; the Navy already destroyed the Roosevelt Roads base. I wonder if the Navy is going to build a parcel with a fence to protect these sites. How are artifacts found at archaeological sites stored? What happens to cultural resource areas?

Mark Davidson: The Navy has been building out at the base for 40-50 years and any time they find an archaeological site it has been inventoried. The understanding is that there is no current facility on the island that is certified to house the archaeological items. The Navy is going to investigate the areas before they transfer the properties, so they know what things should be excavated and preserved. The Navy doesn't want amateur archaeologists out there because once they go searching; the artifacts can be lost forever. The Navy has experience at investigating cultural resources areas and has protected many artifacts for the future.

Visitor: That parcel was going to be given to the Fishermen Association and nothing has been done.

Visitor: The auction will start in August or will end in August; can you clarify the bidding process?

Mark Davidson: We are still trying to find out when the bids and Request for Proposals (RFP) will come out. The Navy is trying to market the property again and finalize the RFP. Based on the last bid from two years ago, if you want to be a bid on the property, you have to put down a large amount of money, because they want to make sure that that you're serious about it. There will be a minimum bid on the property that must be met. They want to make sure you have the resources and the financial backing. If you don't get the bid, you get your money back. The bidding is estimated to go on for a decent amount of time, beginning in August. The bidding process can be entered into online. *[Note: the sale has since been postponed until December 2009.]*

- **Budget Process for Environmental Cleanup:** The budget is updated by the Navy twice a year (fall and spring). The Spring 2009 submission was just completed. We use a computer model that generates an estimated dollar amount to complete the environmental cleanup at each site. Once a cost to complete has been created for each

site, the Navy allocates the dollars into different years based on the estimated timing of the cleanup.

The Navy also develops control numbers for each base. Control numbers are a maximum dollar amount per year per base, so they act like a funding constraint. Sometimes the cleanup requirements exceed the control numbers. Remediation then has to be pushed out to the future to accommodate the constraints. The control numbers are based on how much money the Navy has for remediation at all of their Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) bases. They have their priorities and allocate the money accordingly. Control numbers are also based on what the Navy projects the cleanup requirements will be for future years.

For 2010 and 2011, there are tough constraints at Roosevelt Roads. The cleanup funds typically come from the proceeds generated from BRAC property that is sold (hence the main reason why the Navy wants to sell property at Roosevelt Roads). All of the “sold” money rolls right back into the environmental cleanup process. Roosevelt Roads was supposed to be sold two years ago, but that didn’t happen and the money in the pot has now run dry. Now the Navy has to go to Congress and get appropriated funds to complete the cleanup. In the future, hopefully there will be more money coming from property sales to go back into the remediation pot of money.

- 2010: Budget for Roosevelt Roads is \$4.1 million. Control number is \$4.1 million. The control number is driving what is budgeted. We could have used a little bit more money, but are now constrained to a maximum of \$4.1 million. We feel comfortable, though; that a lot of progress will be made with what’s allocated.
- 2011: Budget for Roosevelt Roads is \$6.2 million. Control number is \$6.2 million. The same story applies for 2011 as 2010.
- 2012: A lot of remedial action will begin this year at numerous sites, so a lot of money (\$19.7 million) is required this year. Included in the projected workload for 2012 is \$.7 million dollars for capping the remaining portion of the landfill. The rest of the money goes to general remediation of the other sites.
- 2013: Cleanup requirement for Roosevelt Roads is \$16 million because, like 2012, a lot of remediation will take place as a lot of cleanup is needed. The control number is projected to be \$704,000, which is obviously way lower than what’s necessary. It’s so far out in the future, though, that there is no need to be concerned yet.
- In the out-years (2014 and out), the money drops off dramatically, because by then the remedial actions and investigations are completed. By then it will just be the cost to run the RAB and complete long-term monitoring. It will be more of an O&M (operation and maintenance) type process at that point in the future. There are no control numbers on the horizon for these out-years as of now. The monitoring is a hard and fast requirement, so it will have to be funded in order to complete.

- What are some of the costs that are required annually?

In the SWMU 3 landfill, there is a lot of monitoring happening to ensure nothing is being released to the adjacent waters. Some of the tank sites are being heavily monitored to ensure nothing is occurring with the groundwater. SWMU 7 and 8 sites are having raw oil (free product) monitored and collected from the wells on a monthly basis.

RAB meetings are a required part of the budget and will continue as long as the Navy owns property and has actively ongoing cleanup, and the community stays interested.

Land use control inspection and reports are necessary annual expenditures for the budget, too.

After funding the mandatory requirements, the remaining budget has been spent to determine the extent of the contamination at the Environmental Condition of Property (ECP) sites (SWMU 56 – 78). It needs to be determined if any of these sites pose a risk to human health and get these sites to a point where we know what needs to be dealt with. Some budget is left to the bigger sites (like SWMU 1 and 2, SWMU 9). They have been investigated for awhile and the Navy wants to keep the remediation moving. The cumulative cost to complete for all sites from FY 2010 to the future is roughly \$57.5 million in the budget.

#### IV. Closure

---

Question: Is it possible to bring a radio station to the next meeting to let the people know what is being done? Mark Davidson authorized this.

*The next meeting is scheduled for August 19, 2009.*

#### V. New Action Items, Action Items that Require Follow-up, and Ongoing Action Items for the Next RAB Meeting

---

The following summarizes the action items that will be carried forward to the next RAB meeting in August 2009. There were no new or ongoing action items carried forward from the last RAB meeting in May 2009.

Item	Description	Discussion	Status
#1	Report back on what the specific metals were that were found at SWMU 62.	Navy	New
#2	Provide a map of the sites that are being worked on at the next RAB meeting.	Navy	New

**Note:** This summary is presented in English and Spanish for the convenience of the reader. Every effort has been made for the translations to be as accurate as reasonably possible. However, readers should be aware that the English version of the text is the official version.

**Nota:** Este resumen se presenta en inglés y en español para la conveniencia del lector. Se han hecho todos los esfuerzos para que la traducción sea precisa en lo más razonablemente posible. Sin embargo, los lectores deben estar al tanto que el texto en inglés es la versión oficial.

Item	Description	Discussion	Status
#3	More information about the Los Machos mangroves restoration area (report of three dead mangroves)	Navy	New

---

**Note:** This summary is presented in English and Spanish for the convenience of the reader. Every effort has been made for the translations to be as accurate as reasonably possible. However, readers should be aware that the English version of the text is the official version.

**Nota:** Este resumen se presenta en inglés y en español para la conveniencia del lector. Se han hecho todos los esfuerzos para que la traducción sea precisa en lo más razonablemente posible. Sin embargo, los lectores deben estar al tanto que el texto en inglés es la versión oficial.

---

**ATTACHMENT 1 - Meeting Attendees - May 13, 2009**

---

<b>RAB Community Members in Attendance</b>	<b>RAB Community Members Absent</b>
<b>Ramón D. Figueroa, Community Co-Chair</b>	Carlos Brown
Luís A. Velázquez Rivera	Jimmy Concepción Robles
Lirio Márquez D'Acunti	Jorge Fernández Porto
Rafael Montes	Myrna Maldonado
Agustín Velázquez Santos	Ramón M. Ríos
Debra McWhirter	Daniel E. González
William Laurido	Noraida Vázquez Arce
José Díaz	Samuel Caraballo
	Rogelio Figueroa
	Ángel de Jesús Matta
	Ismael Velázquez
	Mike Dalton
<b>Community Members Visiting</b>	
Carmen Guemer	Daly Ávila
Carmen S. Victor	Luis A. Velazquez
Bernandette Feris	José A. Rosa
Nancy Solis	Miguel D. Ferguson
Roberto Hernández	Juan Solís
Cecilia Hernández	Teodoro Matta
José A. Caraballo	Pedro Tejada
Rafael Donato	Juan Vega
<b>RAB Agency Representatives in Attendance</b>	
<b>Mark Davidson, Navy Co-Chair,</b> BRAC Environmental Coordinator	Navy - BRAC Program Management Office Southeast
David Criswell, Deputy Program Manager (absent)	Navy - BRAC Program Management Office Southeast
Tim Gordon (absent)	US Environmental Protection Agency, Region 2 (EPA)

**Note: This summary is presented in English and Spanish for the convenience of the reader. Every effort has been made for the translations to be as accurate as reasonably possible. However, readers should be aware that the English version of the text is the official version.**

**Nota: Este resumen se presenta en inglés y en español para la conveniencia del lector. Se han hecho todos los esfuerzos para que la traducción sea precisa en lo más razonablemente posible. Sin embargo, los lectores deben estar al tanto que el texto en inglés es la versión oficial.**

Wilmarie Rivera	Puerto Rico Environmental Quality Board (EQB), Federal Facilities Coordinator,
Gloria M. Toro Agrait	EQB, Hazardous Waste Permit Division
Neida Pumarejo Cintrón (absent) Santiago Oliver (representative)	Puerto Rico Conservation Trust
<b>Other Agency Representatives</b>	
Jaime González (absent)	Director, (Local Reuse Authority [LRA])
Freddy de Jesús	LRA
José A. Candelaria (absent)	LRA]
CDR Daniel Kalal (absent)	Naval Activity Puerto Rico
<b>Support Staff Present</b>	
Susana Struve	CH2M HILL, Inc. (Navy contractor – meeting facilitator)
Pedro Ruiz (absent)	Naval Activity Puerto Rico
Mark Kimes	Baker Environmental, Inc. (Navy contractor – Installation Restoration Program)

**Note:** This summary is presented in English and Spanish for the convenience of the reader. Every effort has been made for the translations to be as accurate as reasonably possible. However, readers should be aware that the English version of the text is the official version.

**Nota:** Este resumen se presenta en inglés y en español para la conveniencia del lector. Se han hecho todos los esfuerzos para que la traducción sea precisa en lo más razonablemente posible. Sin embargo, los lectores deben estar al tanto que el texto en inglés es la versión oficial.