



**Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Meeting
Former Naval Station Roosevelt Roads
Ceiba, Puerto Rico**

Meeting #41 – December 7, 2016

Note: This meeting summary is based on informal notes taken at the meeting. It is not intended as a verbatim transcript. Rather, it is intended to summarize the overall discussions. If comments or additional notes are provided within 30 days of distribution of these minutes, they will be considered and potentially added as an attachment to this summary.

I. Welcome and Introductions

The meeting began at approximately 6:50 P.M. See Attachment 1 for meeting attendees.

Madeline Almodovar (moderator) greeted attendees to the 41st Naval Activity Puerto Rico (NAPR) RAB meeting, gave a brief explanation of the agenda and introduced the NAPR BRAC Program Manager, Thuane Fielding (Navy). Thuane expressed thanks to those in attendance supporting the cleanup program at the former Naval Station Roosevelt Roads, including representatives from the Navy, Environmental Protection Agency, Puerto Rico Environmental Quality Board (PREQB), and the Local Redevelopment Authority (LRA). She excused Malú Blázquez (LRA), and welcomed Mr. Freddy de Jesus representing the LRA. She informed the RAB that representatives from the Army were not able to attend the meeting. The Army's environmental compliance update presentation would be scheduled for one of the 2017 RAB meetings, as representatives become available.

II. New and Ongoing Action Items

The following summarizes the status of action items, including new and ongoing action items that will be carried forward to the next RAB meeting.

Action Item Description	Status as of 12/07/2016
Navy will prepare a presentation to show the data and results as investigations are complete for future RAB agenda topics.	ONGOING: As investigations are completed, this information is being presented to RAB members at the next available meeting.

Action Item Description	Status as of 12/07/2016
Navy will develop a presentation for the RAB members when a Statement of Basis is developed summarizing the investigation history and planned cleanup activities	ONGOING: As Statements of Basis are issued for public review and comment, a presentation is being provided for the community members at the next RAB meeting.
Navy will consult whether pictures of archaeological items could be shared with the community.	COMPLETED: The Navy archaeologist shared a presentation during the December 2016 meeting with photographs of the items that have been found at NAPR, which was presented during the RAB meeting.
PREQB will provide SHPO contacts to community stakeholders who have expressed interest.	NEW

III. Area of Concern F Investigation Planning

- Stacin Martin (Navy) described the planned investigation related source area investigations at Area of Concern (AOC) F. It includes areas where above ground storage tanks (AST) or underground storage tanks (UST) were located. The site includes ASTs or USTs associated with former buildings 124,2842B, 520, 731, 734, 735, 1738 and 1995.
- Stacin mentioned that since AOC F was used for fuel storage, site contaminants include petroleum related compounds. Potentially impacted media is soil and groundwater. He also showed the planned site work map and summarized the next steps to be performed during investigation, including the equipment and tools to be used for characterization of the site.

Questions/Comments from the Public

- Rafael Montes (Community RAB Member) expressed concern about the possible contamination of crabs at a lagoon behind the Navy lodge.
 - Stacin answered that he does not believe that area is part of an environmental site being evaluated, but he will confirm its location with Pedro Ruiz. Concerning crab populations, Stacin stated that as part of ecological risk assessments, the Navy may collect organism samples if contaminants of concern are present within an environmental site that serves as habitat to that specific organism. This process is performed to determine potential ecological hazard to the organism or its predators.

IV. Area of Concern E - Piñeros Terrestrial Investigation Planning

- Stacin presented the investigation planning for AOC E Piñeros Island. He provided the site history of the island as part of the former Naval Station Roosevelt Roads operations. He summarized previous investigations and showed a map of previous sampling events.

- Stacin presented the additional assessments and media sampling events needed to evaluate the potential corrective action required for the site, based on the concentration level of the chemical compounds of interest which may include explosives, organic and inorganic constituents. The media to be sampled include soil, sediments, groundwater and organism tissue. Stacin finished the Piñeros island topic with a summary of the work schedule and the sampling scope for the upcoming investigations.

Questions/Comments from the Public

- Manuel Martinez (APRODEC) commented that acquaintances had asked him whether they could visit Piñeros Island, and he responded that he understood that it is **not** open to the public and unsafe to visit. He also asked if there was an established perimeter that people could reference as a safe distance from the island.
 - Stacin Martin responded that access to the island is dangerous and prohibited. The site media are under investigation and there is an acute potential hazard for munitions. Warning signs are posted throughout the island with information regarding munitions safety. Stacin answered that there is no determined safe distance from Piñeros.
- Carlos Morales (Para la Naturaleza) asked about the reason for the recommendation to perform additional sampling on the island.
 - Stacin answered that when the Navy sets out to perform sampling their objective is to be able to determine if there is a risk to human health or ecology. When risk assessors perform an initial data screening they determine whether there is enough data or if samples are representative of the site to be able to make a corrective action recommendation. Based on that assessment, the risk assessors may recommend additional sampling to be performed, as in this case. This is all performed in conjunction, coordinated and discussed with the regulatory agencies.
- Luis Velazquez (RAB Community Member) commented that Piñeros Island has been closed from public access for a long time and that he would like to see the area open to the public as soon as possible.
 - Stacin answered that he understands the concern and desires of the public and wanted to remind the public that the Piñeros Island site is complex. For example, beach erosion and wash down processes have to be understood, and it also takes time to make sure that the site is safe for visitors. The Navy and regulatory agencies will determine the corrective actions warranted based on the investigations performed at the site. Ecological risks are an important issue since this site is ecologically active.
- Ismael Velazquez (RAB Community Member) asked for clarification on what the Navy considers to be small arms.
 - Stacin answered that Department of Defense classifies small arms as anything smaller than a 20 mm round. Piñeros Island was used for Special Operations training, therefore the Navy has to address any type of munition encountered during the environmental investigation and remediation activities.
- Ismael Velazquez (RAB Community Member) added that the Navy should include the near shore areas as part of the investigations at Piñeros Island.
 - Stacin answered that former Navy divers used metal detectors to evaluate multiple transects around the off shore areas where training had taken place. The Navy also

performed initial investigations and cleanup on the interior of the island and they found various munition related items. A good rule for a citizen when dealing with munition items is the three (3) R's: **Recognize**, **Retreat** and **Report** the item to authorities for proper handling. As a reminder from earlier discussions though, visitor access to the island is currently prohibited.

V. Archaeological Artifact Collection Overview

- Stacin shared information concerning the cultural resources found at NAPR. The Navy archaeologist provided a presentation including photographs of archaeological artifacts collected at the site. Stacin explained that the Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) process mandated that the archaeological artifacts be curated in a repository that meets federal standards codified in 36 CFR 79. He summarized the quantity and type of artifacts contained in the collection. Photographs included artifacts consisting of ceramic, lithic, coral and animal bones. He also added that the State Historical Preservation Office (SHPO) is the entity that oversees this process in Puerto Rico.

Questions/Comments from the Public

- Manuel Martinez (APRODEC) asked about the facility size needed to house the artifacts.
 - Thuane Fielding stated that the Navy has not determined the required size of the facility since the final content of the collection and its evaluation are part of the Context Study and consequent report writing that the contractor has to submit. Stacin added that since the Navy cannot provide directions as to the size or compliance requirements of the facility to harbor them, they recommend that the interested parties contact SHPO for guidance on the process for getting an approved facility.
- Manuel Martinez (APRODEC) asked about the location where the artifacts were found.
 - Stacin answered that the Navy cannot disclose that information.
- Rafael Montes (RAB Community Member) stated that a group of citizens are organizing to rehabilitate a facility and make it compliant with 36 CFR 79 requirements to be able to warehouse the artifacts in Puerto Rico, but that he needs clarification on the requirements.
 - Stacin answered that the Navy is following the applicable 36 CFR 79 requirements and meeting the requirements that it signed with SHPO by contracting a firm that curates and handles the archaeological artifacts. The Navy recommends that the citizens communicate with SHPO and ask them for clarification about the process and requirements.
- Carlos Morales (Para la Naturaleza) asked whether the artifacts had been found previous to BRAC, or if there had been an existing collection.
 - Thuane stated that the items housed by the Cultural Resource Program while the base was operating, were handled in the same way as the current BRAC process. The original Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) between the Navy and SHPO under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) required that the Navy follows the same 36 CFR 79 procedure with the artifacts it already had under its possession.
- Ismael Velazquez (RAB Community Member) asked for clarification if the agreement was between the Navy and SHPO and no third parties are involved.

- Thuane stated that the community or any entity that is seeking to receive these items from the Navy has to set an agreement forward with SHPO, not the Navy. SHPO determines the requirements under 36 CFR 79. SHPO would be able to answer the questions related to the requirements of the curating facility and historical artifacts.
- Luis Velazquez (RAB Community Member) wanted to know if there were previous accounts of archaeological activities before the Naval Station Roosevelt Roads was established.
 - Stacin stated that the Navy cannot account for any activities previous to the establishment of Naval Station Roosevelt Roads. The Navy follows the requirements set forth in the federal regulations regarding cultural resources and has finished investigations pertaining to archaeological evaluations for potential sites in the entirety of NAPR. Thuane added that there is a NAVFAC Mid-Atlantic report that was published when the base was still in operation and it contained information about the archaeological and historical artifacts that had been collected on site before the NAPR BRAC process started.
- Manuel Martinez (APRODEC) asked whether there is a cemetery or human remains identified within NAPR.
 - Stacin said that the current presentation included a single human carved bone. Pedro Ruiz added that if human remains or archaeological artifacts are found, then the Navy will follow the standard operating procedures in 36 CFR 79 and in accordance with the SHPO agreement.
- Ismael Velazquez (RAB Community Member) asked if a SHPO representative could attend the next RAB meeting.
 - Thuane clarified that the Navy cannot engage the community regarding regulatory matters concerning the archaeological or historical artifacts. However, she suggested that someone from the community create a list of questions or topics and discuss those with SHPO, potentially through a contact in PREQB. Those questions may be answered in a separate meeting or agenda in order to ascertain that the RAB meeting stays in context of the environmental restoration.

VI. Status Update on Planned and Completed Activities

Stacin Martin (Navy) provided a brief update of the status of sites under investigation or corrective measures stage.

VII. PREQB Update

Mr. Juan Babá Peebles (PREQB) provided an update of his duties as Federal Facilities Coordinator for NAPR. He expressed his availability for the community to communicate with PREQB for any clarification or input concerning the environmental restoration work being performed at NAPR sites.

VIII. Closure

Thuane thanked all the participants for attending the RAB meeting. The next RAB meeting is scheduled for Wednesday March 8th, 2017. The meeting adjourned at approximately 9:40 PM.

ATTACHMENT 1
Meeting Attendees – December 7, 2016

RAB Members	
RAB Community Members Present	RAB Community Members Absent
Ramón D. Figueroa, Community Co-Chair Rafael Montes Ismael Velázquez Luis A. Velázquez Rivera	Samuel Caraballo, Michael Dalton, José Julio Díaz, Jorge Fernández Porto, William Lourido, Lirio Márquez D'Acunti and Ramón M. Ríos Agustín Velázquez
Community Members Visiting	
Pedro Tejada Sr.	Pedro Tejada Jr.
William Sarriera	Angel Camacho
Juan R. Dávila	
RAB Agency Representatives	
Thuane Fielding, Navy Co-Chair	Navy – Base Closure Manager
Stacin Martin	Navy – Remedial Project Manager
Doug Pocze (absent)	Environmental Protection Agency, Region 2
Jessica Mollin (absent)	Environmental Protection Agency, Region 2
Vicente Quevedo (absent)	Department of Natural and Environmental Resources (DNER)
Juan Babá Peebles	Puerto Rico Environmental Quality Board (PREQB) – Federal Facilities Coordinator, Emergency Response Area
Gloria M. Toro Agrait	Puerto Rico Environmental Quality Board (PREQB) – Hazardous Waste Permits Division
Other Agency Representatives	
Malú Blázquez (absent)	LRA
Freddy de Jesús	LRA
Carlos E. Vivoni (absent)	LRA
Adalberto Molina	LRA
Ramón Lizardi	LRA
Manuel Martínez	Alianza Pro Desarrollo Económico de Ceiba (APRODEC)
Craig Lilyestrom (absent)	Puerto Rico Department of Natural and Environmental Resources
Santiago Oliver (absent)	Puerto Rico Conservation Trust (Para la Naturaleza)
Carlos Morales	Puerto Rico Conservation Trust (Para la Naturaleza)
Support Staff	
Pedro Ruiz	Navy
Jamie Butler	CH2M (Navy contractor – project manager)
Thomas Beisel	CH2M (Navy contractor – technical consultant)
Madeline Almodóvar	CH2M (Navy contractor – facilitator)
Daniel G. Concepción	CH2M (Navy contractor – support)