



FORMER NAVAL STATION ROOSEVELT ROADS Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Meeting Minutes

Club Cívico La Seyba, Ceiba, Puerto Rico
Meeting No. 15 - October 28, 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 6:30 p.m. Mark Davidson (RAB Navy Co-chair) welcomed the public and asked everyone to introduce themselves (see Attachment 1, *Attendance*).

II. Investigation and Cleanup Update: Mark Kimes – Baker Environmental

Mark Kimes summarized the status of the environmental investigations from August 20 through October 28, 2009 (see Attachment 2, *Presentations*, for more details).

Fieldwork (Investigations): Solid Waste Management Units (SWMUs) 1 and 2 Sampling

From September 8 through 17, 2009, we collected samples from SWMU 1 and SWMU 2 to further delineate soil contaminated with metals and pesticides. The data will be plotted on a map to delineate the “hot spots” (areas of the highest contamination) for an Interim Corrective Measure (ICM). At the same time, because the source of contamination is located in SWMU 1, large piles of soil and surface metal debris will also be removed. A work plan for the ICM will be sent for review by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the Puerto Rico Environmental Quality Board (EQB) in November 2009.

Fieldwork: Landfill Semiannual Groundwater Sampling

Twice every year, we take groundwater samples and monitor landfill gases. We took nine groundwater samples for volatiles and metal analysis. The EQB provided comments on the report in August 2009.

Reports Submitted:

Once these reports are approved, they will be available in the Administrative Record.

- **Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) Quarterly Progress Report.** This is a permit requirement for the work done on the entire Base, and it is updated every quarter. The last report was submitted in August 2009.
- **Area of Concern (AOC) F Draft Monitored Natural Attenuation (MNA) Year 7 Annual Report.** The annual report on groundwater sampling includes the data we gathered to determine if MNA continues to reduce the contamination at eight underground storage tank (UST) sites. The EPA agreed with the Navy’s recommendations to study the groundwater plume at Site 1738 further, to replace some groundwater wells at Sites 124 and 1738, and to reduce the frequency of sampling for polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) to once every 5 years.

- **Draft Statement of Basis for SWMU 68 (Former Southern Fire Training Area).** A Statement of Basis describes the proposed corrective measure for an environmental site. The public will have a chance to comment on this before EPA makes a decision. We are proposing to excavate approximately 555 cubic yards of surface soil in two hot spots contaminated with copper, lead, and zinc. The contaminated soil will be disposed of at a licensed, offsite facility.
- **SWMU 61 (Former Bundy Area Maintenance Facilities) Additional Investigation Letter.** This letter summarized the findings from the ongoing Corrective Measures Study (CMS). The Navy proposed additional sampling of surface soil, subsurface soil, and groundwater in the upland areas of SWMU 61 and additional sediment sampling from the adjacent freshwater wetland.
- **Draft Phase I RCRA Facility Investigation (RFI) Reports for SWMU 71 and SWMU 78.** The EPA and EQB approved these two reports. The regulatory agencies agreed with the Navy's recommendation to conduct further investigations (full RFIs) at both sites. The next step is to develop Full RFI Work Plans.
- **Work Plan for a Final Phase I RFI at SWMU 76.** The regulatory agencies also approved the work plan for the Final Phase I RFI at SMWU 76. That site will be ready for investigation once funding becomes available.
- **Final Semiannual Groundwater Monitoring Report for SWMU 3 – September 2009 sampling event.** The EQB provided their approval of the final semiannual groundwater monitoring report for the September 2009 sampling event.
- **Draft Semiannual Groundwater Monitoring Report for SWMU 3 – March 2009 sampling event.** The EQB agreed with the report's conclusions and recommendations. We expect to submit a final report in few weeks.
- **Draft Landfill Gas Monitoring Report for SWMU 3 – March 2009 monitoring event.** The EQB recommended future sampling events.
- **Draft Steps 6 and 7 of the Baseline Ecological Risk Assessment (BERA) for SWMU 1 (July 2009).** The EPA concurred with the Navy's recommendation for an ICM to remove contaminated surface soil hot spots. The Draft Final Report, including the BERA, will be submitted to the EPA and EQB in December 2009.
- **Draft Full RFI Report for SWMU 9 (Area B, Tank 214 Area) (July 2009).** The EPA concurred with the Navy's recommendation that a CMS is warranted. SWMU 9 is one of the sites used for fuel storage and the site was found during a soil removal action. Further delineation of contaminated areas is needed before the CMS and ICM can take place. A proposal for additional sampling will be submitted to the EPA and EQB in November 2009.
- **Draft Phase I RFI Report for SWMU 62 (February 2009).** After regulatory agency comments have been addressed, the Final Report will be submitted to the EPA and EQB.
- **AOC F (MNA sites), Year 7/Quarter 2 Report.** The report summarizes the findings from the groundwater sampling conducted in August 2009 to determine if MNA continues to reduce the contamination.

Reports Being Developed:

- **Airfield Soil Background Report Addendum.** This background document develops naturally occurring levels of metals in the soils at the airfield to compare against metals contamination at sites at the airfield to determine if the concentrations are background or a result of former Navy operations.
- **Freshwater Drainage Ditch Background Report.** This report summarizes findings from the freshwater drainage ditch sampling that was conducted in June 2009. SMWU 56 is the drainage ditch out of the airfield; we needed a background data set of the freshwater drainage to compare with the metals data to see if the metals concentrations are naturally occurring or are a result of former Navy operations.
- **Draft Phase I Report on the CMS Investigation for SWMU 74 (Fuel Pipelines and Hydrant Pits).** This report summarizes the findings from soil and groundwater sampling that was conducted along the underground fuel pipelines and valve pits of the bulk fuel system that runs from the tanks to the airfield and up to the piers.
- **Draft Project Closeout Report SWMUs 13, 46, 53, and AOC C.** These are all sites that have been successfully remediated. This closeout document includes the results of the samples taken after the soil was removed, the manifest from the disposal of the contaminated soil, and other information showing that the site has been cleaned and is ready to be closed.
- **Draft Steps 6 and 7 of the BERA for SWMU 2 (Langley Drive Disposal Site).** This includes the information for Draft Steps 6 and 7 of the BERA for SWMU 2.

Discussion:

- Lirio Márquez (RAB member): Why you are not doing groundwater studies at SMWUs 1 and 2? You are collecting surface and subsurface soil, but no mention of groundwater sampling.
- Mark Kimes: The groundwater was investigated early during the RFI Phase and nothing of concern was identified in the groundwater. We identified risks to ecological receptors, but the source did not come from groundwater; the contamination is related to the soils and sediments. So, we performed additional investigations on the soils and sediments, going from the uplands to the mangroves to the open waters, where we collected surface water and sediment samples.
- Lirio Márquez: Was the extent of the plume at Site 1738 identified?
- Mark Kimes: Not yet; this is why we are proposing further investigation. We have randomly placed wells installed to determine how large the plume is.
- Lirio Márquez: And that's the same situation with SMUW 9?
- Mark Kimes: We have a pretty good idea where the contamination is on SWMU 9, but there are a couple of areas that we haven't completely delineated. The site sits on a hill, which goes down into the mangroves, so we need to perform additional sampling in the mangroves at that site.

III. Restoration Update: Tom Beisel, CH2M HILL

We are taking some of the documents that Mark Kimes and his company have put together during the investigations to figure out how best to clean up three contaminated sites.

SWMUs 7/8 Cleanup:

The Tow Way Fuel Farm is located on a hillside along Forrestal Drive, north of Ensenada Honda. During the facility's operational history, numerous releases occurred from various storage fuel tanks.

The corrective action objective is to clean up the petroleum on these sites. We dug small pits, allowed groundwater to seep into them, and let them sit to wait for any signs of petroleum product. This is a great way to determine where the petroleum is, instead of installing expensive new groundwater wells. The pits have been there for over a month and we haven't seen any product. There are areas we are not able to get into, due to utilities, petroleum lines, power lines, communication lines, and sewer lines. We had also checked for petroleum product in all of the wells. The only places we are finding product is in the pipeline trenches.

We are addressing the surface soil contamination (arsenic and PAHs) and the groundwater contamination (free product). The goal is to reduce product thickness to 1/8 inch (0.01 feet), using natural attenuation parameters, to determine if MNA is a viable remedial action for the groundwater.

We are using two drill rigs to install product recovery wells up on the hill where all of the USTs are located. Once the wells are installed we will use a big truck with a large storage tank in the back to connect to the wells and vacuum petroleum product from groundwater. More wells will be installed if we find more petroleum product.

Additionally we are installing wells downgradient from the product recovery wells to be used to monitor the portion of the groundwater plume that may only contain dissolved petroleum and not free product. These are called MNA wells. Nature tends to try to clean up a lot of the contaminants by itself; we are encouraging the natural processes to clean up groundwater contamination.

SWMU 7/8 Product Investigation South of Forrestal Drive - Results:

To recover the product, 48 test pits were excavated to the water table and 11 test pits were completed as temporary sumps. The performance of solar-powered pumps and high vacuum-extraction will be evaluated with a pilot study using enhanced fluid recovery.

The fact that we are not finding a lot of product on the southwest side of Forrestal Drive is good evidence that natural processes are already working on the contamination. There may be free product contamination, which is raw petroleum sitting on the water table, and there could be contamination from petroleum product that is dissolved into the groundwater; these wells are trying to address this contamination. When we checked the temporary sumps, we observed oily sheens in three, but none of them had a product thickness greater than the Corrective Action Objective of 1/8 inch.

SWMU 54 (Naval Exchange Repair/Maintenance Shop (Building 1914) Cleanup:

The building was constructed in 1979, with fuel stored in a UST that was removed in December 1992. SWMU 54 has two plumes: one with benzene and the other one with trichloroethylene (TCE) contamination. Both are pretty well-defined plumes, not very big. We are making sure that we know the location and extent of these plumes so that we can design the adequate treatment in the proper area.

The TCE plume will be addressed with an anaerobic treatment process; by injecting a vegetable oil solution into the plume we will encourage the growth of special natural bacteria that will eat the TCE. It is more difficult for bacteria to degrade TCE than petroleum products, but these certain types of bacteria that live in low oxygen environments do very well eating or degrading the TCE. This is a

simple technology, but works very well. The options for the benzene plume include aerobic treatment or air sparging. For the benzene plume, we are conducting a pilot study of injecting a compound that releases oxygen into the aquifer that will aid in the breakdown of the benzene.

SWMU 55 Cleanup:

Before 1989, the building was used to store and maintain small watercraft. The depth of the TCE contamination ranges from 10 to 35 feet below ground surface. The cleanup method at SWMU 55 is different than the one used on SWMU 54, primarily because the concentrations are higher. We are performing a pilot study evaluating the use of in situ chemical oxidation, using potassium permanganate, to clean up the groundwater. To verify how the technology is working, we installed injection wells, collected samples from monitoring wells, and analyzed for TCE. We are installing a few other wells to make sure that we know the geometry of the plume and that we have good monitoring points when we inject the potassium permanganate.

Discussion:

- Jorge Fernández (RAB Member): When you mentioned free product thickness reduction to 1/8 inch, is that the remediation goal?
- Tom Beisel: For other contaminants, there is an actual limit you can use to establish your cleanup goal, but in this case we are talking about petroleum sitting on the groundwater. The EPA and EQB liked the idea of trying to clean up to the minimum thickness that you can measure with the equipment.
- Jorge Fernández: In other words, there is no technology to measure to a lower level, or is the restriction based on the money you want to spend to evaluate the thickness?
- Tom Beisel: I would say that once you get down to a level of 1 inch, at that point the bacteria are going to get rid of what is left.
- Jorge Fernández: This site is located close to the beach. Therefore, leaving a thickness of 1/8 inch of product means it is still possible that those hydrocarbons could reach the water, causing other effects that are not being evaluated right now.
- Mark Davidson (Navy): There is really no technology that can remove every last bit of petroleum. We discussed the different technologies to remove free product and selected vacuum extraction as the preferred alternative. We communicated with the regulators about setting a limit; 1/8 inch is the value we agreed to use to evaluate the pilot study, since we believe that the bacteria will take care of what is left.
- Jorge Fernández: Why do you use two different methods to treat TCE, oil for one site and permanganate for the other?
- Tom Beisel: At SWMU 54, the TCE is dissolved in the water, so by adding a food source (oil), the bacteria are able to live in the water and degrade and eat the dissolved TCE. At SWMU 55, the big difference is that we have a continuing source and pure TCE in the groundwater. If we use vegetable oil there, it would only take care of what's dissolved in groundwater. The permanganate will go after the free product *[which is not dissolved]*.
- Luis Velázquez (RAB Member): I think this is a superficial solution, because I understand that you don't really know where 90 percent of the product is. I know there were thousands of gallons

spilled on the surface; there was a lot of petroleum. You just have not found it. Will you be monitoring these sites indefinitely?

- Tom Beisel: In the handouts we distributed tonight, there is information on all the releases that occurred at these sites. What we know is that most of these releases occurred on the surface; few were underground. Thousands of gallons of fuel don't just inject themselves into the ground. During a spill, most of what is on the surface is either recaptured, evaporates, or bacteria could degrade it. This is exactly what this pilot study is trying to find out. I think, in this case, nature has been taking care of it. So far, we have only installed a couple of wells in this area. What we are finding is that, while there is some free product out there, so far we haven't seen any amount closer to 1 foot. We have only found small amounts of product. Perhaps we are talking about different sites?
- Rafael Montes (RAB Member): You are telling us that you are working as much as you can to decontaminate the tank areas. But in the future, if those sites are transferred to the municipal government and they decide to use those tanks again, another spill could occur, because the valves are old and are not being maintained. I imagine you are dealing with the contaminated soils but not the pipelines, so if the government reuses these tanks, the people could be exposed again.
- William Lourido (RAB member): Let's convert his comment into a question. After you finish your work with those tanks, can they be used again?
- Tom Beisel: I would say any kind of infrastructure left at the Base that has not been used and maintained should be inspected before any future use.
- Mark Davidson: There are a lot of regulations related to those fuel storage facilities. A certified inspector must conduct extensive inspections and a lot of work would need to be done before putting any fuel back into the tanks.
- Lirio Márquez: I know you have been doing annual inspections of the MNA sites and the final remediation of some of the sites will depend on the natural attenuation efficiency. How is this remedy working on sites where the pilot study has already been implemented? How long does it take to clean up the remnants of the product?
- Mark Kimes: The MNA sites have been in the program for about 7 years. The plumes are shrinking, so we know the contamination is decreasing in size. We will continue sampling for one or two more years and periodically reduce the sampling schedule until we see that there is no more petroleum product.
- Lirio Márquez: A comment about the benzene plume, I think I remember from the first documents that there was a laundry or a dry cleaning facility on that site.
- Pedro Ruíz (Navy): The laundry was located far away from these sites. We know that the contamination we are addressing is related to the car maintenance/washing operations and not from the laundry. There used to be an UST there, which we know is the source of the benzene. The tank was removed in the mid-1990s.
- Ramón Figueroa (RAB Community Co-Chair): Based on everything you are doing, how long would it take to be able to use that land for construction (buildings, offices)? This site is included in the parcels for sale or to be transferred.

- Tom Beisel: We are in the process of verifying and also trying to clarify exactly how much petroleum is in this area. The length of time for the cleanup really depends on how much we find out there, if there is 6 feet of product out there, then obviously it is going to take longer to clean it up. From the sampling results, and based on experience, I am actually very surprised at how well the site has already been able to clean itself up.
- Mark Davidson: It's hard to guess how long will it take for the groundwater; it could be years. Tom is also looking at soil problems on the site. Because people are directly exposed to the soil, we are removing all that can be harmful to human health. If we still have issues with the groundwater plume, before any transfer or sale can occur, there will be land use controls (LUCs) in place. These controls would allow the use of the surface, but not use of the groundwater (for drinking, watering grass, running it through your cooling system, etc). With LUCs, someone could develop this property; they could put a building on there, since there is no exposure to the groundwater.
- Rafael Montes: We heard that in Vieques, the investigation of the population's health was reopened. Why are we not talking about the impact on the workers on the base and on the civilian population around it? As we have seen during these meetings, there are contaminants in different parts of the Base where the employees have been exposed, whole families have been exposed. I see that the Congress has given importance to Vieques, which is well deserved, but they are leaving us behind and here people are dying of cancer, we are contaminated with heavy metals and no one is interested in addressing this serious problem.
- Daly Ávila (Visitor): When we started these meetings, one of our concerns was the existing contamination at Roosevelt Roads and the effects on the employees. Based on these findings that you are describing, are there health effects a result of the exposure to the contaminants you mention?
- Mark Davidson: Is your question related to the potential exposure to the contaminants related to the fuel farm?
- Daly Ávila: Most of the employees are contaminated with mercury, arsenic, cadmium; some of them have died; others are contaminated with asbestos. So in my mind, this means that they have been exposed to those contaminants.
- Mark Davidson: The Navy can't really address your concern about past exposure of people that worked on the Base. The work that we are doing here focuses on investigating environmental sites and any remaining contamination related to past Navy operations. Worker exposure falls under OSHA (Occupational Safety and Health Administration) or ATSDR (Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry), which focuses on existing public health issues. The Navy is in charge of the remediation, to make sure that if people use these areas in the future, there will be no exposure and no risk to human health or ecological resources.
- Luis Velázquez: About the use of sodium permanganate at SMWU 55, does this chemical have secondary effects that can affect us 10 years from now?
- Tom Beisel: No. Potassium permanganate is a common chemical that you can find in Home Depot or a pool supply company. It reacts very quickly when injected into the ground and it goes away very fast, in weeks, as it takes care of the contaminants. This site is by no means the first site where potassium permanganate has been used in this manner. It's been used for at least a decade at

similar sites. It would be actually more beneficial if it can stay in the ground a little bit longer, but it breaks down very fast.

IV. Role of the Puerto Rico Environmental Quality Board in the Cleanup: Wilmarie Rivera – EQB

The EQB is a member of the Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) cleanup team. We have been supervising to guarantee that Puerto Rico environmental regulations are met. We coordinate and participate in decision-making meetings to guarantee that EQB is actively participating in cleanup decisions. We review work plans and reports.

When the Navy prepares a Draft Work Plan, the agencies first discuss it in a meeting; then they send us a Draft Work Plan. The regulatory agencies (EQB and EPA) review it, approve it, or suggest changes. Depending on the comments, we start a negotiation process until all agencies reach consensus. The regulatory agencies then review the Final Draft Work Plan, to verify that our comments were incorporated. The work plan is finalized when we send the Navy a letter confirming that our comments were addressed. After the Final Work Plan has been approved, the Navy can start collecting samples. We also evaluate documents generated during the investigation and participate in oversight visits during sample collection.

Role of EQB in RCRA Corrective Actions:

Because this cleanup program is under RCRA, EPA as the lead agency has the final approval. EQB is a stakeholder who ensures compliance with Puerto Rico regulations and provides field oversight, working in close cooperation and coordination with EPA.

Used Tire Storage at the Ceiba's Airport:

At the last meeting, there was a concern about the tires stored at Hangar 200. That activity followed a resolution issued by the EQB's Government Board, which was effective until July 13, 2009, and extended for 90 days. The objective was to address the imminent hazard to human health and the environment posed by the excessive and illegal disposal of used tires on the island. Tires were collected and stored in different places. The tires stored at the Base were moved and now there are no more tires stored in Hangar 200. The storage of used tires in Ceiba (José Aponte de la Torre Airport) was performed and supervised by the Solid Waste Authority and the transportation was performed by different municipalities.

Discussion:

- Luis Velázquez (RAB Member): Has EQB visited the area where mangroves died, to see what the problem is? In previous meetings, I was told that the mangroves needed salt water, but 40 years ago there was no salt water and the mangroves were alive. The EQB or Department of Environmental and Natural Resources (DNER) need to see what is going on there.
- Wilmarie Rivera: We have not been directly involved with the investigations into the mangroves, but I promise to go to DNER for more information for the next meeting.
- Magdalena Rodríguez (Visitor): While this cleanup process is ongoing, what's going to happen with the community that is exposed to this continuing contamination? I would recommend that EQB get some help from the Health Department to advise the community on what to do to avoid further contamination.
- Wilmarie Rivera: I'll take your concern to the Department of Health.

V. Other Questions and Comments from the Public

- Luis Velázquez: I had two questions at the last meeting related to the reuse plan. I don't see anyone from the Local Reuse Authority (LRA) here tonight. I asked if they had a zoning plan under the new Caribbean Riviera development proposal. They should have been here with an answer. Did they give the Navy something?
- Mark Davidson: Freddy de Jesús normally is here representing the LRA, but I don't know where he is tonight. The Navy has not received a plan, mainly because the whole zoning process is related to gaming legislation, which is under Puerto Rican Legislature review. If special legislation is not approved, I think it's safe to say that the Caribbean Riviera is a dead deal. The LRA is telling us now that probably it will be May before any action is taken on this special legislation.
- Mark Davidson: The second part of your question related to the Army – we transferred the Army parcel two months ago – 54 acres to be used as an Army Reserve Center. Part of the BRAC 2005 decision was to consolidate some of the existing reserve centers onto the Base and that is in what was called the Moscript Area of the Base. Nobody lives out there; they are just using it for office space and going home at night. There's one SWMU out there, SWMU 73. It was part of the deal – the Army got the property but they also have to do the cleanup. They have been working with Baker Environmental and the Navy on the documents. The EPA and EQB will be part of that cleanup process.
- Daly Ávila: I want to let everyone know that on September 9, the Navy did not return to the Puerto Rican government the lands they were asking for, because the reserve was going to be there. If the Army Reserve is coming to Ceiba, are they going to use all of the Roosevelt Roads housing?
- Mark Davidson: The Army has no plans to use any of the housing on the Base, just the office space. The LRA was looking for ways to use the dry dock and was asking the army to give the LRA some of the land promised to the Army, which is located adjacent to the dry dock so as to enhance the potential future use of the dry dock by the LRA. But the Army had security concerns and was unwilling to give up this additional property adjacent to the dry dock. The Army was working with the LRA to see if they could come up with some kind of agreement, but the negotiations never came up with a viable solution. In September the Navy transferred the Moscript parcel to the Army Reserve. The LRA will eventually get the dry dock, which is located just outside the Moscript Army Reserve parcel..
- Daly Ávila: What has happened with the hospital?
- Mark Davidson: It has been transferred. I don't know what they are doing with it, but they have owned that property since June. The Department of Health and Human Services executed the deed and now the Episcopal Services owns the hospital.
- Ismael Velázquez (RAB member): It was mentioned that a study was going to be done about the drones that were said to be on the beach, but we never got more information.
- Mark Davidson: Those are the drones that were shot off from Cabras Island. The Navy's Environmental Condition of Property report found some contamination on the ground around the launch pads. Part of our investigation will be to determine if the propulsion part of the rockets actually came down into the ocean and eventually to see if they are still out there. The first phase of

the study is to look at Cabras Island, which is currently owned by the Coast Guard; the Navy has an agreement with the Coast Guard to use this land. The next phase will be to develop another work plan and to perform a more intensive investigation at Cabras Island.

- Ismael Velázquez: We are not talking about the sites from where the rockets were launched. We are talking of an area about 500 feet from Cabras, where there are thousands of canisters that were the propellers of the small airplanes (drones). There's no fishing allowed in this area, which is the major complaint of the fishermen. The problem is that those canisters were never picked up.
- Mark Kimes: The next investigation that will be done is to locate where those bottles are in the water and do further studies on them.

V. Adjournment

Several RAB members questioned the lack of participation from some members who had not attended the last several meetings; they should be removed from the list. Susana Struve (CH2M HILL) stated that Navy will work with Ramón Figueroa (RAB Community Co-chair) to issue a letter to those members, asking them if they are still interested and can participate before we remove them from the list.

The next RAB meeting is scheduled for January 13, 2010.

V. Ongoing Action Items

The following action items will be carried forward to the next RAB meeting.

Item	Description	Discussion	Status
#1	Talk with DNER about areas of dead mangroves	EQB (Wilmarie Rivera) and DNER	NEW
#2	Talk with the Department of Health about Roosevelt Roads worker exposures (question)	EQB (Wilmarie Rivera) and Department of Health	NEW
#3	Information about zoning under "Caribbean Riviera proposal"	Local Reuse Authority (Freddy de Jesús)	ONGOING after May 2010

ATTACHMENT 1 – Meeting Attendees – October 28, 2009

RAB Community Members Present	RAB Community Members Absent
Ramón D. Figueroa, Community Co-Chair	Carlos Brown
Luís A. Velázquez Rivera	Jimmy Concepción Robles
Lirio Márquez D'Acunti	Myrna Maldonado
Rafael Montes	Ramón M. Ríos
Agustín Velázquez Santos	Daniel E. González
Debra McWhirter	Noraida Vázquez Arce
William Lourido	Samuel Caraballo
José Díaz	Rogelio Figueroa
Jorge Fernández Porto	Ángel de Jesús Matta
Ismael Velázquez	
Mike Dalton	
Community Members Present	
Daly Ávila	María M. Ávila
Magdalena Rodríguez	Lionel Llano
José A. Candelaria	Gilberto Camacho
Cheito Mendoza	Ángel L. Colón
RAB Agency Representatives Present	
Mark Davidson, Navy Co-Chair.	Navy - BRAC Environmental Coordinator BRAC Program Management Office Southeast
Tim Gordon (absent)	US Environmental Protection Agency, Region 2 (EPA)
Wilmarie Rivera	Puerto Rico Environmental Quality Board (EQB), Federal Facilities Coordinator
Gloria M. Toro Agrait	EQB, RCRA Environmental – Permit Officer II Hazardous Wastes Permit Division
Santiago Oliver	Puerto Rico Conservation Trust
Elizabeth Padilla	
Other Agency Representatives	
Erwin Kiess Rivera (absent)	Director, (Local Reuse Authority [LRA])
Freddy de Jesús (absent)	LRA
CDR Daniel Kalal (absent)	Naval Activity Puerto Rico
Support Staff Present	
Pedro Ruiz	Naval Activity Puerto Rico
Susana Struve	CH2M HILL, Inc. (Navy Contractor – meeting facilitador)
Mark Kimes	Baker Environmental, Inc. (Navy Contractor)
Tom Biesel	CH2M HILL, Inc. (Navy Contractor)

ATTACHMENT 2 - Meeting Presentations- October 28, 2009
