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

**Club Cívico La Seyba, Ceiba, Puerto Rico**
**Meeting No. 24 – January 26, 2012**

***Note: This meeting summary is based on informal notes taken at the meeting. It is not intended as a verbatim transcript. 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. Welcome and Introductions

The meeting began at 6:30p.m. Mark Davidson, Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Navy Co-chair, welcomed the public and asked everyone to introduce themselves. (See Attachment A, Meeting Attendees.)

## II. Action Items from Last Meeting

Cabras Island Lighthouse – In the RAB meeting held September 28, 2011, a meeting participant asked what happened to the lens from the Lighthouse. Historical pictures found on the internet showed the Lighthouse with a lens in 1916, but a photograph taken in 1937 showed the Lighthouse without a lens. Mark Davidson called the Coast Guard in Miami, and the Coast Guard didn't know anything about it.

Ismael Velázquez asked Mark Davidson if the Navy could recreate the original Lighthouse. Everyone knew the lighthouse and was guided by it. If in Isla de Mona they are restoring the lighthouse restoration completely, why aren't they recreating it here? This is a historic site. Regardless of what you do to the island, why don't you recreate it?

Mark responded that it is a shame that the Lighthouse was destroyed. The Coast Guard is looking to sell this property, and the Navy would never restore the lighthouse in this economic climate. Also, Base Realignment and Closure laws require the Navy to clean up properties, but improvements to properties are not permitted.

## III. Phase I RFI SWMU 76/Boat Maintenance Facility – Major Carlos Cosme (Puerto Rico Army National Guard)

Mark Davidson, RAB Navy Co-Chair introduced Major Carlos Cosme, Puerto Rico Army National Guard (PRARNG). The Navy transferred the property to the PRARNG in January 2011, and the transfer agreement requires new owner to assume responsibility for cleaning up the site. Major Cosme told meeting attendees that a contract is currently in-place to investigate the site. The site investigation will be in adherence with the RCRA Facility Investigation work plan approved by the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the Puerto Rico Environmental Quality Board (EQB).

If the results of the investigation indicate contamination has originated from the Boat Maintenance Facility, the Army National Guard will implement an appropriate cleanup.



***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.*

Maj. Cosme said the PRARNG expects to finish clean up by next summer. They are currently planning a sampling effort. Ten sampling locations are planned, four will collect groundwater samples. The PRANG also will be installing three new wells. He said the PRANG doesn't have any more information at this time, but we wanted to present this sampling plan. If all goes well, the investigations on this SWMU could be completed by this summer.

**Discussion Points:**

William Lourido, RAB Member – Who will pay for this?

Major Cosme – The National Guard Bureau, which is federal money.

Naida Dávila, RAB Member -Have you done any investigations about archeological artifacts there?

Major Cosme – We checked with the Navy's plan and received clearance that there wasn't any cultural significance to this area.

Rafael Montes, RAB Member – About the groundwater wells: if you find anything that is contaminated, how do you tell if you contaminated it or if someone else contaminated the water?

Major Cosme – We have earlier studies to determine who has responsibility. We will clean it regardless of who is responsible.

Mark Davidson, Navy Co-Chair – All of the contamination of the fuel farm is north of this road. It has not impacted the side that he is investigating.

## IV. Investigation and Cleanup Status – Mark Davidson and Mark Kimes (Baker Environmental)

**Piñeros Island – Mark Davidson**

In 2011, the Navy conducted underwater investigations to see if munitions of concern are present. Divers studied three areas where the Navy may have practiced doing underwater demolitions (along the beach. One item was found that appeared to have a live explosive charge associated with it. The item was removed; the island is currently closed to the public until the Navy completes its investigation and cleanup. Once it is cleaned up, the Navy will transfer the property to the Department of Natural and Environmental Resources (DNER).

**Discussion Point**

William Lourido, RAB Member – When the Navy got the island it was clean; now the Navy is releasing it by checking only 10 percent and deducing that there are not munitions. A one hit rate for three locations seems high to me (in baseball, if a batter had that average, he'd be a millionaire). In all the years that this clean up has been going on, it seems to me that every inch would have been already investigated. Not performing a full cleanup is an insult to the Puerto Rican community.



***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.*

**Bulk Fuel Storage System Pipeline Grouting – Mark Kimes**

Many miles of pipeline are located within the Port Property (part of the EDC transfer), including the sale parcel and the airfield. This area contains six bulk fuel storage areas, including the Tow Way Fuel Farm. A number of these areas are already under investigation. Cut and cover tanks and aboveground storage tanks were used to store fuel. Pipelines transferred fuel from the fueling pier to the pump house and to different points on the base. Grouting the pipeline will seal the pipelines; they never will be able to be used again.

**SWMU 2 Interim Corrective Measure Soil Removal – Mark Kimes**

This SWMU is an approximately 28-acre abandoned, unlined waste pile/landfill. It protrudes into the mangroves of Ensenada Honda. SWMU 2 has undergone previous investigations. An ecological risk assessment was conducted, which is important given that it is so close to the wetlands. Investigations found metal debris. There has been work to remove surface debris (metals) while conducting the baseline eco risk assessment. The contaminated soil was removed to protect the habitat. The soil was found to be contaminated by metals – antimony, copper, lead and zinc – that came from the metal debris that was removed. Results of the confirmation sampling of the excavated areas identified areas requiring additional excavation.

**Discussion Points**

Ismael Velázquez, RAB Member – I remember about six months ago when there were excavations behind the hotel. There were loads of metals. As far as I know the area immediately behind the Navy lot has not yet been cleaned.

Pedro Tejada, RightWay Environmental. In SWMU 1, when the surface water rose due to heavy rains, we were not able to continue with the removal. We hope to finish this before April of this year.

Ismael Velázquez, RAB Member – You investigated the transformers storage area (SWMU 76). The excavation and sampling were supposed to be conducted but it has not been done yet.

Mark Kimes – Originally there was a little excavation that was done. Since then that turned in to a much larger investigation; this past summer we did an initial investigation, the data collected helped us further delineate the area. In September we had a meeting with EQB and EPA where we agreed to grab additional samples. The report on the data analysis is getting ready to be submitted to the regulators in a few weeks.

**SWMU 7/8 Tow Way Fuel Farm – Mark Davidson**

Mark Davidson provided a history of the tank farm. The Navy evaluated active and passive removal technologies and installed 25 wells with active technology to remove free product which floats on top of the groundwater. The Navy also will address groundwater contamination using monitored natural attenuation.

**Discussion Points**

Ismael Velázquez, RAB member – I don't want to appear to be a pessimist, but I think what you have installed here are small toys. How much time will it take for the entire product to be removed from the soils? How long will it take to neutralize it in years?



***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.*

Mark Davidson – It could take up to 30 years for a dissolved plume. That is why we have land use controls for the site. No one can use the water. We have control wells that are clean. If we get a spike in a control well, we know that the product is moving. We could throw a lot of money at the cleanup and it probably wouldn't speed the removal much at all – probably reduce it to 20 years. We selected the best economic and environmental sensitive alternative.

Mark Kimes – One million gallons is the total amount released. There were releases in ponds that were recovered. This doesn't necessarily mean that there is 1 million gallons in the ground. Lots of fuel was recovered. There were systems in place to control releases.

William Lourido, RAB Member – To calm my confusion, how many gallons have been recovered? Will the pumps you installed be there for years and years after you are gone? If so, who will pay for the cost and what do you expect?

Mark Davidson – Not all of the 1 million went into the ground. The Navy won't leave until EQB and EPA sign off that the Navy has completed the goals of the cleanup. Product recovery has been going on since the mid 1990s by bailing free product out of the site wells. More than 100,000 gallons were removed during the 1990s and going into the 2000s.

Luis Velázquez, RAB Member – The old power plant and this parcel are highly contaminated. There were releases throughout that area. Who will be responsible – who will ensure that no one touches this land? Are you going to seal the access to the airport?

Mark Kimes – In 1995/96 there was a large removal action to remove fuel releases at the old power plant (SWMU 45). The fuel lines going out to the airfield have been grouted. Fuel cannot be pumped through the fuel lines. These areas have all been investigated.

Mark Davidson – The Airport Authority paid the Navy $600,000 so we can re-delineate the area of SWMU 69 after they violated the land used controls. We will continue to check the site annually. After evaluating the risk, we decided to transfer the parcel with controls in place to bring economic benefit. The system (land use controls) we have is not perfect, but it was worth it to get the property turned over to the Airport Authority for reuse instead of waiting 40/50 years.

Naida Dávila, RAB member – Is the fine that was imposed on Airport Authority similar to other situations when airports have violated land use agreements?

Mark Davidson – It wasn't a "fine" per se, they just needed to pay the Navy to re-assess the site after they violated the land use controls affecting the site; the estimated cost was $600,000. The Airport Authority paid for the new investigation and data collection/analysis and for additional soil that will be required to be removed.

Ismael Velázquez, RAB Member – SWMU 45. What was done there?

Mark Kimes – There were follow on investigations in the mid 1990s – near the cooling water intake tunnel – soil/subsurface/water – samples were collected. We found that the previous work took care of the contamination and that there is no risk to humans or ecological receptors at that site.

Ismael Velázquez, RAB Member – In February 2004, a pipe that went to the treatment plant broke; they excavated and found sludge, I thought that it was petroleum, it was sticky. Two employees were there and covered it back up.

Mark Davidson – Was anyone notified about this? Was it reported?



***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.*

Miguel Cruz, employee at WWTP – What was found looked like petroleum, and workers took pictures and did not follow up with the issue..

- **ACTION ITEM** – Follow up on what was found at the WWTP.

**SWMU 60. Landfill at the Marina - Environmental Conditions – Mark Kimes.**

Mark Kimes provided a history and the location of SWMU 60. Potential contamination from a disposal area was found and a Phase I RCRA RFI was conducted in 2009. Detailed information of the findings by media (contaminant distribution) was provided on the handouts, if there are questions, we will be discussing them at the next meeting. EPA and EQB are reviewing the Draft Sampling and Analysis Plan.

**Discussion Points**

Naida Dávila, RAB member. Being that this is a bit complicated and since the English is the official document, I want to make sure the translation is accurate. I think there are discrepancies between the Spanish and the English versions.

- **ACTION ITEM** - Susana Struve –Susana will call Naida to review the English text and its translation.

Ramón Figueroa, RAB Community Co-chair –There are lots of people interested in the Marina, I talked to Mark Davidson and asked him to talk about this site specifically so we can know a little more about the environment there. My question is from an environmental perspective: should the Marina investigation be expanded?

Mark Kimes – From the data collected thus far, low levels of contamination are showing up but they are minor. The investigation couldn't be expanded until we finalized these results.

Ramón Figueroa, RAB Community Co-chair – I was told that a spokesperson for the Marina said the exact opposite. He (spokesperson) said that the speed boats left a lot of contamination.

Ismael Velázquez, RAB Member – several contaminants were found near the Marina. Can those contaminants affect fish, mollusks, and crustaceans? How does this all affect marine life and people using the water?

Mark Kimes – During the investigations, wetlands, water and sediment from Ensenada Honda were analyzed from the upland all the way out to see if any of the releases migrated first into the mangrove and then the open water. Samples obtained have been evaluated with an eco risk assessment (ERA) that includes several potential receptors – birds, mammals, and fish. We found out that there are not contaminants of concern in the open water. The ERA was developed to determine whether there was risk to ecological receptors. A human health risk assessment was also conducted.

Magda Garret, Community Member – We have photos of manatees and turtles and mangroves. We understand that they want to expand and dredge the Marina. How do we protect the turtles and mangroves?

Mark Davidson – The Navy is retaining ownership of this area because we are investigating the site. We will release the property to the Local Reuse Authority (LRA) – Commonwealth of Puerto Rico when cleanup work is complete. If they want to make improvements to the property now under their lease agreement, they need to get our OK to do it. They would probably wait until we're done to



***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.*

propose any expansion. If they want to dredge down there, the Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) needs to get involved and provide the permits that are needed. In that sense, there are safeguards in place to protect the marine species and mangroves in this site.

Ramón Rios, RAB Member– I have four newspaper reports that talk about what they want to do in the dry forests in Guanica, including having All Tetrrein Vehicles (ATVs) going through there. Did the Fish and Wildlife Service tell the Navy about what is planned to be done in that area?

Mark Davidson – The Navy is not aware of the articles nor do we know the specifics what the LRA may want to do in this area.

Question from the RAB –Are the waste water treatment plants being closed down?

Mark Davidson – Even the Navy was surprised to find this out. We figured that PRASA would continue to run the plant but about a month ago the Commonwealth told us they'd rather shut the plants down. They're going to truck the sewage. That was the Commonwealth's decision. The water plant is operational. I understand they're going to run the plant for awhile. Not sure what their long term plans are.

Naida Dávila, RAB member – My question is for Wilmarie, EQB – Do the Navy's criteria to conduct investigations and analyze the data coincide with the EQB's criteria?

Wilmarie Rivera, EQB – If we don't have criteria established, the Navy and EQB follow EPA's criteria. If our own criteria are more restrictive, the Navy has to follow our standards. Before the Navy starts field sampling , we make sure that they comply with established criteria for each parameter, including the laboratory analysis methods . This information is included in the Work Plan that the regulatory agencies review and approved before the Navy can go to field and start taking samples.

## V. Economic Development Conveyance and Property Transfer Update – Mark Davidson (Navy)

Mark Davidson reviewed EDC sites, describing the ones with controls and the ones that will be sell out but won't be transferred until the cleanup is complete.

Luis Velázquez, RAB Member – Parcel 28 after the Marina: why is it blue on the map? Here is says that blue areas are for sale. That particular parcel is supposed to belong to DNER.

Mark Davidson – We made a mistake. Luis is right. Parcel 28 should be shaded as conservation (grey).

Rámon Figueroa, RAB Community Co-Chair –5 port properties and the docks: have they been transferred? The LRA wants to bring cruise ships.

Mark Davidson – Yes they have been transferred.

Samuel Caraballo, RAB Member – Can you show us on the map these sites where the LRA can do whatever they want.

Corrective action complete without controls – SWMU 5, SWMU 38, SWMU 40, SWMU 47, SWMU 49, SWMU 52, 53, 58, AOC D, SWMU 19, 41, SWMU 50, SWMU 72, SWMU 21, SWMU 22, SWMU 24, SWMU 36

**Auction of Parcels 1 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.*

Mark Davidson described sale parcels 1 and 2. The auction is planned to begin 13 February 2012.

**"Indian Rock" Petroglyph Transfer – Mark Davidson**

The Navy will assign the 68 acres first to the Department of the Interior (DOI). DOI will then transfer the 68 acres to DNER for conservation. All parties have agreed, so we'll go through the process that would help protect this special site.

**Discussion Points**

Rafael Montes, RAB Member– People are telling us that we are supposed to know what is being done on the base related to the cleanup. Can you please tell us how much has been spent in clean up? About grouting the pipeline, how much will be spent on that? Until you tell the people how much has been spent, people will continue to think that nothing has happened.

Mark Davidson – The estimate for grouting the pipeline is $800,000.

Mark Kimes – So far, the Navy has spent around $40 million on the clean up.

Ramón Figueroa, RAB Co-chair – The LRA said that they have plans to use the tanks but the Navy has said that the pipeline has been sealed. All of Puerto Rico knew of the negotiation between the Navy and Government through the Association of Defense Communities. The community has to reclaim our rights to involved in the re-use decision making process. We are talking about an individual right and not a political one.

William Lourido, RAB Member –When I first came to a meeting it was full of people. There used to be community groups participating. I then said if the community doesn't rise up, the land will be lost and be sold to others. And that is happening. I suggested we create a fund where each citizen donates $365 to raise the original $2 million asking price to buy Roosy Roads when the first auction was opened. Now it is too late.

## VI. CLOSURE

Susana Struve (facilitator) – Thanked participants for attending and announced the next RAB meeting will be held on May 2, 2012, at the Club Cívico La Seyba, if available. She reminded RAB members to call ahead or send an alternate, if they can't attend. Contact Ramón Figueroa, RAB Community Co-Chair with discussion topics for the next meeting. The meeting adjourned at 8:15 p.m.



***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.*

# ATTACHMENT A – Meeting Attendees – January 26, 2012

| RAB Community Members Present | RAB Community Members Absent |
|---|---|
| Samuel Caraballo | Lirio Marquez D'Acunti |
| Naida Dávila | Jorge Porto Fernández |
| Michael Dalton | Ramón M. Ríos |
| Ramón D. Figueroa, Community Co-Chair | Debra McWhirter |
| William Lourido | Agustín Velázquez |
| Ismael Velázquez | |
| Luís A. Velázquez Rivera | |

| Community Members Visiting | |
|---|---|
| Lucas Alturet | Carmen Guerrero |
| Antonio Avila | Ivette Hernandez |
| Angel L. Colon | Manuel Martinez |
| Juan R. Dávila | Idalia Mendez |
| Marilyn del Manzano | Elizabeth Padilla |
| Magda G. Garret | Marina Sandes |
| Soledad Gaztambide | Pedro Tejada |

| RAB Agency Representatives | |
|---|---|
| **Mark Davidson, Navy Co-Chair** | BRAC Environmental Coordinator - BRAC Program Management Office Southeast |
| Tim Gordon (absent) | EPA, Region 2 |
| Wilmarie Rivera | EQB, Federal Facilities Coordinator |
| Gloria M. Toro Agrait | EQB, Hazardous Waste Permit Division |
| Carlos Cosme – Manuel Medina | Puerto Rico Army National Guard |
| Santiago Oliver (representative) / Neida Pumarejo Cintrón (absent) | Puerto Rico Conservation Trust |

| Other Agency Representatives | |
|---|---|
| Jaime Lopez (absent) | Director, Local Reuse Authority (LRA) |
| Freddy de Jesús (absent) | LRA |
| Thuane Fielding (absent) | BRAC Program Management Office Southeast |
| Commander Daniel Kalal | Naval Activity Puerto Rico |

| Support Staff | |
|---|---|
| Mark Kimes | Baker Environmental, Inc. (Navy contractor – Installation Restoration Program) |
| Pedro Ruiz | Naval Facility Engineering Command (NAVFAC) |
| Leticia Solaun | CH2M HILL (Navy contractor) |
| Susana Struve | CH2M HILL, Inc. (Navy contractor – meeting facilitator) |



***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.*