



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

Club Cívico La Seyba, Ceiba, Puerto Rico
Meeting No. 16 - January 13, 2010

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 Comments

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. Action Items from Last Meeting

1) Talk to the DNER about the dead mangroves – Wilmarie Rivera (EQB)

EQB is coordinating a site visit with the DNER Secretary's Assistant to inspect the site. The visit is programmed for the end of January or beginning of February.

2) Meet with Department of Health – Wilmarie Rivera (EQB)

EQB has various issues to discuss with the Department of Health. A letter was sent in December 2009 to the Health Department Secretary requesting a meeting. We are waiting for an answer and will follow up on that request.

3) Zoning under the Caribbean Riviera proposal – Mark Davidson (Navy)

Mark Davidson spoke with the new Local Reuse Authority (LRA) Executive Director and learned that they are scheduling a public meeting on February 8th in Ceiba. They want to talk with the community about what's going on with the Caribbean Riviera. That will be your chance to ask questions. Mark will share any updates with Ramón Figueroa (RAB Community Co-Chair).

III. Investigation and Cleanup Update: Mark Kimes, Baker Environmental

Mark Kimes summarized the status of the environmental investigations from October 2009 through January, 2010. (See Attachment 2, Presentations, for more details.)

Fieldwork (Investigations)

AOC F Sampling Event

We completed another quarterly round of sampling at AOC F the week of November 9th. At Site 124, we collected a groundwater sample from one of the monitoring wells and analyzed it for MTBE. Samples from two wells at Site 2842B and from four wells at Site 1738 were analyzed for volatiles, total petroleum hydrocarbons, methyl sulfate, dissolved oxygen, and ferrous iron. These analyses will help us determine whether or not the natural attenuation is working at the site.

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.

The laboratory analysis and the third party data validation have been completed. We also have completed the development of the document presenting the results which was submitted to the EPA and EQB on January 6th, 2010.

Cleanup Activities

Tow Way Fuel Farm (Sites 7/8)

Since our last meeting, nine petroleum product recovery wells and 10 monitored natural attenuation wells (MNA) were installed. As discussed at the last meeting, 11 sumps on the 48 test pits were installed to try to pull the product out of the ground and to measure the thickness of the petroleum product found. The corrective action objective for petroleum on the groundwater is 1/8"; none of the temporary sumps had any product greater than that.

We will continue installing product recovery wells around the MNA wells for the next few months. If petroleum product is found, we will go further out across the site to make sure they are capturing any product that is in the groundwater out there.

We will evaluate the performance of solar-powered pumps and the high vacuum extraction technology in late January or February. We will perform a product recovery test, using enhanced fluid recovery, in January. We will continue to recover product until they get to the corrective action objective of 1/8" in the well. Quarterly sampling of the wells at the Tow Way Fuel Farm will continue. As part of this cleanup effort, new wells have been installed at the benzene plume.

SWMU 54

At this site, we are evaluating if the oxygen release compound is appropriate as a remedy to address the higher benzene concentrations being detected in the groundwater. If it is appropriate, this compound will be used in a full-scale application to clean up the benzene. The benzene concentrations will be monitored over time to determine whether or not this method is working successfully. If not, we will start looking at another option, which may include air stripping or soil excavation.

Discussion

- Jorge Fernandez Porto (RAB Member): Were those higher benzene concentrations found after using the oxygen release compound, or were the concentrations higher than what this methodology can manage?
- Mark Kimes: I am not 100% sure. Before the injection, some additional wells were installed. I believe when they sampled those wells, we saw higher concentrations in a different area than what was found in historical data from years ago. When they sampled those wells again, the benzene concentrations were higher over time, and the contamination in the groundwater had increased. That is why they are doing a pilot study, to find out if the oxygen release compound will be enough to clean up the benzene.

SWMU 55

This site has a TCE plume. Recently they installed and collected samples from four injection wells and 10 monitoring wells in a small area at the site. They also performed an aquifer test to measure how quickly the water moves underground at this site. That information is used to

calculate how much compound they need to inject into the groundwater and how fast it will move across the site to clean up the TCE.

10,000 gallons of potassium permanganate solution were injected into the groundwater. The injection radius was measured to determine the injection rates for the cleanup of that site. We are currently assessing how long the potassium permanganate stays in the subsurface, removing the TCE. If the TCE concentrations decrease quickly, more potassium permanganate will be added to continue attacking the contamination in the groundwater. The TCE concentrations will continue to be monitored over time to determine how well this technology is working.

Reports Submitted

Final Phase I RFI Report for SWMU 62. Submitted to the EPA and EQB on October 29, 2009. The document recommends a full RFI for the site to be able to characterize the nature and extent of site metal contamination in the surface and subsurface soils.

Final Semi-Annual Groundwater Monitor Report for SWMU 3. Submitted on October 29, 2009. This report covered the results from the March 2009 sampling event at the Solid Waste Landfill on the Base; recommends continuing the semi-annual monitoring of groundwater at the landfill.

Draft Sampling Analysis Plan for SWMU 77 Report. Submitted on November 6, 2009. It was developed to investigate the potential munitions constituents and munitions and explosives of concern for surface and subsurface soils at the Small Arms Range.

Draft Phase I Interim Corrective Measure Work Plan for SWMUs 1 & 2. Submitted on November 19, 2009. This is the work plan to remove the piles of metals and debris at SWMUs 1 and 2 and to delineate the extent of surface soil contamination at the Army Cremator Disposal (SWMU 1) and Langley Drive Disposal (SWMU 2). We expect to begin removing the metal debris at SWMU 1 in January 2010.

Final Phase I RFI Report for SWMU 70. The report was submitted to EPA and EQB on November 19, 2009. This report recommends a full RFI to delineate the contamination at the Former Disposal Area west of the landfill. The contaminants identified were metals in the surface soil, metals in the subsurface soil, metals in the sediments of the mangroves, and volatile organic compounds and metals in the groundwater.

Draft Corrective Measures Implementation Design and Work Plan for SWMU 68. Submitted on November 9, 2009. This site is ready to be cleaned up. The metals contamination has been delineated and we are going to dig up the soils, because there is a risk to the ecological receptors. The soil removal will begin once we get approval from EPA and EQB on the plans submitted.

Discussion

- Jorge Fernández Porto: At SWMUs 1 & 2, we are talking about two old landfills where for a long time unknown materials were deposited and have been undisturbed for 30, 40, 50 years. What is the environmental risk that could result from removing the debris?

- Mark Kimes: In our investigations, we have identified some areas with really high levels of metals in the soil. We decided that the best approach is to get rid of that high contamination, then reevaluate the site. The first step is to remove the piles of metal debris, especially at SWMU 1, which is the source of the contamination. Then we can further delineate the “hot spots” (areas with high contamination). Once the debris piles have been removed, we can do some sampling to really find out where the highest contamination is located, before we start digging. The area is close to the mangroves and we don’t want any contamination to be leaching out. We also found a combination of a few metals in those hot spots, so by digging up the soils we are going to remove a lot of the contamination at once.
- Jorge Fernández Porto: From what I can read from the handouts, you have found high levels of acetone in sediments. Acetone is a very volatile compound. How can you explain the high levels of acetone in surface sediments? And did you find high concentrations of cobalt and vanadium?
- Mark Kimes: Those concentrations are measured in parts per billion. Most likely the acetone concentrations are not related to the site contamination. The soil and sediment samples were collected with what we call “terra core” sample kits. Also, acetone is a common laboratory contaminant; it is used to clean glass. Therefore, acetone is not a real concern. The concern in the sediment was the cobalt; we did find some cobalt in the soils and I also believe some cobalt in the estuarine wetland. This was one of the comments we received from one of the agencies, so we jointly decided to further evaluate the cobalt in our next round of sampling, to help us determine if the concentrations are related to the site.
- RAB member: How much did you investigate outside the fire zone?
- Mark Davidson: We haven’t started that investigation yet. The first part is what we called Phase I RCRA Facility Investigation, which focuses on areas with high potential contamination. We will be investigating near the locations where they actually shot the guns. We have an aerial photograph, which indicates that there might be an area potentially used for open burning of munitions.

Draft Full RFI Report for SWMU 9 (Area B, Tank 214). Responses to EPA and EQB comments submitted on November 19, 2009. The regulators made very good comments about the risk assessments. We made some modifications to the report and jointly agreed that we need to do more sampling in additional areas, to make sure that we fully delineate the contamination of the subsurface soil and the mangrove sediment at the site.

Draft Phase I of the Corrective Measure Study Investigation Report for SWMU 74. Submitted on November 19, 2009. The site consists of the fuel pipelines and valve pits for the bulk fuel storage facilities on the base. This site covers a lot of ground, a big portion of the base. Since this is such a large site, we divided it into five areas just to make it a little more manageable: SWMU 9 Area B, SWMU 9 Area C, JP5 Hill, DFM (Diesel Fuel Marine) Area and Fueling Pier Area. This investigation did not cover sites 7 and 8, because those sites are already in the cleanup phase. Phase I was the initial investigation.

The report recommends going back to each of these areas for more soil and groundwater sampling to determine how much contamination is out there and if it is widespread or not. During Phase II, we will delineate the contamination that might have come from the fueling

system operations. After the delineation, we will continue with a corrective measure study to determine the best way to clean up any potential contamination at the site.

- Jorge Fernández Porto: [Referring to a photo shown] The yellow spots mark some kind of fuel found near the pipelines. Why are some of them bigger than others, do they represent a larger extension of contaminants?
- Mark Kimes: There's a larger "blob" in the area we called SMWU 9A; Tanks 212 and 213 are located there and I believe three or four valve pits also there. Because of this, we installed more borings and more wells where we identified petroleum product. When we made those "blobs", we made an estimate on how far out we think the additional sampling is needed, so the "blobs" in these areas are a little bigger in size.
- Luis Velazquez (RAB Member): I understand that you have a tank area marked as highly contaminated near the airfield. Why are you not doing anything there, even though there are Port Authority personnel working near that area? Who's going to take out that tank and clean up the contamination? When the airport was transferred the contamination was also transferred and nobody is cleaning anything there.
- Mark Davidson: The Navy is responsible for cleaning up all sites within the airfield. SWMU 74 is one of the sites we are working on and is part of this area. This is just the first phase of the investigation. We have identified that there is contamination on the subsurface soil there and maybe on the groundwater. We are following the regular process to investigate Sites 74, 68, 69, 56, and 14. We are very diligently following the process to get rid of those contaminants and to clean up these sites. If we thought that there was imminent danger to an individual at a particular site, we would go in and do what we call an interim corrective measure. The contamination that we are seeing there is not at that point, so we are able to let the process work the way it is intended to work for these sites.
- Mark Davidson: About Port Authority workers being exposed to contaminants, remember that when the deed was transferred to the Port Authority, it has specific land use controls that prohibit them to develop or work on those sites until the cleanup is completed. The Navy has been inspecting the site every three months, as good faith to assist the Port Authority. Every time we come to Ceiba for a public meeting, Mark Kimes and I go out to the airport and we schedule a meeting with the Port Authority; we drive around with them and inspect every single site at the airfield. That reminds them to stay away from the site, and obey the restrictions. We think that this process is working very well. If you recall, about a year ago, there was an issue at the airfield when the Port Authority dug into two of our sites. By making these inspections, we decrease the likelihood that this happens again. We are being very diligent working with the process and we are doing our best to make sure the people are protected.
- Luis Velázquez: If there are contaminated areas within the airfield, I believe you should make them a priority because the exposure of the public and people working there.
- Mark Davidson: The sites are in areas at the airfield without access to passengers and people working at the airport. People are not exposed to these sites.
- Ismael Velázquez (RAB Member): The runway area where the firemen trained is not at the end of the runway, as shown on your map; it is near the Crash Crew building, where the

firemen servicing the runway were. I would like to know the difference between that site and the one we have been talking about.

- Mark Kimes: What you just talked about is what we call Site 14. We know this area very well. It is at the Crash Crew area, and it was the fire training pit. After reviewing all the records we learned that at the end of Site 14 there was the original fire training pit. We also learned about the different types of fuel that they dumped. Later they updated/replaced that fire training pit and used another area for this activity for about a year. Once we get the approval on the background document we are going to use the data in that report to address this area.

RCRA Quarterly Progress Reports. Submitted on November 24, 2009. It shows the progress every quarter for each site. It also contains the Quarterly Progress Report for the Fuel Recovery Process that has been ongoing for many years at the Tow Way Fuel Farm.

Draft Final Steps 6 & 7 of the Baseline Ecological Risk Assessment for SWMU 1 (Army Cremator Disposal Site). Submitted on December 1, 2009; includes response to EPA and EQB comments. The report recommends removing metal debris and delineating hot spots of contaminated soils at SMWU 1 (as discussed earlier). Then that site would move into the Corrective Measures Study stage, where we identify what remaining elements needed to be cleaned up. This report also recommends that the sediments in Ensenada Honda be designated as “corrective action complete without land use controls.” We did not find any contaminants at that site, so there is no risk to any of the ecological receptors and we will no longer be looking at the open waters sediments in relation to SWMU 1.

Draft Report for the Baseline Risk Ecological Assessment for SWMU 2. Submitted to EPA and EQB on December 4, 2009. The report recommends an interim corrective measure for the removal of the hot spots of the metal contamination in the surface soil at SWMU 2 and then to move the site from an Interim Corrective Measure into a Corrective Measures Study.

Draft Project Closeout Report for the Remedial Action for Soil Remediation. Submitted on December 4, 2009. Includes the cleanup activities for Site 9, Site 13 (Pest Control Area), Site 46 (Transformer Storage Pad), Site 53 (Malaria Control Shop) and Area of Concern C (Transformer Storage Pad). This is a closeout report that shows that all the contamination was removed from those sites and that the corrective actions objectives were met. Clean soil was used to fill in the excavation area. This corrective action is complete.

Final Annual Report for AOC F (MNA Sites). Submitted on December 30, 2009. Includes groundwater sampling to determine if the natural attenuation continues to reduce the contamination at the eight underground storage tank sites, which make up AOC F. The document addressed the comments received at the end of September.

Final Second Quarter Report for Year 7 on AOC F. Submitted on December 30, 2009; addresses the regulators’ comments on Sites 124 and 2842B. Continued sampling is recommended to monitor the total petroleum hydrocarbons (TPH) and BTEX (a petroleum-related compound), as well as the low level of MTBE (another petroleum-related chemical) detected in the groundwater. The report recommends continuing the quarterly monitoring to monitor BTEX and TPH compounds at site 1738 and to develop a proposal to address the MTBE plume. At Site 735, we will continue sampling for volatile organic compounds and TPH diesel range compounds to determine if we need to install additional wells.

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.

Draft Semi-Annual Monitoring Report at the Solid Waste Landfill. Submitted on December 30, 2009; presents the results of sampling conducted in September 2009. During that sampling event one compound, nickel, exceeded our overall projection limit for the landfill. The recommendation is to continue monitoring it in the next round, to see if this compound still there or if it was an isolated detection in the groundwater.

Draft Year 7 Quarter Three Report for AOC F. Submitted on January 6, 2010. In that quarterly event we sampled wells at three of the six sites; it recommends continuing with the quarterly sampling to monitor TPH, BTEX, and the low-level MTBE concentration. Once funding becomes available, we will replace some of the wells at that site. At Site 1738, benzene was detected in the down gradient well in the previous quarter but was not detected during the BTEX quarterly sampling event. The report recommends continuing the quarterly monitoring for BTEX and TPH and developing a proposal to address the MTBE contamination in the groundwater.

Background Soils Concentrations at the Airfield. Submitted on January 6, 2010 as an addendum to our Inorganic Background Document for the Base. This document will be used to evaluate the data for all the sites on the airfield, Sites 14, 56, 69, 68, 74, and the east side of the airfield.

Site 61- Corrective Measure Study Investigation. Submitted on January 8, 2010. A request was made for additional sampling at this site. When this investigation was done, it was determined that the contamination was not fully delineated. After talking with EPA, the Navy proposed to do additional sampling to make sure that all contamination was delineated, and to present those findings in the Corrective Measure Study Report.

Comments received from the regulators

On November 18, 2009 we received comments from EQB on our Draft AOC F Year 7, Second Quarter document. After the comment was addressed, EQB approved the document.

On December 15, EPA made comments on the proposal for additional sampling at SWMU 61 and SMWU 62. We are in the process of addressing those comments. We also received comments on the Final Phase I RFI Report for Site 70; after addressing EQB's comments, we received their approval. EPA provided contingent approval on the report, pending the analysis for cobalt for soils.

IV. Re-Use Update: Mark Davidson, Navy

The Dry Dock and its Nomination as a Historical Site

The dry dock was not transferred to the Army. The Dry Dock is part of the Science Park Parcel and is intended to be transferred to the LRA. The dry dock is adjacent to the property transferred to the Army. Currently, the Navy has a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) with the Puerto Rican State Historical Preservation Office (SHPO), which identifies what properties on the base have historical, architectural, or cultural significance and any special requirement for the preservation of those sites. The Dry Dock was listed as eligible for inclusion on the National Register for Historical Places.

SHPO stated that transferring this site will cause an adverse effect. They know that once it leaves the Navy's hands it has the potential to be damaged or may not be protected anymore.

To mitigate this adverse effect, SHPO requested the Navy to provide the architectural drawings and pictures of the dry dock to document the structure's significance. We complied with that request; so as far as the SHPO is concerned, the Navy has done everything they needed to do. When we get ready to transfer it, we will have notices in the deed stating that "the Dry Dock is eligible for the National Register of Historical Places" and that it should be treated as such. LRA will have to consult with the SHPO if they want to change or develop the dry dock.

- Ramón Figueroa (RAB Community Co-chair): I requested a discussion on this topic because we heard rumors that there are plans to develop the Dry Dock into a shipyard.

Detailed Environmental Site and Structure Report about Fuel Tank Sites

Last October we discussed that the Navy has no intention to ever use these tanks, nor the associated pipelines. In November, the LRA approached us and told us that they are interested in using the tanks located on JP5 Hill. That decision is not really up to the Navy. If someone wants to use them after the transfer, the new owner would have to do the required inspections and testing to determine the integrity of the tanks and the pipelines. As long as the Navy owns the property, the Navy has no intention of letting anybody use those tanks. This property is intended to go to the Port Authority or to the LRA.

Discussion

- Agustín Velázquez: Would the Navy continue to use the tanks if the base had not closed?
- Mark Davidson: When the base was operational, all the tanks went through periodic inspections. If they passed and met all the specifications, they were used. If they did not pass the inspections, it would have been necessary to build new ones.
- Jorge Fernández Porto: My concern is not about the future use of the tanks, but about Agustín's question. If the base were still operating, contaminant releases from the Navy operations would still be occurring. I don't know the criteria used to determine if the tanks passed the inspections, but I am certain that potential release of contamination was not one of the criteria.
- Mark Kimes: The Navy was aware of some problems associated with the system, so they made some improvements. My company was contracted to do some additional work on the tanks to help upgrade the facility, but then that contract was cancelled when the base closed. The point is that the Navy was constantly trying to make improvements to the system to take care of any problems during all the years of operation.
- Mark Davidson: I understand that when a new pipeline was installed, it is required to use a double wall pipe, so that if there is a spill, the product will remain within the second wall.
- Pedro Ruiz (Navy): The Navy was aware of the potential contamination coming from the tanks. That is one of the reasons that we have all these sites identified. The Navy has been addressing this issue for several decades; the leaks from the tanks have been addressed for a long time.
- Ramón Figueroa: I was part of the Armed Forces in the 70s and 80s and during those years the last concern of the Armed Forces, Navy or Army, was protecting the environment. It was in the 80s, when the emphasis on the environmental regulations started. I am not justifying anything, there's still a lot to do, but they have made significant progress.

- Mark Davidson: Ramón is right, it wasn't just the Army, Navy or the Air Force, it was also companies like Exxon, Mobil, utility companies and others. It was the way it was done back then, you had waste and, you took it to your backyard and threw it into the woods. But things have changed and the Navy has learned and is getting a lot better. The regulatory agencies, including EPA and EQB, are regulating these issues.

Economic Development Conveyance (EDC) Application

This refers to an application from the LRA asking the Navy for some property. In May 2009, the LRA submitted an EDC application for the Science Park Parcel, the University Parcel, the three Wastewater Treatment Plants, the Water Treatment Plant, the Fire Station and a Bowling Alley. Later, the LRA came up with the concept of the Caribbean Riviera and asked the Navy to hold on processing that application because under the new concept, they might want to request more properties. So the Navy put the application on hold, waiting to see if the Caribbean Riviera goes through.

It is my understanding that a new gaming special legislation was introduced and it will be soon debated in the Puerto Rican legislature. If the gaming legislation goes through, it is likely that the LRA will request a modification of the EDC. If it doesn't go through, the LRA might request to process the EDC application "as is" or they might want to negotiate the transfer of different properties with us. We'll know more about this issue by April or May. The Navy would transfer the areas that are clean and keep any of the environmental sites that are still in the cleanup process at that time.

- William Lourido (RAB member): When all this started, I requested 100 acres from Portal del Futuro for the veterans and nobody paid attention to this request. There are 150,000 veterans in Puerto Rico and we deserve attention. We don't need more casinos or games. Some veterans are homeless, there are widows losing their homes. I am opposed to any development from the government that will create more casinos.

Status of the Caribbean Riviera

The Navy invited the new LRA director to attend this meeting; tonight Mr. Erwin Kiess, the new Director of the LRA, is here tonight and has informed me that on February 8 he wants to have a public meeting with the citizens of Ceiba.

V. Other questions or comments from the public

- Luis Velázquez: In several meetings we talked about the areas of burned Ceiba mangroves. I asked EPA and DNER to investigate them and let us know what happened. I have not heard an update on this topic. My other question is related to "Casa de la Reina" and the tunnels in Piñeros. Both are supposed to be on the historic preservation list, do you know the status of this?
- Mark Davidson: Piñeros will be part of the Conservation Parcel; we already transferred the Los Machos beach parcel because it is clean. Piñeros will go to the DNER Conservation Trust eventually, after we finish our unexploded ordnance investigations. About the mangroves, we have no history of any releases in that area. We believe the mangroves appeared "burned" as a result of just the lack of salt water. After we worked on the site, the salt water is coming in again, so the mangroves should recuperate.

- Wilmarie Rivera (EQB): EQB contacted DNER about the mangroves. We will inspect the site and will let you know what we find. I will have more information about this subject for the next RAB meeting.
- RAB member: We also asked for an investigation regarding the drones in Isla de Cabras, any progress on that?
- Mark Davidson: No progress to report, but it is still on our radar. Now that it is a site (SMWU 79) it will follow the investigation and cleanup process.
- Luis Velázquez: Are you sending an invitation to the Municipality to attend these meetings?
- Susana Struve (CH2M HILL): Not specifically, but we are announcing the meetings (in newspapers, radio and megaphone cars), so they should be aware of the meeting.
- Luis Velázquez: I think you should send an invitation directly to the Mayor. They are the people who should be looking out for the welfare of the Ceiba community.
- Susana Struve: I will work with Ramón Figueroa so we can make sure the Municipality is getting the information and reminders about the meetings.

VI. Adjournment

- Susana Struve: We discussed at the last meeting the need to send a letter to those RAB members who have not attend the meetings. We will ask them if they are still interested and able to attend; if not we will remove them from the list.
- Wilmarie Rivera (EQB): We want to know if you would be interested in getting more information about how the samples are taken, how the data is analyzed and how the risk assessment evaluations are performed. We want to provide this 4-hour Risk Assessment Workshop to you, if the RAB and community members are interested. Think about it for next meeting and we'll decide on a date.

The next meeting is scheduled for April 8, 2010.

V. Ongoing Action Items

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

Item	Description	Discussion	Status
#1	RAB: Determine interest in a Risk Assessment Workshop and decide on a date.	Workshop would be provided by EQB; 4 hours.	New
#2	Navy: Letter to inactive RAB members.		Ongoing
#3	EQB and DNER: areas of dead mangroves.	Will inspect the site and provide an update.	Ongoing

Item	Description	Discussion	Status
#4	Navy: Status of the Economic Development Conveyance application.	On hold by request of the LRA (special legislation on gaming, status of Caribbean Riviera concept).	Ongoing

ATTACHMENT 1 - Meeting Attendees - January 13, 2010

RAB Community Members Present	RAB Community Members Absent
Ramón D. Figueroa, RAB Community Co-Chair	Carlos Brown
Luís A. Velázquez Rivera	Jimmy Concepción Robles
Rafael Montes	José Díaz
Agustín Velázquez Santos	Myrna Maldonado
Debra McWhirter	Lirio Márquez D'Acunti
William Lourido	Ramón M. Ríos
Jorge Fernández Porto	Daniel E. González
Ismael Velázquez	Noraida Vázquez Arce
Mike Dalton	Rogelio Figueroa
Samuel Caraballo	Ángel de Jesús Matta
Community Members Visiting	
Judith Hernández	José A. Calendario
Patrick Reyes	José A. Rosa
Hiram Rivera	Antonio Ortiz
Maria M. Ávila	
RAB Agency Representatives Present	
Mark Davidson, Navy Co-Chair, BRAC Environmental Coordinator	Navy - 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, Hazardous Waste Permit Division
Neida Pumarejo Cintrón (absent) Santiago Oliver (representative)	Puerto Rico Conservation Trust
Other Agency Representatives	
Erwin E. Kiess	Director, (Local Reuse Authority [LRA])
Freddy de Jesús, Ramón Felix, Jorge A. Fuentes,	LRA
CDR Daniel Kalal	Naval Activity Puerto Rico
Kim Goluska, Tim Brange	CSS
Elizabeth Padilla	FCPR
Support Staff Present	
Susana Struve	CH2M HILL, Inc. (Navy contractor – meeting facilitator)
Pedro Ruiz	Naval Activity Puerto Rico
Mark Kimes	Baker Environmental, Inc. (Navy contractor – Installation Restoration Program)