



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

Club Cívico La Seyba, Ceiba, Puerto Rico
Meeting No. 17 – April 08, 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.

II. Action Items from Last Meeting

1) Risk Assessment Workshop – RAB Members

RAB members will decide if they would like to have the workshop and propose a date.

2) Discuss with the Department of Natural and Environmental Resources (DNER) the dead mangroves location – Wilmarie Rivera (EQB)

EQB contacted DNER. They would like to know the specific areas because when EQB and DNER went to do an inspection, they did not find any ecological problem with the mangroves. EQB also talked with US Fish & Wildlife Service (USFWS) and the Puerto Rico Conservation Trust; technical staff from these agencies will be part of the site inspection.

3) Letter to RAB Members not attending the meetings – Ramon Figueroa/Mark Davidson

A letter stating that if a RAB member can't attend meetings regularly, he/she will be removed from the RAB was signed by both Co-Chairs and will be mailed to RAB Members who have not been attending. They can still come to RAB meetings as members of the public.

4) Status of Economic Development Conveyance (EDC) – Mark Davidson

This document, the EDC Application, is a year old now. It reached the Navy in May or June last year; shortly thereafter, the Local Reuse Authority (LRA) asked Navy to hold off on processing the EDC Application, pending the gaming legislature approval. The Navy is still waiting to receive the LRA's revised EDC Application which would include the Caribbean Riviera development concept.

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

Mark Kimes focused his presentation on the field investigations currently being done at the base. From January to April 2010, we have investigated six different sites:

- **SWMU 57 (Former Facility # 278, POL Drum Storage Area) - Phase I Remedial Facility Investigation (RFI).** This site stored drums of petroleum, oils, and lubricants.
 - Surface and subsurface soils were collected at 7 soil borings located around the pad.

- Five surface soil samples were collected at another sampling point, where we had a small detection of PCBs in a preliminary investigation.
- Five groundwater monitoring wells were installed in 7 of those borings and groundwater samples were collected.
- Concrete chip samples were collected from the slab and some wipe samples from the concrete.
- All of these samples were analyzed for volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and semi-volatile organic compounds (SVOCs), polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), metals, diesel range fuel, and gasoline range fuel.
- The laboratory analysis of those samples has been completed, and the lab data is now going third party data validation. The draft report will be submitted to EPA and EQB around June.
- **SWMU 61 (Former Bundy Area Maintenance Facilities) - Additional Corrective Measures Study (CMS).** The site is located in the Bundy area and was used from the 1940s to the 1960s.
 - SWMU 61 is a level flat forested area southwest to Building 1686, adjacent to a fresh water wetland. During historical aerial analysis, two areas of disturbed ground were identified with a couple of storage tanks, a few drums and some staining on the ground in the maintenance area.
 - Two different types of wetlands were identified at this site. To the west side of the site is the palustrine wetland and to the north, the forested wetland.
 - This field work consisted of additional sampling to address data gaps identified in earlier sampling results. The purpose was to better delineate the contamination before the CMS document is finalized.
 - Soil samples were collected at a total of 31 soil borings across the site; 3 surface soil samples were analyzed for VOCs and the other 28 samples were analyzed for VOCs, low level SVOCs and metals. From those same 31 soil borings, a total of 32 subsurface soil samples were collected; four of which were analyzed for VOCs and 28 for VOCs, SVOCs and metals.
 - Eight (8) new groundwater monitoring wells were installed and a total of 14 groundwater samples were collected, eight (8) of which came from the new monitoring wells and six (6) from the monitoring wells installed in May 2008. Those groundwater samples were analyzed for VOCs, SVOCs and total and dissolved metals.
 - In the forested wetland, 11 surface water samples were collected and are being tested for SVOCs and total and dissolved metals. We also collected 10 sediment samples, which are being analyzed for VOCs, SVOCs, metals, Total Organic Carbon (TOC) and Acid Volatile Sulfites/Simultaneously Extracted Metals (AVS/SEM). That last one is a special test that we need for the ecological risk assessment, to help determine whether or not the metals are available for the ecological receptors.
 - We collected an additional 10 background sediment samples from within the Palustrine wetland area and analyzed them for metals.
 - The laboratory has completed analysis of all of the samples we collected from SWMU 61, close to 100 samples, and the third party data validation is underway. The Draft CMS Investigation Report will be submitted to EPA and EQB around June 2010.

AOC F (Monitored Natural Attenuation [MNA] Sites) - Year 7 Quarter 4 Groundwater Sampling.

- Quarterly sampling is done to evaluate if the natural attenuation process is working to clean up the spilled fuel. The field work was conducted in February 2010.
- Groundwater samples were collected from wells at four of the eight MNA sites: 124, 1738, 2842B and 735.
- Samples from two wells at site 2842B and four wells at 1738 were analyzed for VOCs, Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons (TPH), Methane, Sulfate, Dissolved Oxygen and Ferrous Iron. Those last chemicals are indicators to help us determine whether or not monitor natural attenuation process is working at those sites.
- Samples from two wells at Site 735 were analyzed for VOCs and Diesel Fuel.
- The annual soil sampling was conducted at MNA site 731.
- Groundwater samples from Site 124 were analyzed for Dissolved Oxygen and MTBE.
- Sixteen soil samples were collected from two borings at site 731 and were analyzed for gasoline range fuel and diesel range fuel.
- Laboratory analysis and data validation of the soil and groundwater samples have been completed and the Draft Report will be submitted to the EPA and EQB on April 21st.
- **SWMU 67 (Former Gas Station)**
 - This site is located on the east side of Langley Drive, in a level area covered with secondary growth vegetation. There is a concrete foundation left from the gas station building.
 - Eight surface soil samples and 16 subsurface soil samples were collected from 8 soil borings. Those samples were analyzed for VOCs, SVOCs, metals, diesel fuel and gasoline fuel.
 - We also installed a monitoring well in each one of those 8 borings. The 8 groundwater samples collected were analyzed for VOCs, SVOCs, total and dissolved metals and the diesel and gasoline fuel.
 - From the drainage ditches to the north of the site, we collected 5 sediment samples and one surface water sample. The surface water sample was analyzed for VOCs, SVOCs, total and dissolved metals, diesel and gasoline range fuels. The sediment samples were analyzed for VOCs, SVOCs, metals, total organic carbons and diesel and gasoline range fuels.
 - The laboratory analysis of the samples is underway, which will be followed by third party data validation. The report on that investigation should be submitted sometime around July 2010.
- **Solid Waste Landfill - Semiannual Groundwater Monitoring.**
 - Groundwater samples were collected and landfill gas monitoring data was obtained between March 21 and March 25th.
 - Samples from the 9 monitoring wells surrounding the landfill are being analyzed for VOCs and metals.
 - The draft report will be submitted to EPA and EQB around the end of June.

- **SMWU 75 (Building 803) - Phase I RFI Investigation.**
 - This building was the pump house for the emergency fire deluge system out on the main pier of the base. It pulled water out of the ocean to be used for fighting fires on the ships at the pier.
 - During preliminary inspections, this site was identified due to a release of suspected waste oils and diesel fuel inside on the floor; discarded oil filters from the motors that ran the pumps were found on the floor of the building. Wipe samples from the concrete floors and walls of the building were collected inside the building to see if there were any releases from the building.
 - During this investigation, we installed five soil borings around the building and collected a total of five surface and ten subsurface soil samples, which were analyzed for VOCs, SVOCs, metals, diesel, and gasoline.
 - The lab is presently analyzing the samples and the third party validation will follow that analysis. The draft Phase I RFI Report will be submitted sometime around July of this year.

Discussion

- Member of the public: During the discussion on the MNA sites, you said some points couldn't be accessed - why?
 - Mark Kimes: There is a very steep hill up to the pad where the drums were stored, which we could not access with the equipment.
 - When the bacteria in the ground start working, the conditions change in the ground because the bacteria are eating the fuel, so the oxygen levels change. We monitor the levels of dissolved oxygen, ferrous iron and methane. If these parameters are not changing over time, then we can assume that monitored natural attenuation is not working, so we will need to use another methodology to remediate the site.
 - What we found is that natural attenuation is actually working at the site and the contamination levels are decreasing. Probably some of these sites are reaching a point where we are going to ask for site closure, since Mother Nature has taken care of the contamination at these sites.
- Member of the public: And if there are no reports related to the gas station, how are you fulfilling the information you need on the site?
 - Mark Kimes: We could not find information in the records review, which was done when the base was closing, about whether or not the underground storage tanks were ever removed at this former gas station. The laboratory is analyzing the samples so we need to wait for the results.
 - During the investigation, our geologist used a photo ionization detector (PID) to screen the samples; he didn't see any detection or smell any fuel on the samples.
- Member of the public: How long would it take to finish these contamination inspections and monitoring?
 - Mark Davidson (Navy): In response to a request from the RAB Co-chair, we are distributing tonight an estimated schedule of the time we think it will take to finish the cleanup of these sites. You will notice on the handout that there are some pink bars, showing the sites that will be monitored for several years; such is the case of the groundwater at the landfill.

- Member of the public: So you will keep the property and the authority over these contaminated sites?
 - Mark Davidson: Not necessarily. The Navy is responsible for the cleanup, but we might transfer the sites that could be used safely. For example, we could transfer a building so it can be used, while continuing with the monitoring and cleanup of the groundwater and making sure that there is no adverse effect on the health of the people using this building.
- Member of the public: From what I have heard, seen and read, the type of casino and development the LRA has designed for the top of the landfill is not acceptable. How can you transfer the property and allow them to build on this property without any kind of precautions taken to address the existing contamination?
 - Mark Davidson: We are taking precautions; we call them land use controls, which are restrictions identified in the deed that are designed to protect human health. We are taking precautions based on the results of the ongoing monitoring of the parameters at the landfill. We are making sure that if the landfill stays there, it will be capped to prevent any migration of contaminants and that the cap is not breached. If we start getting detections of contaminants in the groundwater from any of our monitoring wells, be assured that EPA and EQB are going to make Navy come back and address the contamination with a more active approach to remediate the groundwater.
- Member of the public: At the recent Ceiba public hearings organized by the LRA, they presented information about their construction plans. They plan to build at Building 23 and not at the landfill. But the LRA will have to deal with the contamination where the fuel farm used to be.
- Member of the public: What is the status of the results on the SWMUs we discussed at the last meeting three months ago?
 - Mark Kimes: We are still working on reports. They have been submitted to the regulatory agencies; we received some comments and we are in the process of incorporating some revisions. For SWMU 71, a site located northwest of the landfill, we continue discussing the results with EPA and EQB; we are looking at 9 or 10 months before the draft report can be finalized. This is a lengthy process; we need to make sure that the regulators' concerns are addressed, and once they are satisfied with the conclusions, we can issue recommendations and execute the work after getting regulatory approval.
- Member of the public. Six months ago you told us that there was contamination at Site 78; has any action been taken?
 - Mark Kimes: For SWMU 78, EPA and EQB approved the initial report and we are currently in the process of developing the work plan for the next investigation, which we expect will be distributed in the next two weeks. The recommendation is to remove all the transformers.
- Member of the public. What about the drones at Cabras Island?
 - Mark Kimes: We are developing the work plan for the RCRA Facility Investigation for Cabras Island. During the development of that work plan, we contacted the drones manufacturers, travelled to Washington and had a meeting with them to express the concerns that we've heard from the RAB, and gathered really good information.

- Luis Velázquez (RAB Member): I have a concern regarding the areas that may remain contaminated when you sell or transfer the lands. My question is: if you tell EPA and DNER and give them a map identifying the areas that cannot be disturbed/harmed in any way, I am afraid that the use restrictions will not be followed.
 - Mark Davidson: All the sites we transferred to the airport have land use controls or deed restrictions on it. They have a map and GPS coordinates pointing exactly where the site is and a list of what the restrictions are. They can't violate those restrictions without coming to the EPA, the Navy and EQB. We got our process, we got a schedule and we are still doing the cleanup out there, but they don't have the right to do what they want; they would be violating the law if they did that.
 - Luis Velázquez: Remember that they already had a problem with the restrictions; they dug the soil without your permission, and what happened?
 - Mark Davidson: You are right, they dug in one of our sites and we found out about it later. We knew where the contamination was, had it all delineated, before they dug through it. Afterward, we don't know where all the contaminated dirt is, because they moved it a little bit. So, we sent them a bill for \$600,000 because that's what's going to cost for us to go back there and resample that site. That's what happened.
- Ismael Velázquez: I have been talking with Pedro and I have a concern about asbestos. In Roosevelt Roads there are still buildings with "Durotech" roofs, which is asbestos-cement. Once those roofs start deteriorating, they will get a green fungus on top and the friable process starts. I would like you to check that out.

V. Remedial Action Update: Mark Davidson-Navy

- **SWMU 1** – This site is the old landfill on the base. Right Way Environmental was there in January doing an Interim Corrective Measure (ICM), by removing the debris which is the source of metals contamination on the site.
 - While they were performing the removal, they encountered munitions and explosives of concern (MEC); the site was secured and Explosives Ordnance Disposal (EOD) was called. On February 10, 2010, they examined all the items found and determined they were inert and allow us to continue operations. After eight hours more MEC were found, so the UXO technician on site recommended we stop the work, remove the contractor and secure the site.
 - Now the next step is to remove all objects that may be MEC. To do this, we need to develop an Explosive Safety Submission (ESS), which needs to be approved by the Naval Ordnance Safety and Security Activity (NOSSA). This document outlines the safety precautions that must be followed in order to remove the MEC safely. After getting their approval, a work plan will be developed and we will be able to remove all the MEC and continue with the interim corrective action (debris removal).
- **SWMUs 7&8, 54, 55** – SWMUs 7 & 8 are the fuel farms, 54 is an old car repair facility and 55 is a trichloroethylene (TCE) plume. We have been doing a pilot test on these sites, trying to enhance in situ bio remediation by injecting different solutions into the ground to help the natural attenuation process.

- At SWMU 54 we have two plumes, a benzene plume and a TCE plume. We are addressing the benzene plume by injecting an oxygen release compound (ORC) into the ground; for the TCE we are injecting emulsified vegetable oil. While evaluating the results of the pilot test, we found free product which is basically raw gasoline, and found that the concentrations of the contaminants in the groundwater were a little higher than we originally thought. So, we are going to change from the ORC injections to the cleanup process we call air sparging. This change will be documented in a CMS addendum.
- At SWMU 55 we used potassium permanganate to help the naturally occurring bacteria remediate the site.
- At SWMUs 7 & 8 we are starting the free product removal.
- **Piñeros Island.** Back in August 2006, we did a geophysical study looking for MEC and unexploded ordnance (UXO) concentrating on areas that have the potential for visitors.
 - The geophysical survey identified 196 terrestrial anomalies (which can be anything from a bullet to a beer can), and 217 anomalies underwater. Currently, we are investigating the terrestrial anomalies, so we can dig them up, and find out exactly what they were. So far, only one item was determined to be MEC, we believe it is a live grenade, and the rest are categorized as munitions debris.
 - We plan to go back and investigate the underwater anomalies to determine what they are in January - March 2011. We try to time these field events when turtle nesting season is not going on, so we don't disturb these species. We need to submit another ESS and get it approved by NOSSA before we can start the underwater work.

Discussion

- Agustín Velázquez (RAB Member): The anomalies underwater at Piñeros were from three cannons that the navy blew up and the residues got in the water. If you go to the top of the hill, you will see three tunnels where the cannons used to be.
 - Mark Davidson: I hope you are right and we don't find anything in the water that needs be destroyed.
- Luis Velázquez (RAB Member): When can we use Piñeros as a public beach? Keep in mind that some people are using the beaches anyway.
 - Mark Davidson: You can use the beaches after we transfer them, which will be after they are deemed safe. Please stay away from the island.
- Luis Velázquez: What was the explosive that you found?
 - Mark Davidson: The UXO techs assumed that it was TNT, so they destroyed to be on the safe side.
 - After we transfer the property, we will still come back and do further cleanup if the new owner finds problems and they are confirmed to be Navy wastes, for example petroleum products, TCE, PCBs or bombs.

VI. Other questions or comments from the public

These questions were sent to the Navy by Ramon Figueroa (RAB Community Co-chair).

- 1) What is the timeline for the environmental cleanup?

Mark Kimes showed on the screen and pointed to the handouts distributed at the meeting to show the current timeline for the entire base

- 2) What is programmed vs completed in the environmental cleanup?

Mark Davidson used the same graph to explain the timeline for all 86 sites. A lot of the corrective actions have been completed

- 3) Is there an intermediate time limit to accomplish portions of the cleanup process?

Mark Davidson: The Navy and DOD have a cleanup goal to have the “remedy in place” for all sites by 2014. You can look at the graph for more detail on each site. What drives 99% of what we do at Roosevelt Roads is guided by the Consent Order we have with EPA which follows a lengthy process.

- 4) How would a substantial conceptual change in reuse alter any conditions to the timeline?

- 5) The short answer is little to none, or maybe it could even make it quicker under some circumstances. We need to meet EPA and EQB regulations to an industrial cleanup level. We know exactly the direction we need to go. The Navy does not get involved with what the developers’ plans are. The bottom line is that the cleanup of the environmental sites is driven by EPA and EQB regulations, and the reuse will have to be consistent with the level the Navy (with approval of EPA and EQB) cleans the site up to. The developer always has the option to do additional cleanup if they would like to, for instance, use a site for residential use instead of industrial use. What is the most likely course of action for the environmental cleanup process?

Mark Davidson: We are following a pretty clear process (EPA and EQB regulations) to clean up those sites to an industrial level and to transfer the clean parcels. I have no idea what are the Caribbean Rivera (LRA) plans. I believe the LRA is waiting to see if the new gaming legislation is passed. If we find soil contamination, we’ll probably have to clean it up before we can transfer the parcel. The only time you would not be able to transfer property with a groundwater plume, is if you have a plume that has very high concentrations of say TCE, gasoline or benzene, resulting in soil-gas and vapor intrusion into building.

- 6) Has the local reuse agency submitted any proposals/amendments of a reuse plan that would drastically impact/change the environmental assessment already completed?

Mark Davidson: The answer is no. We have not seen another reuse plan or another Economic Development Conveyance (EDC) application from the LRA since the one they submitted a year ago.

Discussion

- Member of the public: You were talking about the remedial standards that you were using for the cleanup, which are industrial levels; would that still be considered a Brownfield?
 - Mark Davidson: More likely. Most Brownfield sites are cleaned up to an industrial level. My experience is you must apply to even be considered a Brownfield site.

- Member of the public: You told us that the landfill will be encapsulated and then a parking lot could be built on top of it. What happens 30 years from now? I am worried about this because given that we are an island, we have nowhere else to go to. Chances are there are going to be future developments and who's going to know what safety standards are in place, in case the encapsulation is broken.
 - Mark Davidson: With the transfer there will be land use controls in the deeds. Let's say that we have soil contamination and the Navy or the developers come along and put this parking lot there, so there is no longer any exposure to that contamination. We will transfer the site with deed restrictions, such as you can't disturb the cap, you can't dig under the cap. Keep in mind that one of the requirements under these land use controls is to do annual inspections. The property owner is responsible to comply and perform these inspections, and when he/she sells the property that requirement stays with the land, it will go in the next deed and to the next owner.
- Visitor: You said you are waiting for the legislation to be approved to act. I have been here before and you have said that if the central government does not have a project, something specific, you would sell the parcels as originally planned. Is this still correct? How long have you given the government to present a plan that could be approved?
 - Mark Davidson: We still plan to sell some of the property. We tried to sell through a public auction before, but we didn't get the minimum bid we wanted, so we did not continue with the sale. Then, the economy crashed and we held back on the sale plan. Then the LRA came to us and mentioned the Caribbean Riviera concept and indicated that they may want more land than originally requested in the EDC Application which they submitted in May 2009. Shortly after the LRA submitted the May 2009 EDC Application, I think there was a change of governors, or vision, so the LRA came to the Navy again and asked us to hold off on acting on that May 2009 EDC application. After we know if the new gaming legislation is approved or turned down, the LRA has to decide what amount of land they want, because the Navy needs to move forward with the sale of the remainder of the property. Remember that the proceeds from the sale will be used to fund the cleanup.
 - Ramón Figueroa: The legislation Mark is talking about refers to Project 2250, which authorizes the establishment of the mega casino in the facilities. As Mark said, once the Navy complies with the environmental cleanup standards, everything else is up to the regulatory agencies of Puerto Rico. We cannot expect that the Navy will be responsible for everything. The sad part of all of this is that, while the cleanup process is being conducted, six years had gone by and nothing positive has come to the local community. I understand that the Navy gave Mr. Kiess (LRA) until the end of the month to resubmit the EDC.
 - Luis Velázquez (RAB Member): The Puerto Rican government doesn't have the money to buy all those parcels. We have been asking the LRA for a plan and we still don't have it. Why don't you give the community an opportunity to buy those parcels
- Luis Velázquez: During the last meeting, you talked about the dry dock being transferred as a historical monument. I suggest that that the Piñeros tunnels, the Queen House at Bundy, the defense wall, and Punta Puerca beach also be nominated as historical monuments.

- Mark Davidson: There is a process to evaluate historical significance, which is done by the Puerto Rican State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), to determine what actually goes into the National Register of Historical Places. Again, I don't know what the LRA is going to ask for; it is all speculative, until this legislation passes.
- Member of the public: What's going to happen if you can't sell those lands?
 - Mark Davidson: I am assuming that we'll find a buyer, but we may have to drop off the price drastically. I don't know what the strategy for selling the parcels is. If we drop the minimum bid maybe the Commonwealth can buy the property. But this is only speculation.
 - Ramón Figueroa (RAB Co-Chair): BRAC establishes that if an agreement cannot be reached, the President of the U.S., through BRAC offices, contacts the governor of the Commonwealth. The land is Navy's property, legally, the Navy can do whatever they want with the parcels, whether we like it or not. What's going to happen? What's the governor going to recommend? I believe, like Mark said, that the federal government has the ability to dispose of those parcels faster than we think.

VII. Adjournment

- Susana Struve (CH2M HILL): Please remember to decide if you want the risk assessment workshop the Navy and the regulatory agencies have offered to the RAB.
- We need to have any questions from the RAB at least two weeks before the meeting, so we can get the answers on time.
- **The next meeting is scheduled for July 2010.**

V. Ongoing Action Items

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

Item	Responsible	Description	Status
#1	RAB members	Decide if they would like to have a Risk Assessment workshop and propose a date	Ongoing
#2	EQB, DNER, USFWS, and the Puerto Rico Conservation Trust	Conduct a site inspection of the area where a RAB member reported seeing many dead mangroves	Ongoing
#3	Navy and RAB Co-chairs	Send letter to RAB members who do not attend meetings	Complete
#4	Navy	Address concern about potentially friable asbestos in Durotech roofs	New

ATTACHMENT 1 - Meeting Attendees - April 8, 2010

RAB Community Members Present	RAB Community Members Absent
Ramón D. Figueroa, Community Co-Chair	
Rafael Montes	Jorge Fernández Porto
Ramón M. Ríos	Lirio Márquez D'Acunti
Luís A. Velázquez Rivera	Mike Dalton
Agustín Velázquez Santos	William Laurido
Ismael Velázquez	Debra McWhriter
	Mike Dalton
Community Members Visiting	
Marc J. Tallmadge	José Benítez
Marilyn del Manzano	Federico Delgado
Naida Dávila	Manuel Piñeros
José A. Calendario	Coralis Morales
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 (EQB)
Neida Pumarejo Cintrón (absent) Santiago Oliver (representative)	Puerto Rico Conservation Trust
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	
Susana Struve	CH2M HILL, Inc. (Navy contractor – meeting facilitator)
Mark Kimes	Baker Environmental, Inc. (Navy contractor – Installation Restoration Program)