

N40003.AR.002201
PUERTO RICO NS
5090.3a

MINUTES FROM 22 MAY 2013 RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING (ENGLISH
LANGUAGE VERSION) NAVAL ACTIVITY PUERTO RICO
5/22/2013
NA PUERTO RICO



FORMER NAVAL STATION ROOSEVELT ROADS

Restoration Advisory Board (RAB)

Meeting No. 27 – May 22, 2013
Club Civico La Seyba, Ceiba, Puerto Rico

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 6:10 p.m. Susana Struve/CH2M HILL welcomed the members of the Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) and the public. Before beginning the meeting, the RAB members and meeting facilitators introduced themselves to those in attendance. Susana requested that members of the audience provide their contact information such as name and address in writing prior to leaving the meeting. This will assist with the distribution of information and future meeting announcements.

Thuane Fielding/Navy welcomed and thanked everyone for attending the meeting. Thuane explained that due to U.S. government sequestration, the meeting that was supposed to occur in February 2012 was canceled; therefore today's meeting will include the topics that would have been presented during the meeting that was cancelled.

Thuane welcomed the participation of the Local Redevelopment Authority's (LRA) recently appointed executive director Ms. Malu Blázquez.

Ramon Figueroa, RAB Community Co-Chair gave a formal welcome to the LRA representatives stating that it is nice to have a representative from LRA in attendance.

Malu introduced herself to the RAB members and meeting attendees and thanked everyone for the introductions and the warm welcome.

II. Site Access and Security (Warning Signs for SWMU 54, SWMU 77)

Stacin Martin/Navy stated that the topic of his first presentation was security and vandalism issues occurring at Roosevelt Roads. As this meeting has a wide range of attendees and each person has interactions with various groups, the Navy hopes that the group can make an impact by mentioning that these security and vandalism issues affect the cleanup activities at the base.

Stacin provided a brief background on sites that have been impacted:

- (Solid Waste Management Unit) SWMU 54 (Vandalism): Attempting to install a groundwater remedial system, but power lines were stolen twice. Although solar power has been used at

other sites, the system planned for SMMU 54 requires an electrical system. The Navy is working to come up with a solution to this issue. This vandalism is having a direct impact on the cleanup of the site.

Pedro Ruiz/Navy has been talking to the police and providing them maps of the sites. Stacin is hopeful that this message gets out in the community; this could potentially stem some of the vandalism and break-in issues at the cleanup sites.

- Autoport (Break-in): The autoport has been broken into twice. This is the site where the field crew stores equipment. No major equipment has been taken, but the field crew will be missing some items, which makes working difficult.
- SWMU 77: Former small arms range. There is a gate at the site, and this area is still under investigation. Although there is not an immediate hazard, Unexploded Ordnance (UXO) and munitions items have been found. The gates and warning signs are there for a reason; people should not be accessing the site. Nevertheless, people have been cutting the lock and trespassing into the area.
- Piñeros Island – There are a lot of physical hazards at this site, such as degraded tanks, buildings, and other structures as well as a potential for UXO. The Navy is taking actions with the marinas and distributing information that will hopefully keep people from entering the site.

The Navy is in the process of installing additional signs at all the environmental sites at the base, indicating where they are in the clean up phase. Now that the sites are more accessible, the Navy wants to make sure that it is clearly communicated where work is occurring and that the sites under investigation should be avoided.

III. Update on Investigations

SWMU 77 (UXO-1) Remedial Facility Investigation and Remedial Action

- SWMU 77 was a small arms range used for target practice for rifles and small artillery. There is also some evidence of UXO. The Navy completed a Phase I (an initial investigation) and narrowed the site down to six areas. These six areas were investigated in the full RCRA Facility Investigation (RFI).

SWMU 77 was investigated for various contaminants, such as metals, explosive compounds, and munitions based on the evidence found on the site. Stacin showed photographs of the site activities, including vegetation clearing, a geophysical survey, and an excavator digging trenches. With regards to findings, no munitions items were found in the initial RFI investigation, but various metals were present at the site in soils, including localized areas with low levels of nitroglycerin. Metals were found in the pistol range sub-area and within the rifle range.

After analyzing the initial data, the Navy decided to perform additional investigations at each of the areas to find the specific extent of the metals in the soil to determine where the metal contamination was located. During the additional investigation, the Navy did locate some munitions items (3.5-inch rockets) at the far north end of the range. The Navy didn't expect to find those items. The active duty Mayport explosive ordnance disposal team was called to dispose of the rockets right away. The preliminary data also showed some lead contamination in the soil. Stacin spoke to the Environmental Quality Board (EQB) and EPA to agree on an interim action for the site, which included removing the soils that contain the higher concentration of lead.

Questions:

- **Member of the public:** To work in the small arms ranges and rifle ranges, do you use ground penetrating radar (GPR)?
Stacin: The technology has evolved quite a bit with geo-physical techniques. Ground penetrating radar is somewhat effective; the piece of equipment you saw on the slides is electromagnetic and is more effective and precise than GPR.

- **Member of the public:** In the past unused ammo was not returned instead it was disposed in unmarked locations; how do you know you found everything?
Stacin: Disposal is always a concern at ranges because people in the past would sometimes discard munitions. The EM-61 electromagnetic equipment is designed to look for these items, particularly if buried, and is more precise than GPR. There was some evidence of trenching at the range and it appeared that munitions or something else may have been buried. Based on historic photographs, the Navy investigated the site and dug within the area. No munitions or other evidence of burial were found within the historic “trenching” areas.

- **Luis A. Velázquez (RAB Member):** I know that boxes of bullets were buried at the site and covered with soil.
Stacin: Again, this was a practice that sometimes occurred at small arms ranges, and today it is always a consideration at these sites. After the soil removal, the Navy will develop a Corrective Measures Study (CMS) to make sure SWMU 77 is fully characterized. There are very strict regulations for historic munitions sites. Because the site is being transferred, DoD looks at these sites very closely and will not allow the sites to be fully transferred until they are comfortable that the hazards have been fully identified. The Commonwealth and EPA pay particular attention to munitions sites because of the acute hazard to humans. The Navy will investigate the full extent of these sites to make sure they meet the requirements of DoD and also the regulatory community.

- **Susana Struve (CH2M HILL):** Yesterday (May 21st) we went to Ceiba and distributed fliers which describe what the community is supposed to do if they encounter munitions. You as members of the community can help the Navy and spread the message. The people who received the fliers were very happy to have the information. Members of the community need to help and inform the public to stay away from munitions sites and sites under investigation.

SWMU 55 Remedial Action

- SWMU 55 is located along Forrestal Drive and the Tow Way Fuel Farm, near former building 2314, which was a storage building. The Navy has been unable to determine exactly what the building was used for, but various references note that it was for maintenance and storage. The specific source of trichloroethylene (TCE) in the groundwater is not known. The Navy implemented a remedial action at the site to address the groundwater, using a couple of different steps. The first step is to use sodium permanganate (resembles gravel) to oxidize and degrade the TCE in the soil and the groundwater. Step two would be to install a bioreactor (mulch). A trench would be dug. The sodium permanganate will be placed in the trench and then the bioreactor would be placed in the trench as well. Then vegetable oil is placed into the mulch, which in turn enters into the groundwater and feeds the bacteria that already exist in the ground. The TCE is broken down by these bacteria into simpler components. This is a very effective remediation process for TCE in groundwater when the correct site conditions exist.

Questions:

- **Naida Dávila (RAB Member):** The TCE becomes non-toxic in two years – How?
Stacin: The concentrations of TCE will hopefully be degraded by the bacteria to acceptable levels (basically by eating the contaminant). The process will continue with monitoring (various soil and groundwater sampling) and evaluation of risk to determine the risk to humans and the ecology.

- **Naida:** During the remediation, what happens if there is a lot of rain, will that affect the timeframe for the remediation to occur?
Stacin: Yes, that's a good point. Two years is a projection for this site. If it rains a lot, in this case, it could actually help to expedite the degradation process; if it doesn't rain as much it could take longer. The remedial action projects two years to reduce the source of the contamination and its expansion into the downgradient plume. Currently we are treating the source area, which is area where the concentrations are greatest. Then in about two years, if it is at a level that we find acceptable, we can move this system down to the area where the concentrations are lower and treat those. It's a continuous process until we get the concentrations of the entire plume down to an acceptable level. It's not exactly two years, but we predict it would take about two years. Groundwater monitoring will continue throughout the treatment, and the plume might get larger or smaller depending on the results. The site may require follow up treatment beyond this remediation action.

- **Luis:** I was watching the work you did at the site and have several questions. If the LRA would like to develop a project at a contaminated site, would they have to wait the two years?
Stacin: For this and for all the sites currently under investigation, when a remedial action is completed, a decision is made looking at different scenarios, and identifying the types of uses that are allowed for each site in particular (residential use, parking lot, industrial use, commercial use). After the remedial action is completed, we will evaluate the conditions of the groundwater and soils and clearly state the allowed uses and restrictions for this site. When the property is transferred, those restrictions would be in place. The property can only be developed for the proper use. The Navy is responsible for the remediation, but also the land owner would have to follow the laws and abide by them. Nevertheless, the land developer does have the option to change the use of a site, but they would have to go to the EPA and the Navy and get approval so they can clean up the site to a level that was acceptable for that use.

- **Manuel Martínez (member of the public):** I brought a report regarding asbestos in Roosevelt Roads. I thought the RAB told us no asbestos.
Stacin: Asbestos has to be dealt with depending on its condition. They do asbestos surveys when you transfer property. You have to go around to all the buildings and see which buildings have asbestos. If a building does have asbestos, it doesn't mean that it's necessarily bad. As long as the asbestos is complete, not friable, or in a condition where it is degrading, it may be acceptable. The users of the property – those buyers or those who receive it – must be told of the presence of asbestos. That is why the asbestos surveys are completed. An example is building 38, the power plant building.

There are PCBs in the building which need to be cleaned up, but while we were investigating the PCBs to determine how to clean up, we found asbestos that is friable. It's falling apart, and that's what makes asbestos hazardous. So in addition to the PCBs, the Navy will clean up the asbestos. Yes, there is asbestos in various buildings, but the areas where it's found to be

friable, we have to go in and clean it up. The other areas are just identified as containing asbestos, but it has to be identified as being in acceptable condition.

- **Malu Blázquez (Local Reuse Authority):** Some properties we know have asbestos. While the LRA is looking at the redevelopment efforts, the asbestos will need to be addressed, either by remodeling or demolition.
- **Manuel:** This is the most recent asbestos survey that I have, is it still current?
Stacin: I am not sure if we did an asbestos survey in 2011. But we need to note that asbestos only is a problem if it is friable.
 - ✓ **Action item – Stacin:** Will check if there is more current information on the asbestos survey and bring the results to the public at the next RAB meeting. I believe all the asbestos report are available on the public website.
- **José Cabán (member of the public):** There is a local concern on the runoff into the bay and low-lying marshes related to other SWMUs like 6, 7, and 8? What is status of those sites?
Stacin: I don't want to give the wrong impression that SWMU 77 and 55 are the only sites being remediated. Every SWMU that is still open is in some phase of investigation, whether it be field work or reporting. The public website has reports available for each of the SWMUs.
- **José:** At AOC D, along the water, you can see oil/petroleum coming from the sediment. Can we assume it is coming from one of the SWMUs?
Stacin: At each SWMU we are addressing different concerns; some do have petroleum products like SWMU 45. The Navy did a full investigation of AOC D, and found out that sediments do not pose a risk. The fueling pier is located around this area. The oil you see could be residual fuels, and they may or may not pose a risk. So it is the Navy's job to determine the level of risk. The regulators and Navy have to work together to make sure that all the contamination sources are addressed.
- **Thuane:** This is why we are also asking the community to help. The Navy is trying to improve the signage because we don't want anyone to be out there fishing or doing any other activity on a particular site that could bring harm to them before the environmental cleanup is complete. As soon as the sampling reports have been approved, we will share them with the public.

IV. NAPR Archeological Articles

- **Naida:** I want to follow up with the discussion about the archeological pieces from NAPR that we discussed in the past.
- **Thuane:** We had scheduled Darrell Gundrum, the Navy archeologist, to participate in a RAB meeting and provide an update on the archeological resources from NAPR that have already been identified and stored. Now that the majority of the property has transferred, we can see if Mr. Gundrum can come to the August RAB meeting to discuss the status of those articles, as well as the status of the continued actions that the Navy is doing in regards to the programmatic agreement and the finding of no significant impact that the Navy has signed with the LRA and SHPO.

- **Naida:** My question isn't related to the memorandum of agreement with SHPO, but the 2011 memorandum of understanding?
Thuane: The particular agreement that was signed for the previous finding of no significant impact does not exist anymore. We have updated the document that I shared with Naida which include a supplemental environmental assessment, and that was signed in September 2011. That agreement states the process on how the remaining actions are to be conducted for each site, in particular how they relate to the archeological areas that are in the property.
- **Naida:** I am aware of that document. My position is that if the land is transferred to Puerto Rico, the pieces that were taken from Puerto Rico must be transferred to the original owner, which is Puerto Rico. I am not talking about the artifacts kept at the University of Gainesville. I am talking about other artifacts found that we are not sure where they are being kept, and I want those pieces be returned.
Thuane: This is really an issue we need to address with the state historian and preservation officer and not with the Navy. Currently, there is not a location on Puerto Rico where archeological articles can be placed in accordance with regulations.
- **Naida:** Yes, I understand, but I also know that Department of the Interior/National Park Service returned some archeological pieces to the University of Puerto Rico. At a RAB meeting Mark Davidson told us that he would find more information about those artifacts and inform the RAB.
- **Thuane:** You may need to address this issue with the Department of Interior representative for this area, John Barrett. The Secretary of the Department of Natural Resources (Carmen) knows exactly how to reach him. Mr. Barrett is also working on permitting the petroglyph site.
- **Naida:** Mark said that if there is a repository on Puerto Rico that meets the requirements, then the items would be returned.
- **Ramon D. Figueroa/Community Co-Chair:** The LRA does not have a lot of money to procure a repository for archeological artifacts. A depository that will meet the federal standards will cost a lot of money
 - ✓ **Action Item – Thuane:** Will talk to Darrell Gundrum and the DOI representative John Barrett and inquire about these artifacts. Thuane will email Ramon D. Figueroa/Community Co-Chair the results of this conversation.

V. Property Transfer Update – Thuane Fielding

Thuane Fielding/Navy: At the May 7th ceremony, the Navy transferred the remaining parcels (Parcels I and II) to the local redevelopment authority. In addition to Parcels I and II, the RAB members will recall that Parcel III was also conveyed. There are two leases where the property has been leased to the local redevelopment authority, and the Navy continues to do environmental cleanup on those pieces of property. Those are some of the SWMUs that Stacin has already mentioned.

Petroglyph Site. We have assigned the site to the DOI. The DOI is currently working on the deed to transfer the property to Puerto Rico's Department of Natural Resources. We anticipate that transfer

will occur before the next RAB meeting. This will increase the amount of land that the Department of Natural Resources has under their custody to a little more than 2,900 acres. The Navy still has Piñeros Island and Cabeza de Perro to assign to the DOI, who will then convey them to the Department of Natural Resources as soon as the Navy completes the environmental remediation at those sites.

Questions:

- **Member of the public:** In the past the shoreline of Parcel III was for public use. The Department of Natural Resources then took the lands that were given to the public and privatized them. They placed green signs at Parcel III which state that the Department of Natural Resources prohibits public access to this area. This is confusing. Is the same thing going to happen to Parcels I and II?
Thuane: The property is assigned to DOI. The Puerto Rico Department of Natural Resources submitted a public benefit conveyance application to receive the property for the use of parks and recreation. Once the Navy assigns the property to the DOI, DOI deeds the property over to DNRA with certain restrictions into that deed. The deeds have some language in them that the DNRA has to abide by. If they want to use the area for a park or other recreational use for the public, this is a question for the DNRA.

Parcel I was conveyed to the LRA. There are some mangrove areas on the border of Parcel I that have already been assigned to the DOI. Parcel II will be part of the development plan that I am sure the LRA will issue once a developer is on board.

Questions:

- **Luis:** Does this island belong to the Coast Guard?
Thuane: Yes, we are still conducting environmental cleanup at this property, after the cleanup is complete, the island will be returned to the Coast Guard.
- **Naida:** The Navy has kept some acreage, right?
Thuane: No, unless you are referring to the area that was carved out of the transfer until the cleanup is completed. There are 3,409 acres being conveyed to the LRA, 1,650 acres conveyed to the Airport Authority; approximately two acres to the Department of Homeland Security for customs and border patrol; approximately 54 acres to the Army Reserve; 662 acres to the Air Force; the National Guard received 5 acres; DNRA will receive approximately 3,000 acres and is due to receive more; the beach area went to the town of Ceiba, and approximately 354 acres comprising Piñeros Island and Cabeza de Perro will also be transferred to DNRA after the cleanup is completed. The Navy has not reserved any acreage at Roosevelt Roads.
- **Luis Figueroa (member of the public):** Around the marina area, there are people using the ramp facility to launch their boats into the water, but the public does not have access to that area unless we pay almost \$500 to use the ramp and \$200 a month to be a part of that club. In the past we all had access to the ramp without any charge.
Thuane: The marina property was transferred to the LRA under the Parcel III conveyance back in January 2012. You need to address this issue directly with the LRA.
- **Manuel:** What is the status of the sewage treatment plant?
Thuane: The wastewater treatment plants were closed. They are hauling the waste out of the Base. The wastewater treatment plants are ready to be returned to the LRA.

- **Ramón:** Regarding the pier use. There is a legal action pending that the veterans, etc. will have a private organization to manage those facilities. But I promise you that this will be resolved. These facilities will be shared with the community. The situation will be handled and the conditions will be changed.
- **Member of the public:** Wouldn't it have been smarter to clean up the land and then transfer it, instead of having some "carved out" sites? It looks like we are taking a step backwards.
Thuane: We are not taking a step backwards. The Base was operational for many years; as a result we have environmental issues to address. The new legislation issued to close the Navy bases freed up some money for cleanup activities. The original idea was to sell the entire property within six months of the base closure. The Navy was unable to sell the property in 2004. But the cleanup funds, since 2005 have been used to remediate a third of the sites. Approximately \$86 million has been spent so far on cleanup efforts.

VI. NAPR Administrative Record Location Update – Susana Struve

Susana Struve/CH2M HILL: The Navy has developed a new webpage to keep the community informed which replaces the old public website. This link:

http://www.bracpmo.navy.mil/basepage.aspx?baseid=84&state=PuertoRico&name=roosevelt_roads will take site visitors to all the information about RAB meetings, etc. Final technical documents (including the asbestos reports mentioned earlier) that have been approved by the regulatory agencies are located in this new electronic repository:

https://portal.navfac.navy.mil/portal/page/portal/navfac/navfac_ww_pp/navfac_hq_pp/navfac_env_pp/env_restoration_installations/arfsearch?p_instln_id=Puerto_Rico_NA.

We invite you to access the website and the administrative record. We have shared these links with the library in Ceiba the public can go to the computer at the library and see the documents.

VII. Other Questions from the public.

- **Luis A. Velázquez:** What about airplane noise that contaminated the community. At the next meeting can we have a discussion about noise contamination?

Next meeting: August 13, 2013

Susana: Thank all the participants for attending the meeting. The meeting was adjourned at 8:07 p.m.

ATTACHMENT 1 - Meeting Attendees – May 22, 2013

RAB Community Members Present	RAB Community Members Absent
Ramón D. Figueroa, Community Co-Chair	Samuel Caraballo
Luís A. Velázquez Rivera	José Julio Díaz
Naida Dávila	Jorge Fernández Porto
Michael Dalton	William Lourido
	Lirio Márquez D'Acunti
	Debra McWhirter
	Ramón M. Ríos
	Rafael Montes
	Agustín Velázquez
	Ismael Velázquez
Community Members Visiting	
Jesús Bonilla	Manuel José Martínez
José Cabán	Victor Milian
Gilberto Camacho	Hiram Rivera
M. Carrasco	Barbara Orsillo
Marilyn del Manzano	Danny Velázquez
José Maldonado	
RAB Agency Representatives	
Thuane Fielding, Navy Co-Chair	Navy – Deputy Base Closure Manager
Doug Pocze (absent)	Environmental Protection Agency, Region 2
Stacin Martin	Navy – Remedial Project Manager
Wilmarie Rivera (absent)	Environmental Quality Board (EQB) – Federal Facilities Coordinator
Gloria M. Toro Agrait	EQB – Hazardous Waste Permit Division
Santiago Oliver (representative)	Puerto Rico Conservation Trust
Other Agency Representatives	
Malú Blázquez	Executive Director – Local Reuse Authority (LRA)
Freddy de Jesús	LRA
Support Staff	
Susana Struve	CH2M HILL, Inc. (Navy contractor – facilitator)
Pedro Ruiz	Navy
Lindsey Carr	CH2M HILL, Inc. (Navy contractor)