

MEETING MINUTES

Restoration Advisory Board (RAB)

For the Environmental Restoration and Munitions Response Program in

Vieques, Puerto Rico

Meeting Number 10 - January 17 2007

Note: These minutes are a summary based on informal notes taken at the meeting. They are not intended as a verbatim transcript and everything that was discussed may not have captured. If comments or additional notes are provided by others who were present at the meeting, within 30 days of distribution of these minutes, those will be added as an attachment to these minutes.

I. CALL TO ORDER AND WELCOMING REMARKS

The meeting began at 5:30pm with welcoming and introductions of those present by Susana Struve (CH2M HILL). Kevin Cloe, the Navy RAB Co-Chair person, introduced a new RAB Member, : Cristina Corrada.

Action Items:

Description	Status as of Oct 20, 2006	Comments
The Navy to review the draft scope of work for the TAPP consultant and send it to the RAB members.	<u>Action item completed</u> , information was sent to RAB members electronically, and via mail on October 2, 2006.	
RAB members will review and send their comments back to the Navy	Awaiting comments from the RAB members	

II. TOPICS DISCUSSED AND PRESENTATIONS

IIa. Summary of Progress Presentation - Kevin Cloe (Navy) gave a brief summary of the progress for both programs: munitions and environmental.

Munitions Response Program - Progress through December 2006:

- 235 acres in the LIA have been surface cleared
- 65 acres of beaches have been surface cleared
- Over 2,300 live munitions removed
- Over 100,000 munitions-related items removed
- 754 tons of metal processed
- Provided UXO Tech I training to 13 residents (10 currently employed)

1

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.

Nota: Este resumen se presenta en inglés y en español para la conveniencia del lector. Se han hecho todos los esfuerzos para que la traducción sea precisa en lo más razonablemente posible. Sin embargo, los lectores deben estar al tanto que el texto en inglés es la versión oficial.

- Provided 40-hour OSHA training and UXO awareness training for 48 residents
- 63 residents employed onsite
- Over \$600,000 paid in salaries to employees
- Over \$1,000,000 paid to Puerto Rican contractors and support personnel
- Average \$100,000 per month in local services (food, housing, fuel, transportation)

Environmental Restoration Program - Progress through December 2006:

- Completed PA/SI at 17 west Vieques sites and RI fieldwork at 8 west Vieques sites
 - Approximately \$5,700,000
- Completed EE/CA for removal action at 4 west Vieques sites (removal planned for 2007)
 - Approximately \$92,000
- Completed Phase I RFI (PA/SI) fieldwork at 22 east Vieques sites
 - Approximately \$6,800,000

Iib. Background Investigation Update for Eastern Vieques

Brett Doerr/CH2M HILL gave a status summary of the east Vieques background investigation:

- All data have been validated and loaded into database
- Split sample data have been received from EPA
- All data have been evaluated in accordance with the work plan, including statistical analysis, comparison to EPA split sample data, and comparison with west Vieques background data
- Report has been prepared and is being reviewed by Navy
- Draft Report will be submitted to regulatory agencies in late January or early February
- Once regulatory agencies have reviewed and comments resolved and incorporated into report, draft final report will be provided to RAB
 - Anticipated 3rd calendar quarter 2007

Iic. SWMU 4 Remedial Investigation Update

- Draft Final Work Plan submitted to RAB in November 2006
 - Comment from RAB regarding comparison of SWMU 4 soil data to west Vieques Background; RAB member commented that west Vieques background soil samples should be analyzed for explosives. Brett commented that the west Vieques background samples were analyzed in accordance with the work plan and that the samples, even if they were still being held (which they're not), could not be analyze for explosives because holding times for explosives analysis would have

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.

Nota: Este resumen se presenta en inglés y en español para la conveniencia del lector. Se han hecho todos los esfuerzos para que la traducción sea precisa en lo más razonablemente posible. Sin embargo, los lectores deben estar al tanto que el texto en inglés es la versión oficial.

been exceeded long ago. Brett further stated that the west Vieques background soil data are being compared to the east Vieques background soil data. This will help show that the background inorganics concentrations in soil are similar across the island.

- Final Work Plan to be submitted following agency site visit to select surface water and sediment sampling locations
- Ecological Survey
- Collection of surface and subsurface soil samples at approximately 32 locations
 - targeting areas of former burn pits, ground scars, and geophysical anomalies
 - Installation of 10 monitoring wells
 - targeting areas of former burn pits and potential downgradient directions
- Collection of groundwater samples at 10 new wells and 7 existing wells
- Collection of surface water and sediment samples from ephemeral streams and Laguna Boca Quebrada
- Targeting where runoff enters ephemeral streams, depositional areas in streams and lagoon

Tentative RI Schedule

- May change over the course of the RI
- Ecological survey: January 9 through 17, 2007
- Soil sampling, well installation, groundwater sampling, surface water and sediment sampling: mid-January through mid March 2007
- Data evaluation to determine if sufficient or additional data are needed: 3rd calendar quarter 2007

Discussion Points

- Nilda Medina (community member): We, the RAB, oppose the background investigation. Brett Doerr (CH2M HILL) recognized that some RAB members believed that an off-island background study was more appropriate, but that the on-island background study was more appropriate due to uncertainties that would be introduced in an off-island study. He further stated that several requests by RAB members to help ensure an appropriate background dataset (for example, relocating some sample locations) were incorporated into the study.
- Jorge Fernández Porto (community member): We (RAB members) submitted comments to the background investigation. We are opposed to use the background sampling from the west to compare to the east because explosives were not sampled for at the west. I

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.

Nota: Este resumen se presenta en inglés y en español para la conveniencia del lector. Se han hecho todos los esfuerzos para que la traducción sea precisa en lo más razonablemente posible. Sin embargo, los lectores deben estar al tanto que el texto en inglés es la versión oficial.

recommend taking some samples for explosives in the west to be able to compare east and west. Brett replied that this is not necessary because the inorganics data from the west can be compared for similarity to the inorganics data from the east, where explosives were analyzed.

- Lirio Márquez D'Acunti (community member): Will the water samples be compared to the SWMU 6 ephemeral stream? Brett replied that the agencies will identify an appropriate background location to which water samples will be compared.
- Jorge: How can you use Laguna Arenas when this lagoon is part of SWMU 6? Brett responded that Arenas is outside SWMU 6 and SWMU 4. In addition, there may be other locations identified by the agencies that will be appropriate background.
- Jorge: EQB has not provided the results of their public meeting on the NFA report. We invested a lot of time providing comments to EQB but our comments have not been considered because they have not been submitted to the Navy. Jorge added that the Navy does not have fault because after three years the Navy and all of us have been waiting for EQB decision. At this point, it will be good if the Navy provides time for comments on this document; our concern is that the sites may not be the same after all the time passed, so we feel that our comments were not responded by EQB.

II.d Anticipated 2007 Schedule for Environmental Restoration Program

(Please note that the schedule may change based on findings, report preparation schedules, and regulatory review schedules)

ERP Documents for RAB Review

- 1st Calendar Quarter 2007
 - Draft Final Master Work Plan for ERP
 - Draft Final RI Report for AOC H (west Vieques)
- 2nd Calendar Quarter 2007
 - No Further Action Proposed Plan for 9 Sites (as part of public review)
- 3rd Calendar Quarter 2007
 - Draft Final East Vieques Background Soil Inorganics Investigation Report
 - Draft Final Removal Action Work Plan for AOC J, AOC R, SWMU 6 and SWMU 7 (west Vieques)
- 4th Calendar Quarter 2007
 - Draft Final RI Report for AOC E
 - Draft Final RI Report for AOC I

ERP Field Activities

- 1st Calendar Quarter 2007
 - SWMU 4 RI (West Vieques)
- 2nd Calendar Quarter 2007
 - Additional AOC R RI Sampling (west Vieques)
- 3rd or 4th Calendar Quarter 2007

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.

Nota: Este resumen se presenta en inglés y en español para la conveniencia del lector. Se han hecho todos los esfuerzos para que la traducción sea precisa en lo más razonablemente posible. Sin embargo, los lectores deben estar al tanto que el texto en inglés es la versión oficial.

- Removal Actions at AOC J, AOC R, SWMU 6 and SWMU 7

Iie. Munitions Response Program Update

John Tomik (CH2M HILL) gave an update of the Munitions Response Program.

- The overall objectives are to conduct the investigation and the remedial actions to reduce the risk to human health pose by explosive items. Reduce the explosive risk, as appropriate, to meet USFWS land use plan.
- As part of the Time Critical Removal Action (TCRA), the Navy has implemented boat patrols on north and south sides of the Live Impact Area (LIA) to inform and protect the public.
- Air monitoring has been conducted to evaluate potential releases from detonations, no detections of explosive compound exceeded screening levels.
- On site munitions debris and range related debris are processed including cutting materials into manageable size and heating them to insure no explosive residue remains.
- The Biological Assessment for the LIA was completed; an expanded biological assessment is planned for the Eastern Maneuver Area (EMA), Surface Impact Area (SIA) and Eastern Conservation Area (ECA).

Iif. Air Monitoring Update

- The air monitoring conducted to date has demonstrated:
 - no explosives have been detected in the air close to the BIPs
 - the metals detected in the air were detected at levels within acceptable regulatory limits
- The objectives of the Air Emissions Modeling Approach are:
 - Support prescribed (controlled) burn variance application
 - Estimate impact of emissions in ambient air
 - Identify the appropriate locations for monitoring stations
 - Identify target compounds for monitoring
- The Navy is working closely with EQB, EPA and USFWS with a series of joint calls to achieve consensus on the modeling approach and protocol.
- Two types of models were utilized: CALPUF model for dispersion of emissions from prescribed burns; and OBODM Gaussian dispersion for BIP emissions.
- The modeling conducted assumed the worst case concentrations emitted from the LIA: for BIP assumed 2 simultaneous 1000 lb detonations, for the controlled burned assumes burning a parcel up to 100 acres in size.
- The model used meteorological data from 2003-2005.
- The modeling results show that fine particulates of dust (PM10) and Carbon Monoxide (CO) are the most significant emissions from BIPs and Prescribed (controlled) burn modeling.

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.

Nota: Este resumen se presenta en inglés y en español para la conveniencia del lector. Se han hecho todos los esfuerzos para que la traducción sea precisa en lo más razonablemente posible. Sin embargo, los lectores deben estar al tanto que el texto en inglés es la versión oficial.

- The BIP modeling demonstrates that particulate levels above from the BIPs would decrease to well below regulatory limits before reaching the populated areas of Vieques. In addition, any explosives or metal compounds emitted from the BIPs are unlikely to be detected in populated areas of Vieques. (See attached Summary of Navy's Air Monitoring Program.)

Iig. Controlled Burn Plan Update

- The current draft plan is under internal review. It limits the size of burn area to below 100 acres.
- It is expected that the prescribed (controlled) Burning Variance Application be submitted to EPA and EQB including the summary of the air monitoring completed to date, Air emissions Modeling Report, Air Monitoring Plan and Prescribed Burn Plan.
- The Application will also be submitted for public review following the Navy addressing any comments from the regulators..

Discussion Points

- Michael Diaz (community member): Has there been any progress on the air monitoring? Has a tracer been considered to be added to the detonations? John replied that the Navy modified the air monitoring approach to include extensive modeling. The current air stations do not show any detection of contaminants over regulatory standards.
- Nilda: Could you explain what the two models are? John explained that the OBODM model was used to project potential air quality impacts from the BIP detonations in the Live Impact Area and concluded that the BIPs are not likely to have any significant impacts on the air quality in the populated areas of Vieques. The CALPUF model was used to project potential air quality impacts from controlled burning and concluded that the controlled burns are not likely to have a significant impact on the air quality in the populated areas of Vieques.
- Nilda: What is the amount of explosives that are being detonated, because during the last detonation the houses shook? John replied that 1,000 lbs of net explosive weight is the maximum amount.
- Jorge: The demonstrators outside request that the open BIPs be stopped. We all are concerned about the health of the people. We, RAB members have been asking for the last 8 months about installing air monitors in the civilian site. The Navy leaves us no choice than join the demonstrators outside and request that you stop the BIPs until the air monitoring is in place. We need to know what is going on and why the monitoring station in town is not installed yet. John stated that the existing monitoring that has been ongoing since August, 2005 has demonstrated that there is unlikely to be any air quality impacts in town.
- Sixto Pérez (community member): The RAB requested a monitoring station in town back in January 2006. The monitoring needs to be done before, during and after the detonations. We have been talking about this issue for a while. We need answers.

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.

Nota: Este resumen se presenta en inglés y en español para la conveniencia del lector. Se han hecho todos los esfuerzos para que la traducción sea precisa en lo más razonablemente posible. Sin embargo, los lectores deben estar al tanto que el texto en inglés es la versión oficial.

- John replied that the existing air monitoring stations have not detected any contamination above standards. The Navy continues monitoring BIPs emissions and gather data. After the modeling is final and the Navy reaches consensus with the regulatory agencies on the air monitoring plan and the proposed monitoring locations, the Navy will be installing monitoring stations in town and at Camp Garcia.
- Jorge. Are you installing additional stations because the regulatory agencies have asked you to do so for the controlled burning, if that is the case, the Navy is not responding to a petition of the community but reaching for regulatory compliance.
- Emilio Garcia (community member). How do you expect us to believe the Navy when a federal representative at the last meeting stated that he does not trust the air monitoring data? John Tomik stated that the air monitoring data has demonstrated that there are no explosives or metals detected at the air monitoring stations in close proximity of the BIPs
- Lirio: Additionally, I have a concern of when those stations will be installed, because the controlled burning will not happen yet, have not been approved.
- Roberta Britton (community member): When are you installing the new stations? John Tomik replied that some of the equipment is in Camp Garcia. The Navy is currently in a process of buying the station to be located in town. Only after the modeling is completed and regulatory concurrence granted that the Navy can order the equipment with the right specifications.
- Colleen MacNamara (community co-chair). According to the data, the existing system has not been operating half of the time. Why don't you install the monitor already on hand? As shown on the attached Air Monitoring Summary the air monitoring stations have been operating 93% of the time since June 2003.
- Roberta: Are you saying that the prescribed burning is more contaminating than the BIP? John replied that based on the modeling the higher concentrations of dust particulates (PM) and carbon monoxide comes from the burns.
- Jorge: You said that you can burn 100 acres at once; can you process 10 acres before the vegetation grows again? John replied: Yes, 100 acres is the maximum to be burned.

II.h Comments and questions from public:

- Michael Sosa (resident – local worker). We came here to tell you we are working on the clean up. The Navy and its contractors have followed a process to make sure they are working safe, we have been trained, and have physical tests conducted on a regular basis. We are Viequenses and we are making sure the work is being done correctly. We represent many families that benefit from our work. We are doing a good job.
- Edgar Colon (resident – local worker). We are voluntarily working on the clean up. We have been trained. We are sure that we are doing a good job. We are helping the community with the money we are honestly earning. An error was made by the Navy in the past; this Navy is correcting that mistake by cleaning the island.

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.

Nota: Este resumen se presenta en inglés y en español para la conveniencia del lector. Se han hecho todos los esfuerzos para que la traducción sea precisa en lo más razonablemente posible. Sin embargo, los lectores deben estar al tanto que el texto en inglés es la versión oficial.

- Iris Vera (resident – local worker). It seems that the community will protest for everything, we like our job and know it is being done. I think that RAB members will protest anyway even if the monitoring stations are installed, and later they will protest because we are going the clean up too slowly.
- Jorge: We the RAB are happy that you have a job and you are well trained. The issue here is that the RAB have asked the Navy to install air monitors for a year, we feel that our request has not been heard and no good answer has been given to explain why the stations are not in place. The Navy leaves us no option that request that BIPs stop until the Navy monitors the air. I believe that the contamination is not reaching the civilian population but we (RAB, Navy and regulators) need the data to show that there is not impact. It is interesting that it is now when the regulatory agencies suddenly feel the need to request the stations, when the Navy is willing to comply.

III. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:30 PM. Next meeting was schedule for April/May timeframe.

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.

Nota: Este resumen se presenta en inglés y en español para la conveniencia del lector. Se han hecho todos los esfuerzos para que la traducción sea precisa en lo más razonablemente posible. Sin embargo, los lectores deben estar al tanto que el texto en inglés es la versión oficial.