

**PALI TRAINING CAMP
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD (RAB) MINUTES
WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 4, 2013
KAILUA HIGH SCHOOL CAFETERIA
451 ULUMANU DR
KAILUA, ISLAND OF OAHU, HAWAII**

1. Kevin Pien called the meeting to order at 6:45 p.m. and welcomed everyone.
2. Those in attendance included Government Co-Chair Kevin Pien of U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE); Community Co-Chair Leslie R. Kahihikolo, RAB members Dr. Paul Brennan, Dr. Charles Burrows, Marti McCracken, Steven Mow (State of Hawaii Department of Health), Francis A. Ritchey III, Shannon Wood, and Donna Wong.

Others in attendance included Kanalei Shun of U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE).

Contractors present included Cariann Ah Loo and Gregory B. Jacobs of Huikala and David Shideler of Cultural Surveys Hawaii (CSH).

RAB members absent were Dawn Chang, Victoria Creed, Kimberly Kalama, Maya L.K. Saffery, Bert K. Wong, and Kelly Tomioka.

The agenda of the meeting was:

- I. Welcome and Introductions
- II. Approval of Minutes/Action Items from Previous Meeting
- III. Project Fieldwork Status Update
- IV. Site Visits/Next Meeting
- V. Open Discussion

Name	Action Items from 3 September 2013	Suspense Date	Completed
Kevin Pien	Send website link	January 4, 2014	

- I. Welcome and Introductions
 - Status Update
 - a. USACE and contractor representatives
- II. Approval of Minutes/Action Items from Previous Meeting
 - Draft Meeting Minutes
 - a. Minutes approved

1. C. Burrows moved, Irish Ritchey seconded, motion passed with all voting in the affirmative except Donna Wong who abstained having not attended the previous meeting.

III. Project Fieldwork Status Update

- Greg Jacobs, Senior UXO Supervisor, Huikala LLC.
 - a. Grids, transects and soil sampling completed
 1. 155 transects (1- meter wide) completed, including Maunawili Falls and Demonstration trails.
 - a. Total distance of 58.164 km (36.1 mi)
 2. No threatened or endangered species encountered or impacted
 - a. Some native plants present, particularly in the higher elevations
 3. No negative impact to cultural resources (David Schiedler of CSH to elaborate further)
 4. 22 grids completed- total of 5.6 acres
 - a. 2,500-10,000 ft² in size each
 - b. 100% area coverage broken down into 5-foot wide lanes
 - c. Two types
 - i. Density estimate grids in areas of high anomaly density
 - ii. UXO estimator
 1. “prove-the-negative”- i.e., lack of MEC above the 0.1 UXO/acre threshold
 5. 3,500 anomalies detected and investigated
 6. 5 MEC items
 - a. 37-mm High Explosive (HE) projectile
 - b. 75-mm shrapnel projectile
 - c. 105-mm HE projectile
 - d. (2) 81-mm mortars (Discarded Military Munitions (DMM))
 7. 315 lb MD
 8. 575 lb cultural debris
 9. All items double checked and certified as Materials Determined as Safe (MDAS).
 10. Base camp at center of MRS
 11. Started in Waimanalo and continued clockwise to Olomana, Royal Hawaiian Golf Club, Hawaii Agriculture Research Center and

remainder of Maunawili Valley Impact Area MRS (Munitions Response Site) including hiking trails.

- a. No sign of munitions use in Waimanalo and Olomana areas
- b. Only munitions debris on the HRT (golf course) property
- b. Negotiating with DLNR DOFAW and contractor for full sweep of trails vice a 1-meter transect.
 1. Additional work scheduled for the January-February timeframe
- c. Hazard assessment will be completed as part of the Remedial Investigation Report
- d. Soil Sampling
 1. 6 background samples
 - a. Located where munitions uses is not suspected to establish baseline
 2. 8 samples in high anomaly density areas
 3. Incremental Sampling Method
 - a. 50 sub-increments composited and analyzed
 - i. 4 metals- antimony, copper, lead, zinc.
 - ii. Explosives
 4. Compared against Hawaii Department of Health (HDOH) Environmental Action Levels (EALs)
 - a. Any exceedances will trigger additional sampling
 5. Remedial Investigation Report
 - a. Available in mid-next year

Donna Wong/Leslie Kahihikolo: If the MEC was removed, why would an explosive hazard remain?

Kevin Pien: The MEC items found during the RI were removed. Since the purpose of the RI was to characterize nature and extent of munition contamination (and not a complete removal), some MEC may still potentially be present. The RI is to determine if a problem exists and the further steps in the remedial process (i.e., the Feasibility Study, Proposed Plan) determine what will be done about the RI findings.

6. Feasibility Study
 - a. 3-4 months following RI Report
 - b. Develop and evaluate remedial alternatives
7. Proposed Plan
 - a. Presents the preferred alternative
 - b. 30-day public comment period as required by CERCLA

Shannon Wood: Is there a listing of all the FUDS projects?

Kevin Pien: Yes, a complete inventory of all projects in the FUDS Program nationwide is located at www.fuds.mil.

Donna Wong: On the map, what is the purple area?

Cariann Ah Loo: That was the 2012 removal action.

- David Shideler, Cultural Surveys Hawaii
 - a. Our job was to minimize impact to historic properties and cultural resources and we were extremely successful in that respect
 - b. Pre-field research included Land Court Awards (LCAs)
 - c. Found less than expected
 - 1. Archaeology often found in “bunches”
 - 2. Followed transects didn’t afford the luxury of additional scrutiny
 - d. One-third indeterminate function- largest category
 - 1. Walls- unknown function
 - 2. No time for additional investigation
 - e. No shrines, graves, caves, or heiau
 - f. One-third associated with water control
 - 1. Not surprising in Maunawili
 - g. Trails, roads
 - 1. Some can be dated (e.g., historic), others not
 - h. One charcoal kiln
 - i. Two non-irrigated agricultural sites
 - 1. Irrigated agriculture likely favored
 - j. Two habitation sites
 - 1. May have concentrated near LCAs

Donna Wong: What will happen to this information (the features and LCAs)? Is it publically available?

Kevin Pien: I believe the LCAs are a matter of public record. As for the newly identified features, they will be summarized in a report for the respective landowners (State of Hawaii, HRT) and sent to them.

Shannon Wood: Do you have any idea how old this stuff is?

David Shideler: Not exactly, although many of them can be assumed or determined to be post-contact.

Shannon Wood: Many of the rocks look like they are intentionally moved.

Minutes for Pali Training Camp Restoration Advisory Board Meeting

December 4, 2013

Page 5

David Shideler: Yes, that is possible, but my hunch is that the majority of them are post-contact. We did not do any dating, e.g., radiocarbon.

Donna Wong: So you didn't do any digging (excavation)?

David Shideler: That is correct, we did a reconnaissance-level identification of the feature and then had to move on.

Dr. Burrows: I was curious about the grinding stone discussed last time and whether additional information can be shared as the location.

David Shideler: This was the only one that was found. It may have been used post-contact, but probably originates from pre-contact. We would have to check on landowner permission.

Dr. Brennan: How long do you spend evaluating the features.

David Shideler: It depends, but a matter of minutes is not unusual.

Greg Jacobs: It depends on how fast the team is travelling. In high density areas, the team's pace may slow enough to allow the archaeologist and biologist to spend more time than average.

?: Were there any other lithic artifacts?

David Shideler: Not other than the grinding stone.

IV. Next Meeting

- Next RAB Meeting TBD.

V. Open Discussion

The meeting was adjourned at 8:30 p.m.