

WAIKANE TRAINING AREA
Public Informational Meeting
DRAFT MEETING MINUTES

Waiahole Elementary School
Waiahole, Oahu, Hawaii
Wednesday, August 4, 2004
6:00 P.M.

Introduction

Meeting commenced 6:03

C. Streck provided a brief overview of the agenda, indicating that the meeting would explain the Defense Environmental Restoration Program – Formerly Used Defense Sites (DERP-FUDS) program, the Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) and the work that is scheduled for the Waikane area. He asked that major questions be held for the end, but attendees should feel free to let speakers know if clarification is needed at any time.

DERP-FUDS Program

In conjunction with the PowerPoint presentation, C. Streck provided some background on the DERP-FUDS program. He indicated that this is a national program and referred everyone to the DERP-FUDS Fact Sheet available at the registration table. DERP-FUDS is a Department of Defense (DOD) program and is typically referred to as “FUDS.” It was enacted in 1986 as the military equivalent to the EPA Superfund Program. The program was established by Congress and comes under the authority of the DOD. Under DOD, the Secretary of the Army tasks the Army Corps of Engineers (ACE) to operate the program nationwide. The purpose of DERP- FUDS is to determine whether potential risks to human health, safety and the environment exist from former military activities prior to 1986. The various military services are responsible for restoring their own properties for any activities occurring after 1986.

The DERP-FUDS program encompasses over 9000 sites nationwide with a total annual budget between \$200-240 million. The POH Honolulu District has responsibility for over 500 FUDS sites in Hawaii, Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, Guam, American Samoa and scattered U.S. island possessions in the Pacific region.

Clarification was requested regarding the statement made earlier that each military service is responsible for site clean-ups on their own properties after 1986. This would mean that ACE is responsible for all clean-ups prior to 1986. C. Streck agreed and elaborated by explaining that DERP has two main parts: Formerly Used Defense Sites (FUDS) and Installation Restoration Program (IRP). IRP takes care of active military

sites and any properties that the military excesses after 1986. ACE only has authority over sites that were used and given up prior to 1986.

FUDS consists of four types of project categories:

- Hazardous, Toxic and Radioactive Waste (HTRW)
- Containerized Hazardous, Toxic and Radioactive Waste (CON/HTRW)
- Military Munitions Response Program (MMRP) - this used to be the ordnance program
- Building Demolition and Debris Removal (BD/DR)

Each property within the FUDS program has a primary risk element (e.g., HTRW), but sites can also have a secondary risk element (e.g., HTRW and BD/DR). The basic FUDS process has three phases:

- Inventory Phase (Preliminary Assessment)
This phase has been completed for all 500 sites, but ACE is continuously adding new sites.
- Study Phase (Site Investigation, Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study, and/or Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis)
The Waikane site is currently in the Study Phase. An EE/CA is also being prepared for ordnance at the site.
- Clean Up Phase (Remedial Design and Remedial Action)

In summary, the Phase 1 determines whether DOD has a responsibility for the site, Phase 2 identifies what needs to be dealt with, and Phase 3 delineates how to take care of it.

The Preliminary Assessment for the Former Waikane Training Area will be posted on the ACE district home page within a week. Everything from this meeting will be available at: www.poh.usace.army.mil.

Public Involvement and the RAB

C. Streck indicated that another purpose of this meeting is to gauge community interest in establishing a restoration advisory board for the former Waikane Training Area. A RAB provides a forum for community input in the decision making process and allows for active involvement in the review of technical documents and the clean-up process. RAB members are the first (within the general public) to receive and review any reports and documents that are prepared for the site. In turn, ACE relies on the members to disseminate this information to their families and communities to elevate awareness and provide guidance to the decision makers regarding clean up activities.

RABs are not a regulatory requirement, but rather are established by the local District Commander in response to the local community's level of interest. Community interest is indicated by the following:

- Local government request that a RAB be formed
- Petition signed by at least 50 local residents requesting that a RAB be formed
- Determination by the Corps of Engineers District Commander that a RAB is needed

A RAB currently exists for a FUDS site in Heeia, but has been delayed due to property right-of-entry issues. This has been a very informative RAB and has helped to ensure that ACE looked in the appropriate areas for community action. Another RAB exists for the Waikoloa Maneuver Area on the Big Island. This RAB has been integral in determining ACE priorities and where they focus their efforts. It has been working very well in a bad situation.

Rationale for a RAB:

- Encourages dialogue among stakeholders
 - Community
 - Other concerned parties
 - Local governments
 - Environmental groups with vested interest in general area
- Built on successful Technical Review Committee Model
- Fosters true partnership between the community and government agencies
 - Equal member status; no hierarchy
 - Meetings open to the public

Purpose of the RAB:

- Act as a forum for the discussion and exchange of information regarding clean up between POH, regulatory agencies and the community
- Provide an opportunity for stakeholders to participate in the clean up process and provide input to decision makers
- Complement other community involvement initiatives

Responsibilities of the RAB:

- Provide advisement to POH and federal and state regulatory agencies
- Consider important issues related to clean up, such as scope of studies, clean up levels, waste management and remedial action alternatives
- Review and evaluate documents
- Recommend priorities among sites and projects
- Conduct regular meetings that are open to the public at convenient times and locations

Potential Members of the RAB:

- Representatives of affected community interests and/or guests (these individuals have membership priority)
- Interested individuals
- Installation
- EPA region

- State environmental agency
- Other Federal and State agencies
- Local government

Next Steps:

- Nominate candidates you think can represent the community
- Application Deadline: September 10, 2004
- Watch for the first meeting

C. Streck emphasized that all RAB meetings are open to the general public and serve as the vehicle to report all findings and present information to the community.

Proposed Field Assessment and Investigation

C. Streck introduced Robert Nore of ACE's Ordnance and Explosive Design Center in Huntsville, Alabama. R. Nore has managed ordnance projects since 1989 and assisted in the development of a program to deal with ordnance and explosive sites. The Design Center is responsible for executing ordnance projects, conducting studies and removal actions, determining how to deal with affected sites, and standardizing ACE's approach in dealing with ordnance. The Center also conducts training classes on ordnance recognition and ordnance safety procedures. R. Nore has been involved with projects in Hawaii for several years, preparing all of the Engineering Evaluation / Cost Analysis (EE/CA) reports and assisting with most of the ordnance removal actions in the Hawaiian Islands.

R. Nore introduced Eric Brundage of ZapataEngineering (Zapata), the contractor hired to complete the EE/CA for Waikane Valley. Since Huntsville works for the Honolulu Engineering District (HED) and is responsible for providing HED with a characterization of the Waikane site, a determination of ordnance hazards, and the best approach to manage risk, they have contracted Zapata to gather this data. Zapata has worked with ACE on several projects including EE/CAs for Maui, Heeia Kea and Pali. R. Nore indicated that E. Brundage will present the details of the EE/CA work plan.

Proposed Work Plan and Project Assessment Field Investigations

E. Brundage is the general manager of Zapata's Specific Division and has been a Windward resident for over 20 years. He indicated that he will be discussing the following: project objectives, present site history and past studies, sampling procedures, and evaluation criteria.

EE/CA Objectives:

- Characterize Ordnance and Explosive (OE) Risk
- Identify Risk Reduction Alternatives
- Analyze/Compare Alternatives

- Recommend Risk Reduction Actions
- Involve Public in Decision Making Process

Waikane Valley Project Site:

- Approximately 874 acres
- Used by the Army from 1942 until 1953
- US Marine Corps assumed the lease in 1953 and used the area until 1976
- Used for Jungle Training and as an Artillery Impact Area

The current land use is mostly undeveloped but contains pockets of residential, recreational and agricultural development.

Military Activity:

- Reportedly utilized as maneuver and impact areas for jungle and assault training
- Suspected impact area was possibly used for the firing of:
 - field artillery pieces
 - mortar and/or bazooka rounds
 - rifle grenades
 - possible aircraft practice bombs
- Facilities dismantled by 1976

Previous Investigations:

- Military EOD Sweeps
 - Conducted in 1976 and 1984
 - Recovered 40,000+ pounds of practice ordnance
 - Discovered and destroyed High Explosive projectiles, rockets, grenades and rifle grenades
- Archaeological Studies
 - Reports of dud mortars, projectiles and bazooka rockets

Most Probable Munition (largest items expected to be found in the valley):

- 75mm High Explosive Projectile
 - Diameter = 75 mm
 - Length = 210 mm
 - Material = Steel

Other Potential OE Items:

- M9A1 Rifle Grenade
 - Diameter = 57 mm (2.25 inches)
 - Length = 285 mm (11.2 inches)
- M7A1 Practice Bazooka Rounds
 - Diameter = 60 mm (2.36 inches)
 - Length = 546 mm (21.5 inches)
- 81mm Illumination Mortar Rounds

OE Sampling Procedures:

- Ground reconnaissance surveys (2-3 man teams, walk the valley as much as possible, visual check of ground for visible ordnance)
- Geophysically map 20 acres in suspected impact areas, valleys and drainages (look below surface for buried ordnance, look in areas most likely to find ordnance, take into consideration erosion)
- 10 acres Mag and Flag (lay an area with handheld magnetometers)
- 10 acres Digital Geophysics (Will be using more sophisticated technology – similar to that used on Kahoolawe - to detect metal in ground, record to data recorder and analyze by computer. This technology will help to screen out items that are not ordnance-related. Due to the nature of Hawaii’s soil, rocks can often look like metal.) A combination of techniques will be used in digital geophysics:
 - Grids (stake out an area in rectangular parcels, often difficult as the grid size is terrain/vegetation dependent)
 - Transects (individual walking a 6’ wide path)
 - Super Transects (multiple passes along a 15’ wide path)
- Brush clearing kept to a minimum (will be hiring locally to conduct surveys and brush clearing)
- Geophysical Mapping
 - Collect data from transects and grids
 - Select target anomalies (potential ordnance locations)
 - Reacquire targets (in the field)
- Intrusive Sampling
 - Excavate target anomalies (conducted by trained ordnance technicians)
 - Identify anomaly
 - Record findings
- OE Disposal
- Scrap Management
- Suggest grid locations based on known or suspected impact areas (important for residents to identify any findings or suspicions to ACE to look at)
- Transect data collection provides sample coverage to identify unknown impact areas
- Grids may be relocated based on meandering path data

Safety is Paramount:

- Safety is a number 1 concern (not only for the crew, but for the community as well)
- Unexploded Ordnance (UXO) safety specialists on site at all times
- Minimum separation distances will be established (in the event that something happens to one group, it will not affect everyone)
- All items excavated will be strictly controlled until properly disposed of
- All occurrences of ordnance, ammunition, explosive items, components and scrap will be recorded

Evaluation Criteria:

- Current and documented future land use of property (this is where we need input from the community as it affects our evaluation of the area)
- OE Risk Factors
 - Potential for exposure
 - Likelihood and severity of an incident
 - OE sensitivity
 - OE depth
 - Site stability
 - Site activities
- Risk Evaluation

Risk Reduction Alternatives:

- No Action
- Institutional Controls (e.g., warning signage, etc.)
- Surface UXO clearance with Institutional Control
- UXO Clearance to detection depth
- A combination of the above

It is important to stress that public input is vital in determining the best method of mitigating risks and identifying what is acceptable for the community.

Public Impact:

- Field Activities (2 ½ to 3 months)
- Small crews (2 to 6 people per crew)
- Vehicles will be SUV/pickup truck size and smaller
- No plan for heavy equipment
- Some minor noise from chain saws and weedwackers
- Possibility of explosive disposal of found UXO
 - Safety is paramount
 - Prior public notice and coordination with residents
 - May have temporary road closures
 - Noise associated with planned detonations
 - Use of engineering controls to minimize public impact

General Discussion

Questions were asked regarding the potential depths of ordnance that might be found on the site and the depths at which sampling will be conducted. E. Brundage replied that most of the ordnance mentioned in his presentation (rifle grenades, bazookas, etc.) would not penetrate the ground beyond a couple feet. However, the depth is also dependent on factors such as impact area soil type, and erosion. He also indicated that current technology allows small ordnance (e.g., a hand grenade the size of a baseball) to be seen only as far as two feet deep at best. Larger items such as artillery shells can be identified further down (e.g., 75mm rounds can be seen approximately 34 inches below the surface).

An inquiry was made into the landowners of the 874-acre parcel under discussion. C. Streck responded that property landowners include Waikane Development, the State of Hawaii, the City and County of Honolulu, and some small landowners.

Concerns arose regarding the true intent of the clean up. Some suggested that the clean up was initiated to pave the way for future development of the area. C. Streck stated that primary objective of the DERP-FUDS program is health and safety.

Clarification was requested regarding landowner liability. C. Streck explained that the FUDS program is a cooperative program and is dependent upon the cooperation of landowners. Landowners must grant a right-of-entry for ACE to conduct the studies. If a landowner chooses to be a part of the program then the Department of Defense assumes an indefinite responsibility for any ordnance on the property. A landowner can choose not to participate, but doing so then means they assume the responsibility (liability) for what might be on the site. With regard to this project, ACE is in the process of obtaining the rights-of-entry for the site.

Much discussion revolved around the U.S. Marine Corps' 187-acre parcel formerly owned by the Kamaka family. Some members of the public inquired about initiating clean up efforts at this site. C. Streck reiterated that this property does not fall within the DERP-FUDS authority and therefore cannot be considered for clean up under the ACE purview. When asked who they can talk to regarding this issue, C. Streck responded that they should contact their Representatives.

A question was raised about the budget for the project under discussion. C. Streck indicated that approximately \$1 million has been allocated to complete the EE/CA and establish whether a threat to human health and safety exists and determine how to address that threat. In response, it was suggested that the project could conceivably continue indefinitely if the assessment indicates a serious problem. C. Streck replied that this is possible but too premature to accurately determine. In many instances, funding cannot be appropriated to clean up a site within one year. Since the entire Honolulu district budget is approximately \$13 million and covers many properties, priorities must be set to ensure that ACE focuses its efforts where it can achieve maximum benefits. He remarked that RABs are crucial to the DERP-FUDS program as these priorities and decisions need to be made with community input to ensure that clean up projects are done with the community's best interests in mind.

Concerns were raised regarding the potential for property condemnation in the event that the government determines it is not cost effective to clean up the Waikane site. C. Streck replied that condemnation has not occurred in the history of the DERP-FUDS program. As an example, the Waikoloa project is estimated to cost \$600-800 million to remove ordnance. This cost exceeds any other clean up project but the government is committed to removing the ordnance and will not consider alternatives such as land condemnation. H. Takemoto further emphasized that the FUDS program does not grant authority to purchase property in lieu of cleaning up sites and removing hazards. C. Streck noted that clean up efforts are dependent not only on the type of hazard, but on the proposed land

use for the area as well. Risks are different and efforts are very site specific and use specific.

An inquiry was made regarding the ordnance removal process. C. Streck responded that the preferred method is to detonate ordnance on site to reduce the risk to workers. The ACE employs effective technology to contain blast impacts and shrapnel. On-site detonation also eliminates the risks associated with the transportation of ordnance.

Questions were asked about the accuracy of boundary lines used during the clean up process and whether the project reports and documents would be available for public review. C. Streck indicated that boundary lines are determined from tax map keys and archive maps. He also announced that a depository has been established at the Kaneohe Public Library and materials will also be available on the ACE website (identified earlier).

Clarification was requested regarding why the geophysical mapping of the site will be limited to 20 acres and why the remainder of the site (854 acres) will not be surveyed. C. Streck indicated that the 20 acre designation is based on the statistical computer model prepared by the experts in the Huntsville office to determine probable densities. In reference to looking at the remainder of site, E. Brundage responded that the 20-acre sampling will consist of sub-surface surveys. Above ground surveys will be conducted for the entire area, and based on these findings, 20 acres will be selected for further sub-surface investigation. Some concern was expressed over the fact that it would be difficult to determine just which areas needed thorough investigation and questions were raised as to how ACE will make this determination. E. Brundage replied that this will be done based on community input and ground reconnaissance. Crews will be looking for ordnance remnants.

A question was asked about the status of Senate Concurrent Resolution 212 which was adopted by the legislature to request the federal government to do a feasibility study and thorough clean up of the 187-acre USMC parcel and turn the site back over to the state. C. Streck responded that he was not aware of the status as it was not within the jurisdiction of the Army.

An inquiry was made as to what types of environmental assessments or consultations have been initiated or completed with state and federal agencies for cultural sites, threatened/endangered species and critical habitat. C. Streck indicated that the DERP-FUDS program falls under the scope of CERCLA and therefore does not follow NEPA requirements. As such, environmental assessments and impact statements are not prepared. However, Section 106 (National Historic Preservation Act compliance) is completed and biological studies are prepared though not required. ACE does not perform complete boundary to boundary inventories but will complete studies in areas that are likely to experience adverse impacts (i.e., where ordnance is blown in place).

An inquiry was made into the project timetable. R. Nore replied that the timetable is dependent upon obtaining the rights-of-entry to start the field work. Field work will take approximately 2 ½ to 3 months and reports will be due 2 months after field work

completion. These documents will be made available for public review and comment. ACE will then respond to comments, prepare the final report and ultimately a decision document. The \$1 million appropriation mentioned previously covers this entire process. R. Nore remarked that it typically takes 18 months from award of contract to signing the decision memorandum.

Clarification was requested regarding project crews conducting ordnance clearance activities in Waihee (Kahaluu) Valley and whether these crews were contracted by ACE. It is believed that these crews are responsible for defoliating some steep hillside areas and excavating small holes. Many of the plants were important native species and their removal will allow non-native species to take over the area. It was asked if there are plans to replant the area with native species. E. Brundage responded that the ordnance clearance activities in question were part of a Zapata Engineering project, but he was not aware of their crews removing native plants from the site. He indicated that care is always taken to protect flora and fauna. Biological surveys, as well as cultural surveys, are conducted to identify critical habitat prior to any clearance activities. E. Brundage provided his card to the individual and asked that he show him the sites in question.

More comments were provided regarding the 187-acre USMC parcel. In particular, it was expressed that the ACE should act as an intermediary between the community and the USMC to clean up the parcel. C. Streck responded that he is not part of the chain of command within the USMC, but if he happens to have the opportunity to relay the community's concerns he will.

A question was raised regarding the actual costs for the Waikane property. In a previous meeting for the Waikane/Waiahole Community Association, a USMC representative informed the group that it would cost approximately \$500 million to clean up the 187-acre parcel. Confirmation was sought for this figure. C. Streck indicated that he was not aware of their estimates, but as a comparison he noted that Waikoloa will require an estimated \$600 million to clean up 28,000 acres. R. Nore further noted that the EE/CA report will provide estimates on the various alternatives proposed for the site. If the public desires, these figures can be provided to the USMC to consider for their 187-acre parcel.

Further concerns were expressed about the possibility that the ACE could ultimately determine that the land cannot be cleaned up and will recommend that the land be isolated or condemned. C. Streck emphasized that ACE does not have the regulatory authority to condemn land. In the instance that the evaluations have been completed and the ACE does not have the funding to initiate the clean up, the RAB will be consulted as to the preferred interim measures to take until funding can be appropriated to clean the site. He stressed that if a risk exists, ACE is mandated to remove the hazard regardless of the cost. Within the DERP-FUDS program, cost effectiveness is not an excuse for not cleaning a site. R. Nore supported this statement and remarked that the ACE has been involved in several hundred EE/CAs around the country and has never taken the route of condemnation. It cannot be done.

A question was asked about the amount of power the RAB actually has. C. Streck responded that the RAB does not have any regulatory authority but does have a great amount of influence. It is an advisory group to the Commander who has the ultimate decision-making power. The RAB's advice is always seriously considered and adopted the majority of the time. The only occasions in which RAB advice was not followed was when it was technically infeasible or the ACE did not have the money to follow through with it.

A concern was expressed regarding clearance priorities for the site. There is a fear that those sites with development interests will be addressed first as the large landowners will push for clearance. As a result, other parcels will be fenced off and the smaller users (e.g., farmers) will have to wait until additional funding can be obtained. C. Streck responded that that is not how clearance priorities are set within the program. Areas that are accessible to the public and children have the highest priority. The program has been fairly successful to date.

An inquiry was made regarding whether the ACE is aware of cultural sites in the valley. Many of the important sites have not yet been documented. C. Streck replied that they will be referring to previous surveys that were completed for the valley and will also have archaeologists in the field. Any community members with information on cultural sites are asked to get involved.

With no further discussion, the meeting was adjourned at 8:40 P.M.