

**WAIKANE TRAINING AREA  
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD (RAB) MINUTES  
WEDNESDAY, JUNE 22, 2011  
WAIAHOLE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL CAFETERIA  
48-215 WAIAHOLE VALLEY ROAD  
WAIAHOLE, ISLAND OF OAHU, HAWAII**

1. MAJ Sally Hannan called the meeting to order at 7:10 p.m. and welcomed everyone.
2. Those in attendance included Government Co-Chair MAJ Sally Hannan and Pat Billington of U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE); RAB members John Adolpho, Heidimarie Chung, Walea Constantineau, Todd Cullison, William Keoni Fox, David Henkin, Byron Ho, Kyle Kajihiro, Chris Lopes, Karen Maeda, Roger Morey, Steven Mow, Laurie Noda, Alyssis Okata, Eunice Lehua Pate, Poola Villarimo and Paul Zweng; and community members Emil Wolfgramm, Momi Wolfgramm, Rocky Kaluhiwa, Jerry Kaluhiwa, Clifford Loo, and Ray Kamaka.

Contractors present included Dwayne French of Zapata, Inc., Sonia Garcia and Clayton Kaplan of Environet, and Clayton Sugimoto of Wil Chee-Planning, Inc. (WCP).

RAB members absent were Robert Fernandez and Bernie Panoncial.

The agenda of the meeting was:

- I. Welcome and Introductions
- II. Charter Revisions
- III. Election of Community Co-Chair
- IV. Formerly Used Defense Site (FUDS) Program
- V. Project Update – Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study (RI/FS), Dwayne French of Zapata, Inc.
- VI. Project Update – Removal Action-Construction, Sonia Garcia of Environet, Inc.
- VII. Site Visit
- VIII. Next Meeting
- IX. Adjournment

<b>Name</b>	<b>Action Items from 22 June 2011</b>	<b>Suspense Date</b>	<b>Completed</b>
MAJ Hannan	Identify changes in all documents with “Track Changes”		
MAJ Hannan	Remove 10-mile radius reference in the geographic area of Waikane Valley Training Area		
MAJ Hannan	Change Section v to, “If a RAB member does not attend three (3) consecutive meetings, without sending an alternate, will be dismissed.”		

MAJ Hannan	Check on regulations regarding Section 3A, iii regarding whether the agenda can be jointly determined by the two co-chairs.		
MAJ Hannan	Upload and mail powerpoint presentations, minutes, etc. (post and pre-meeting).		
MAJ Hannan	Check on a standard timeline of how long it took to complete the different reports.		
MAJ Hannan	Provide Emil Wolfgramm information to where the reports are located for the scientific and engineering data of soils.		
MAJ Hannan	Provide qualification process of individuals for this project.		

I. Welcome and Introductions

II. Charter Revisions

MAJ Hannan stated that all RAB members, except one, should have received a copy of the Draft Final of the RAB Charter which incorporated revisions from the last RAB meeting. MAJ Hannan did not receive any feedback regarding the revisions. She then asked if anyone had any concerns on the Draft Final Charter.

A. Ms. Villarimo questioned whether the meeting would start without a quorum and also asked how long MAJ Hannan would wait before convening a meeting should there be less than a quorum. MAJ Hannan stated that it would be a RAB decision, but based off the Charter, the meeting will be convened even if there is less than a quorum. Meetings scheduled will always be held to provide information about the project to whoever is at the meeting. The RAB will be informed before the meeting if there is a major item to be voted on (e.g., adding a RAB member or voting on the Charter) and a quorum will be needed to vote on those issues.

B. D. Henkin had several comments:

1. Suggested that revisions should be made in “Track Changes” so RAB members could see all of the changes.
2. Page 1, Paragraph E: Wants definition of geographic area with a 10-mile radius removed as agreed on at the last RAB meeting.
3. Page 2, Section iv: Questioned whether an alternate could be a RAB member who has been removed from the RAB. After discussion, the RAB voted to keep the language as is.
4. Page 2, Section v: Wants section to read, “A RAB community member who does not attend three (3) consecutive meetings, without sending an alternate, will be dismissed.”
5. Page 3, Section vi: Questioned language regarding 2/3 of the total community RAB membership and whether it was relating to RAB members in attendance at the meeting or the total RAB membership. MAJ Hannan referenced the whole as

“Community RAB members” and “majority of those in attendance” when referring to RAB members in attendance for that meeting.

6. Page 3, Section vii: Same as Section vi above.
7. Page 3, Section III-A, iii: Regarding the agenda; wants the two co-chairs to jointly determine the agenda for each meeting. MAJ Hannan stated that language was directly from the regulations.
8. Page 4, Section III-A, iii: same as Section III-A, iii above
9. Page 8, Section F; Wants it changed to, “Approval of the meeting minutes will require a simple majority vote of the RAB community members present.”
10. Page 8, Section V-A, iii: Thought that termination of the RAB should require agreement of 75% of the total RAB community membership.
11. Page 8, Section V-A, iv: Finding of no longer sufficient sustained community interest should reference criteria of Section II-E.

C. S. Mow noted that, by definition, Formerly Used Defense Sites are no longer under Department of Defense) control. Section V-A, ii on page 8 should be revised to reflect that fact.

### III. Election of Community co-chair-Two members are interested in the position.

- a. David Henkin would like to serve as community co-chair to help facilitate discussions and to advocate on the behalf of the community.
- b. Roger Morey would like to serve as community co-chair to help serve the community. He has no personal attachments to the project site and would like to help move the process along.

Question from Ms. Villarimo to Mr. Henkin: Will your affiliation with the Marine RAB have any conflict with the Army RAB?

Answer: Both RABs are similar, but different. The Marine parcel is a military property, and it was a primary impact area with many issues regarding cleanability. The community is trying to be firm with having the military clean-up the area and get the land back to the original landowners. The FUDS parcel is privately owned. Hopefully, all of the property will be given back to the private owners and for community use.

Question from Ms. Villarimo to Mr. Morey: What is your expertise?

Answer: A background in sales and marketing and served on many other boards.

- RAB members voted David Henkin to be community co-chair and alternate community co-chair will be Robert Morey.

### IV. Formerly Used Defense Site (FUDS) Program Overview

- A. Department of Defense’s (DoD) commitment to clean up of former military properties
- B. Established by Congress in the mid-1980s cleans up properties formerly used by the military service
- C. The Army is the DoD Executing Agent for FUDS

D. How does a property become a FUDS

1. Definition of FUDS Property

- a. A real property formerly owned, leased, possessed by, or under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Defense within the 50 states, territories, commonwealths, and possessions over which the U.S. had jurisdiction.

2. FUDS Program Goals

- a. To reduce in a timely and cost effective manner the risk to human health and the environment resulting from past Department of Defense activities at formerly used DoD properties

E. FUDS Process – 3 Phases

1. Phase I Inventory

- a. Determine if the property was formerly used by DoD and if contamination is present that resulted from DoD activity

2. Phase II Investigation

- a. Conduct an investigation to determine nature and extent of the contamination

3. Phase III Cleanup

- a. Clean up the property to reduce risk to human health and the environment and to improve public safety

F. FUDS Program

1. Privately-owned lands

- a. Rights of Entry required
- b. Farms, parks, etc.

2. Removal Actions

- a. Utilize the best equipment currently available to detect at the highest levels possible

3. Follows EPA Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) Process

G. CERCLA Process

1. Site Discovery

2. Preliminary Assessment

3. Site Investigation

4. Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study or Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis

5. Propose Plan/Record of Decision

6. Site Closeout

H. Project Progress

Currently at the Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study and Removal Action phase

I. Waikane FUDS Project

1. Projects

a. Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study

- i. Entire FUDS property excluding excessive slopes (i.e., slopes > 33%)

b. Munitions and Explosives of Concern (MEC) Removal Action

- i. 2 AOCs = 41.1 acres total
  - c. Institutional controls
    - i. Safety message – “3Rs of Unexploded Ordnance”
      - Community events
      - Visit schools
- J. Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study (RI/FS)
- 1. Purpose
    - a. Characterization of site
      - i. Threat to:
        - Human health
        - Environment
        - Safety
    - b. Determine types of cleanup actions needed
    - c. Executed by Zapata, Inc.
- K. Removal Action (RA)
- 1. Two Areas of Concern (AOC) identified during EE/CA
  - 2. Purpose
    - a. Surface and subsurface clearance of all Munitions and Explosives of Concern (MEC)
    - b. Executed by Environet, Inc.

Paul Zweng: When will the reports be completed? MAJ Hannan response: I can give you a standard timeline for these types of projects.

Kyle Kajihiro: How much has been spent on this project and how much do you estimate to complete this project. MAJ Hannan response: I can give you the contract amounts; \$1.3 million for Zapata and \$1.9 million for Environet. I cannot give you a total amount to complete the project until the RI/FS has been completed.

Kyle Kajihiro: What kind of institutional controls do you have for this project? MAJ Hannan response: The institutional contract is a community outreach program and the Corps has been in contact with every school on the windward side regarding the 3Rs safety program. The Corps has also been to community events (e.g. Kiwanis Club).

William Fox: Since the munitions have been there for years, why is the Corps only addressing the issue now? MAJ Hannan response: There are many other projects currently going on and with respect to Waikane, the Corps identified the need and responded.

- L. Way Ahead
- 1. Funding to complete the RI/FS and RA in this fiscal year.
  - 2. Institutional controls funding is until the 2012 fiscal year.
  - 3. Points addressed by Steven Mow.

- a. Property. Not all transferred sites will be considered to be FUDS property. If the property is transferred prior to October 17, 1986 it will fall under the FUDS program; if it is after this date, it is handled by the service who handled it last.
  - b. Right of Entry. If you deny a right of entry to your property it gives the government the right to not address the concern on the property. Mr Mow urged the RAB to advise property owners that by not signing the Right of Entry, they will be preventing the government from cleaning their property.
  - c. Funding. All Military Munitions Response Program (MMRP) sites will get scored. Based on the nationwide score, funding will be issued according to the Munitions Response Site Prioritization Protocol (MRSPP) score.
- V. Project Update – Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study by Dwayne French of Zapata, Inc.
1. Conceptual Transect Layout
    - a. 22 miles of transects.
    - b. 3 ft. wide path.
    - c. Gaps in transects where slopes too steep or EE/CA said not needed.
  2. Proposed RI Fieldwork
    - a. Transects are entered into a GPS.
    - b. Brush cutters clear a 3 ft. wide path for clearance.
    - c. A magnetometer is used for clearance.
    - d. An archaeologist and biologist are always on site.
    - e. Once transects are complete, 57 25x25 ft. grids will be put in place in most heavily contaminated areas, based on the transect information; some grids will be placed in areas of low contamination to validate transect information.
    - f. Information from the transects and grids are used to determine if any water or soil sampling needs to be taken.
  3. RI Fieldwork Tentative Schedule
    - a. Continue Transect Marking and Limited Brush Clearing
      - i. ~10% of the transects have been completed, with no unexploded ordnance (UXO) found
      - ii. 20 June 2011 through 8 July 2011
    - b. Continue Mag and Dig Operations
      - i. Transects and grids
      - ii. Finish 11 August 2011
    - c. Environmental Sampling
      - i. August 2011 through early September 2011
    - d. Complete RI/FS related fieldwork
      - i. Mid September 2011
- VI. Project Update – Munitions and Explosives of Concern Removal Action by Sonia Garcia of Environet

1. Project Location – Removal Areas
  - a. 2 parcels & road transect
    - i. Area of Concern 1- 7.5 acres
    - ii. Area of Concern 2- 32 acres
    - iii. Road transects- 1.0 acre
2. Operations
  - a. Site Survey
    - i. Grids are laid for the sweep teams.
    - ii. Vegetation is cleared as necessary.
    - iii. Handheld detectors are used to sweep the areas for metallic objects.
    - iv. An archaeologist and botanist/biologist are on site.
  - b. Investigation/Excavation
  - c. Disposal
  - d. Quality Control
  - All site personnel are experienced with explosive ordnance disposal.
3. Site Survey
  - a. 50 x 100 meter grids are laid out.
  - b. Use hand held geophysical surveying equipment to locate potential munition objects.
4. Investigation/Excavation
  - a. Simultaneous Procedures
    - i. Remove surface anomalies (i.e., trash) to ensure complete coverage of grid area.
    - ii. Investigate potential subsurface munition items. Tools to reduce/eliminate suspected items:
      - EM-61 detector
      - F-3 detector
      - Minelab
    - iii. Excavate potential items that cannot be eliminated. Tools to reduce the fragmentation distance during excavation:
      - Barricades
      - Sand bag walls
5. Disposal
  - a. Munitions items deemed too hazardous to move will be blown in place
  - b. Prior to detonating in place the team will take extreme precautionary measures including:
    - i. Notify the Army and Public Safety Officials (e.g., Fire and Police Departments)
    - ii. Use mitigation measures to reduce the blast/fragmentation distance (i.e., sandbags)

- iii. Secure the site to ensure personnel are not within the hazard area
  - After detonating the item, the munitions debris will be containerized and safely removed from the site and disposed of.
6. Munitions Found to Date
- a. Six 2.3-inch HEAT Rockets
  - b. One 81mm HE Mortar
  - c. One 60mm HE Mortar
  - d. One hand grenade, HE
- All items have been safely and successfully disposed with no impact to cultural resources.
7. Waikane Challenges
- a. Public Use: Trails, Off-road Vehicles, Dumping
  - b. Terrain: Steep, Vegetated Slopes
  - c. Difficult Geology: Iron rich substrate
  - d. Safety: Terrain, Heat, Explosives
  - e. Resources: Supplies, People, Equipment
8. Progress Update
- a. Surveying: 100% Complete
  - b. UXO Clearance: 30% Complete
  - c. Anticipated Completion Timeframes: Mid-July 2011

Emil Wolfgramm would like the engineering data on the iron content of the soil. Parts per million (PPM) is a crucial measurement in finding contents in the soil which exceeds the natural background reading of that locality. When looking at the data you are able to distinguish if the data (numbers) are from the natural environment or if it was caused by human error. MAJ Hannan told Mr. Wolfgramm that these results are available in the Site Investigation report and would be sure a copy was available in the repositories.

Sonia Garcia explained how a geophysicist maps out a geophysical prove out area. Seed items are placed in this area for each team to test their equipment before going out into a grid to begin mag and dig operations.

David Henkin: Are items that are removed also detonated, that is do you move things that need to be detonated or is it just frag and debris? I thought all UXO had to be blown in place. Sonia Garcia response: We do move certain items that need to be detonated. MAJ Hannan response: Because the FUDS property is non-military, consolidated detonation must happen on the same day (i.e., no stockpiling).

David Henkin: How do you pick the location of detonation? Clayton Kaplan response: We clear an area within 300 meters of the UXO to be moved and make sure the area is 100% cleared of UXO.

Kyle Kajihiro: Are you sampling for chemical constituents of explosives? Sonia Garcia response: We are only doing a removal action and we are not doing any sampling.



Kyle Kajihiro: Is there any other element in the project that will look at chemical constituents? MAJ Hannan response: The RI/FS phase of the project will be doing environmental sampling. Dwayne French response: We will be doing soil sampling as well as groundwater sampling.

Kyle Kajihiro: Will there be sampling done in the removal area? MAJ Hannan response: Sampling was done during the EE/CA phase. Clayton Kaplan response: We use C4 explosive which does not contaminate the environment and there is clean up after every detonation. Detonation is completely contained all the time.

Byron Ho: How do you qualify people to work on the project? How were project personnel selected to do this portion of the work? MAJ Hannan response: I will provide qualification process.

## VII. Site Visit

- a. Scheduled for Friday June 24<sup>th</sup> to show RAB members fieldwork and to work around the contractors schedules.
  - i. Receive information about the valley from the Kamaka Family.
  - ii. Respect the culture, ancestry of the valley.
  - iii. Site visit will be designated to only the defined route.
  - iv. A non-negotiable liability waiver needs to be signed.
  - v. Limited to 20 people.
- RAB members requested that, due to the small number able to attend, community members be allowed to participate. MAJ Hannan allowed the RAB to vote, and the group voted in favor of opening the site visit to the community.
- The community will be notified only by word of mouth due to the limited time before the event is scheduled to happen (less than 48 hours).
- Due to limited space, it will be on a first come first serve basis, up to a max of 20 participants.
- Participants should RSVP NLT noon, Thursday, 23 June 11..
- b. Smart Sheet
  - i. Visit terrain
  - ii. Overview of the project
  - iii. RI/FS demonstration
  - iv. Hike to the lo'i-archaeologist will be on site.
  - v. Site visit is from 8:30-11:30 a.m. A safety briefing will begin at 9:00 and will leave for the site after.

## VIII. Next RAB Meeting

Wednesday, 27 July 2011, 7 p.m., Waiahole Elementary School Cafeteria

## IX. Adjournment

There being no further business, MAJ Hannan adjourned the meeting at 9:10 p.m.