

MINUTES OF THE
PEARL HARBOR-HICKAM-KALAELOA
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD (RAB) MEETING
OAHU VETERANS CENTER, HONOLULU, HAWAII

April 16, 2025

I. ATTENDANCE: SEE ATTACHMENT A.

II. OPENING

Ms. Stephanie Kawasaki, facilitator of the meeting, opened the meeting at 6:00 p.m. and led the introduction of the RAB members.

Captain (CAPT) Samuel White, Commanding Officer of Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam introduced himself and spoke briefly about the agenda items for the meeting.

Mr. Guy Inouye, RAB member, introduced himself.

Mr. Robert Huber, RAB member, introduced himself.

Mr. Cruz Vina Jr., RAB member, introduced himself.

Colonel (COL) Monica Gramling, Deputy Commanding Officer of Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam, introduced herself.

Ms. Kawasaki asked the moderator, Ms. Dayna Yoshizaki, if there were any RAB Members attending via Zoom. Ms. Yoshizaki confirmed that there were none.

Ms. Kawasaki then introduced herself and presented the structure of the meeting.

III. REVIEW OF DECEMBER 2024 MEETING MINUTES

Ms. Jocelyn Tamashiro introduced herself as the Environmental Restoration (ER) Program Manager at Naval Facilities Engineering Systems Command (NAVFAC), Hawaii, and began the process of approving the December 2024 meeting minutes, but noted that the RAB Community Co-chair, Mr. Henry Curtis, who usually leads the approval had not yet arrived at the meeting. Ms. Tamashiro suggested that another RAB member lead the approval and solicited a volunteer.

CAPT White then asked Ms. Tamashiro if it was possible for the board to proceed with the approval of the RAB charter without the Community Co-chair present, Mr. Henry Curtis. Ms. Tamashiro stated that it would not be appropriate to do so. CAPT White suggested that they defer discussion of the charter to the next meeting because they could not confirm that Mr. Curtis would be attending.

Mr. Kyle Kajihira, RAB member, suggested that they move the approval of the meeting minutes and RAB charter down the agenda under the assumption that Mr. Curtis was coming and was stuck in traffic. CAPT White agreed to delay the discussion for a short time. After some discussion, the board agreed to proceed with the first presentation while they waited for Mr. Curtis. As discussions continued, Mr. Curtis arrived but the meeting proceeded with the first presentation.

IV. COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT PLAN UPDATE

Ms. Tamashiro explained that the Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam (JBPHH) Community Involvement Plan (CIP) is a document designed to cover the entire JBPHH footprint on the island of Oahu and discuss the community's needs, concerns, and expectations regarding ER. Ms. Tamashiro went on to cover how there had previously been two CIPs, one for Pearl Harbor Naval Complex and one for Hickam Air Force Base, but now that these installations had been combined into a single installation (JBPHH) a single document was needed.

Ms. Tamashiro then drew the board's attention to a QR code that linked to the Navy's administrative record file website. Ms. Tamashiro explained how ER Program documents could be downloaded from this site and that the new draft CIP was available there. Ms. Tamashiro also noted that the Navy was planning to update the CIP periodically as new information is made available.

Ms. Tamashiro summarized the key components of the CIP including site descriptions and background, community involvement history, status of ER program sites, location and access information for the administrative record file, communication strategies and outreach methods, and opportunities for public participation and comments.

Ms. Tamashiro then began discussing the results of the CIP's Environmental Concerns Survey. Concerns of the respondents included chemicals of concern such as PFAS, petroleum, metals, and pesticides. 31 percent (%) of respondents were not familiar with what the ER Program does. 38% of respondents were not familiar with what the RAB does. 63% of respondents rely primarily on social media to receive their information, while 58% of respondents rely on traditional news (i.e., newspapers and television) to receive their information about what the Navy is doing for cleanup. Ms. Tamashiro noted that this was a good indication of the best media strategies for keeping the community informed. Ms. Tamashiro then discussed the communication methods laid out in the CIP, which include RAB meetings, community mailing lists for ER Program updates, the administrative record file and information repositories such as libraries, posting notifications in the newspaper for decision documents, open house meetings, and site tours. Ms. Tamashiro stated that site tours are mainly available to RAB members. Mr. Curtis clarified that they are only available to RAB members.

Ms. Tamashiro then stated that the CIP provides the foundation for establishing the RAB. Ms. Tamashiro went over the duties of the RAB, which includes being a forum for discussing community concerns and providing feedback to the Navy. The RAB ensures that there is transparency between the Navy and the community, as well as the other agencies that help the Navy manage its ER sites. Ms. Tamashiro noted that the RAB does not make decisions, but that it is important in providing advice to the Navy.

Next, Ms. Tamashiro presented information on the grant opportunities that are available to the public. The Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) Technical Assistance Grant (TAG) is a program that provides funds for community members to hire outside experts to help interpret environmental information. This program is available for communities near sites on the EPA's National Priorities List, which Ms. Tamashiro noted includes the Pearl Harbor Naval Complex. Ms. Tamashiro also discussed the EPA's Technical Assistance Services for Communities (TASC) program, which provides communities with guidance for moving through the environmental cleanup and site reuse process. Ms. Tamashiro directed the audience to the EPA's website where more information on grants could be found.

Ms. Tamashiro concluded her presentation by discussing the next steps in the production of the CIP. Ms. Tamashiro stated that the draft CIP is available for download on the new Environmental Restoration, Navy (ERN) website that would be presented later in the meeting. She emphasized that the public could read the document and submit comments to her by the May 16, 2025, deadline, and that the Navy would respond to the comments received.

Ms. Kawasaki opened the floor for questions from the RAB members.

Question 1 (Q1): (Mr. Kajihiro) Have there been any cuts to funding for the EPA Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) program or technical assistance to RABs?

Answer 1 (A1): Ms. Tamashiro referred the question to the EPA representatives in the audience. Mr. John Chesnutt, EPA Region IX, introduced himself.

(Mr. Chesnutt) EPA has not been able to fund our Technical Assistance Grants for the last five to ten years, even before recent cuts. Ms. Tamashiro's slide included a couple funding mechanisms that EPA provided; one was TAG. EPA has not been able to fund TAG at several facilities. As for the TASC program, EPA does have limited funding in that program and through other mechanisms. The TAG offered funding up to \$50,000 for the community to hire consultants to help the public review a specific document if the Navy provided highly technical comments. The TASC program might provide someone to help work through a document in a more limited capacity. The EPA could support further if the public or RAB members approached EPA.

Q2: (Mr. Curtis) Does the RAB have to approve the CIP? Or does only the Navy approve it?

A2: (Mr. Chesnutt) From a regulatory perspective, the EPA, and the State of Hawaii Department of Health (DOH) have a relationship with the Navy and work together on Superfund cleanup work. It is governed by a Federal Facility Agreement and every document that the Navy produces, including the CIP, is presented by the Navy (draft and final) to the regulatory agencies (DOH and EPA) for review, comment, and approval. Ms. Tamashiro can answer any questions about how comments are incorporated, but it is important that the Navy made the CIP available to the RAB and the community. The CIP was developed based on community comments, and those 96 comments have helped the Navy develop a strategy to better communicate and collaborate with the community. The Navy is receiving suggestions about using social media or other mechanisms, and the CIP should propose ways to fulfill those information needs. The public should review the CIP, and the Navy, in coordination with the regulatory agencies, will use that input to better serve the community's informational needs. The EPA looks forward to hearing the public and the RAB members' opinions.

Comment 1 (C1): (CAPT White) Mr. Curtis, do you have anything more specific? The original question's intent was unclear to me.

Q3: (Mr. Curtis) It appears that the Navy, EPA, and other regulators will all sign off on the CIP. Do the RAB members also have to sign off? Or is it something handed to us?

A3: (Ms. Tamashiro) In the past, the CIP was not signed by any one person, not the Navy nor the EPA. However, the Navy wants community input and will provide a finalized document that considers that input.

C2: (CAPT White) The idea behind the RAB is to be transparent and empower the members of the RAB and community. If you feel your input is not being taken seriously, please let us know now and provide a specific example. Do you have one?

Mr. Curtis did not present any specific examples. Mrs. Kawasaki then moved to questions from the public.

Q4: (Ms. Lynn Brockway) Ms. Tamashiro, do you know how many people received the survey? Do you have a mailing list?

A4: (Ms. Tamashiro) The Navy emailed the survey to our distribution list. I do not know exactly how many people are on that distribution list. The survey was also posted on Facebook, which is where most of the responses were received.

C3: (CAPT White) It is difficult to answer how many surveys were received or sent out. The Navy can track the sites where the survey was published but how many were received, the Navy is unable to answer that.

Q5: (Ms. Susan Pcola-Davis) Ms. Lynn Brockway probably asked her question to understand the survey response rate. A follow up to Mr. Curtis' earlier question. Will the RAB sign off on the CIP or are they just providing input that the Navy will consider? Who will sign the CIP and is the RAB part of the signing process?

A5: (Ms. Tamashiro) The CIP does not have any signatures.

Q6: (Mr. Curtis) Then, how do you know which document is the legitimate document if it does not have signatures?

A6: (Ms. Tamashiro) The majority of Navy documents do not have signatures. They are identified by the version such as "Final Community Involvement Plan" or "Final Work Plan", and that is how to determine they are final documents and when they were published. The only documents that are signed would be Records of Decision or Decision Documents.

C4: (Mr. Curtis) And the RAB charter.

C5: (Ms. Tamashiro) And the RAB charter.

Q7: (CAPT White) Let me follow up on the point that Mr. Curtis raises. Is a CIP signed anywhere by anyone?

A7: (Ms. Tamashiro) No.

C6: (CAPT White) It is not. Is there a proposal, Mr. Curtis, to do something different?

Mr. Curtis concurred that there was no proposal. Ms. Kawasaki moved the meeting along to the next item on the agenda.

V. REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF DECEMBER 2024 MEETING MINUTES CONTINUED

With Mr. Curtis now present at the meeting, the RAB resumed review of the December 2024 meeting minutes. Mr. Curtis asked the RAB if there were any objections to the approval of the minutes. There were no objections, and the minutes were approved.

VI. DISCUSSION OF THE DRAFT RAB CHARTER AMENDMENT

Ms. Tamashiro stated that the current version of the draft RAB charter was sent to RAB members on Monday April 14th, 2025, and that this version was a response by the Navy to the feedback from the RAB and community members at the last RAB meeting. Ms. Tamashiro asked the members if there were any areas they wanted to discuss.

Mr. Curtis laid out a hypothetical worst-case scenario in which the RAB had its power restricted by the Navy. This scenario highlighted how the range in the number of meetings and site visits allowed by the proposed RAB charter amendment could be used by the Navy to restrict the RAB to only two meetings and no site visits within a year period. Mr. Curtis also brought up that with one year term limits for RAB members in the charter, the Navy could add no new members to the RAB and then dissolve it after the current members' terms expired. Mr. Curtis questioned why the RAB would approve a document that could allow for this scenario and asked if he could begin taping CAPT White's response.

In response, CAPT White offered a change to the text to guarantee three RAB meetings per year. Mr. Curtis objected, mentioning that previously there had been four meetings per year. Ms. Tamashiro explained that the reason for the reduction was due to the significant amount of time it took her staff to prepare detailed presentations for the RAB meetings, and that her staff could present more substantive information at each meeting if they were held less frequently. Mr. Curtis brought up that in the past there were even more meetings every year because there were three RABs operating on Oahu simultaneously. Ms. Tamashiro countered that the reason the Central Oahu and Waianae Coast RABs were not in operation was because there was no information to share from those regions. Mr. Curtis questioned the notion that there was no contamination in the regions covered by these RABs and Ms. Tamashiro clarified that there has not been work in those regions since the last time those RABs were held and, as such, there was no new data to present.

Mr. Curtis then solicited comments from the audience. Ms. Susan Gorman-Chang stated that she did not want the number of RAB meetings to be reduced and requested further explanation for the decrease in the RAB charter amendment. Ms. Pcola-Davis seconded these concerns and expressed that she was concerned that this trend of meeting frequency reduction would continue in the future. She stated that she did not accept the Navy's reasoning and requested that the number of RAB meetings per year be maintained at four.

CAPT White tabled the discussion of meeting frequency and moved the discussion to RAB member term limits. Mr. Curtis noted that there was a contradiction in the document where the Community Co-Chair was to serve for two years but only be eligible for one year as a RAB member. CAPT White emphasized that while members would only serve one-year terms, those terms would be renewable, and that this change was to facilitate the addition of new members to the RAB. CAPT White expressed that while the Navy did not object to longer terms for RAB members, it was also important for members to attend and participate in meetings. After some additional discussion, the RAB agreed to three year renewable terms for members and three RAB meetings per year.

The discussion then moved to the number of site visits per year. Mr. Curtis and Ms. Tamashiro disagreed about the number of site visits that took place per year under Ms. Tamashiro's predecessor.

Mr. Curtis emphasized that before merger of Pearl Harbor Naval Complex and Hickam Air Force Base there was at least one site visit per installation and that now with the merger there was a reduction in visits. In response, CAPT White proposed that the number of site visits in the draft RAB charter be increased to two per year to help alleviate Mr. Curtis's concerns. Ms. Pcola-Davis expressed that she was confused about what the current number per year was for term limits, site visits, and RAB meetings. Mr. Curtis informed Ms. Pcola-Davis that the numbers were still being discussed and compromises would be made.

CAPT White expressed a desire to reach a compromise and a hope that the RAB members could see the practicality in the changes the Navy was proposing. He re-emphasized the previous point that superior information could be prepared for each meeting if the meetings were held less frequently. He also said that he was eager for the RAB charter to be approved either at this meeting or the next meeting so that applications for new members could begin to be accepted.

Mr. Curtis agreed with CAPT White's sentiments and then raised the issue of transparency with respect to nominations for new RAB members. Mr. Curtis brought up that in the current draft charter the nominations would go to the Navy who would then inform the RAB of their selections. Mr. Curtis requested that the RAB Community Co-Chair be made aware of all RAB member applications that the Navy receives prior to the Navy's decision on those applications. After some discussion, CAPT White agreed to provide a list of applicants to the Community Co-Chair. CAPT White requested that language to this effect be added to the draft charter.

Next, language in the charter regarding the role of the facilitator was discussed. Mr. Curtis objected to language describing the role of the facilitator such that the facilitator "lets the RAB members speak" and "enforces the RAB members to stay on topic". Mr. Curtis felt that this controlling language was misrepresenting the role of the facilitator and lessening the authority of the RAB members. CAPT White was willing to accept changes to the language but emphasized that the facilitator's role in enforcing time keeping within the meetings is critical. CAPT White and the RAB agreed that the language should be changed with CAPT White suggesting that "the facilitator facilitates and keeps time" as an alternate wording.

CAPT White asked Mr. Curtis if the intention was to make the previously discussed changes to the draft charter text and then sign it at the next meeting. Mr. Curtis asked the other RAB members if they agreed with the previously discussed changes. All members agreed but expressed that the new draft text should be shared with the other RAB members who were not present at the meeting as well as prospective members. CAPT White noted that the new text would only be emailed to the RAB Community Co-Chair. Mr. Curtis requested that some questions from the public be taken.

Q1: (Ms. Gorman-Chang) Who makes the decision for who is eligible when you get an application?

A1: (CAPT White) There is an established criteria in the charter and the application will be measured against that criteria and will be communicated to the RAB Co-Chair.

Q2: (Ms. Gorman-Chang) I am a member of the Ewa Beach neighborhood board, which is an elected position. What is their geographic responsibility? Do you know?

A2: (CAPT White) The Navy is not going to publicly consider any one case.

C1: (Ms. Gorman-Chang) No, my point is, the Ewa Beach neighborhood board is part of West Loch and Pu'uoloa and it includes parts of Pearl Harbor, but you might not necessarily know that. I want to make sure that the RAB community members can weigh in on the RAB application process. Because

there is so much you do not know being a member of the Navy and not being a part of the community that has a broader knowledge base.

C2: (CAPT White) We will share that information with the Co-Chair. But one would argue that being a member of the Navy does not necessarily exclude one from also being a member of the community because the Navy members live in the same environment as the public.

C3: (Mr. Curtis) And as Co-Chair, I will be able to tell them about matters related to the RAB applications while the Navy makes the decision.

C4: (Ms. Pcola-Davis) If the problem was the “let” word, the Navy can always reword the sentence to say, “the facilitator allows RAB members to be heard”.

C5: (Ms. Kawasaki) Thank you, that is noted.

VII. TECHNICAL PRESENTATIONS

Red Hill Per- and Polyfluoroalkyl Substances (PFAS) Remedial Investigation Update Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam, Oahu, Hawaii – Mr. Niels Heidner, NAVFAC Pacific

Mr. Niels Heidner, P.G. introduced himself to the audience and began his presentation. Mr. Heidner noted that he was selected as the lead remedial project manager (RPM) for this project due to his extensive knowledge of and experience working at the Red Hill Facility.

This project is a part of the ER Program and, therefore, follows the CERCLA framework. This project is currently in the Remedial Investigation phase of that framework. Since the November 2022 accidental Aqueous Film Forming Foam (AFFF) spill the Navy has conducted extensive soil removal in the affected areas, began one year groundwater sampling throughout the Red Hill facility, and began installation of groundwater monitoring wells near the site of the spill. Results have been received for the Quarter 1 (Q1) groundwater sampling event from these wells.

At the Red Hill facility, the Navy encountered two types of groundwater zones, shallow and deep. Shallow groundwater zones can be as shallow as 30-40 feet below the ground surface. This shallow groundwater is naturally of poor quality and unsuitable for use as drinking water. The deep groundwater aquifer is found in volcanic bedrock hundreds of feet below the ground surface. The Navy has installed monitoring wells in both zones to help build a conceptual site model.

The Remedial Investigation is being conducted in two separate areas within the Red Hill facility. Area A is near the easternmost extent of the facility and is the site of the November 2022 accidental AFFF spill. Area B makes up the westernmost extent of the facility and was included following detections of PFAS during the 2023 baseline sampling event. Area B has been extended beyond its original footprint based on results from the Q1 groundwater sampling event.

A total of 34 monitoring wells were sampled during the Q1 event. A total of 30 of those wells draw water from the deep groundwater aquifer, while the other four wells draw water from shallow groundwater. Seven of the wells, all within Area B, exceeded the project screening levels (PSLs) for PFAS. These PSLs are derived from the EPA’s regional screening levels. For PFAS, these levels are extremely low, as low as four parts per trillion. This is the equivalent of one drop of ink in five Olympic-sized swimming pools.

Due to the groundwater sample results above the PSLs for PFAS within Area B, the Navy expanded the sampling effort to include eight additional wells starting from the Q2 event, raising the total to 42

wells. Samples from the Q2 event are currently undergoing the data validation process, which is a key part of the process that ensures the data is of sufficient quality for decision-making. Although there were no PFAS readings above PSLs detected in Area A, the Navy is installing additional monitoring wells in that area due to its proximity to the November 2022 accidental AFFF spill. The installation of at least three wells is the current plan. Installation could be completed as early as fall of 2025. The Navy anticipates that the Remedial Investigation report for this project will be published in 2027. Because of the urgency of this project, sampling has begun before final Work Plan approval. This was a decision that was made in consultation with the relevant regulatory agencies.

Mr. Heidner concluded his presentation, and Ms. Kawasaki opened the floor for questions from the RAB.

C1: (Mr. Curtis) It is in Area A that the accident occurred and it is in Area B where there are exceedances.

C2: (Mr. Heidner) In the shallow groundwater.

Q1: (Mr. Curtis) Does the Navy know how the PFAS impacts moved from Area A to Area B?

A1: (Mr. Heidner) At this time, the Navy does not think the PFAS impacts in Area A and the PFAS impacts in Area B are related.

Q2: (Mr. Curtis) So, do the exceedances from Area B come from something else?

A2: (Mr. Heidner) Yes.

C3: (Mr. Curtis) Another leak?

C4: (Mr. Heidner) Currently, the Navy does not know the source.

Q3: (Mr. Kajihira) What types/source of PFAS were found? What might the sources be?

A3: (Mr. Heidner) Since this was the first quarterly event, the Navy does not have any trend data. But the Navy will be working with its contractor to do fingerprinting to look at the source.

Q4: (Mr. Curtis) So, are the fingerprints substantially different for the types of PFAS in the two areas?

A4: (Mr. Heidner) The fingerprints are different depending on the generation of the AFFF foam. The formulation changed over time, and that formulation can be fingerprinted.

Q5: (Mr. Huber) The foam in Area A was different than the foam in Area B?

A5: (Mr. Heidner) Yes.

Q6: (Mr. Huber) Could it be sewage runoff? PFAS in Las Vegas, in the most known case, the board of water supply found that PFAS was coming as high as 40% from sewage in residential communities. That area is industrial, where there are a lot of businesses that could be contributing to the PFAS issue. Has the Navy looked at sewage?

A6: (Mr. Heidner) The Navy has not looked at sewage. This data is only for the Q1 event results. The Navy added eight wells to the second through fourth quarter, which will provide a more complete picture.

C5: (Mr. Huber) The Navy has done a fantastic job with planning for this project.

C6: (Mr. Curtis) Agreed, currently, the Navy is ahead of the state.

Commander Dunn introduces himself and indicates that he works for NAVFAC Hawaii supporting the Closure Task Force Red Hill.

C7: (CDR Dunn) Area A is where the AFFF incident occurred at the Red Hill Facility. The AFFF system in Area A was relatively new, within a few decades, and the material found there was different than the material that has been identified at Area B. The Navy knows it is not the system that was up at Adit 6 in Area A. Most of those locations where there are detections are near the border of the facility. It is early in the process; the Navy expedited this project to sample that area and that area was initially added based on the baseline sampling that was done in 2023 and those results. It is a self-informing project and as the project progresses, the Navy learns more. At this point, it is very difficult to draw any conclusions. The Navy is in very close coordination with the regulators to help inform them where any additional sampling will occur, where more wells will be installed, to support the project, and identify the source.

C8: (Mr. Huber) Thank you for your hard work on this project.

C9: (Mr. Inouye) Area B is right below the Halawa industrial area. In the next report, it would be interesting to note the type of fingerprints that are detected.

C10: (Mr. Heidner) The Navy will follow the data.

Q7: (Mr. Kajihiro) Did the Navy do archival review of any records of releases that might have happened inside the tunnels?

Q8: (Mr. Heidner) In Area B?

A8: (Mr. Kajihiro) Anywhere in the tunnel?

C11: (Mr. Heidner) Ms. Charlotte Rangel will respond to that question.

Q9: (Mr. Kajihiro) Did the Navy review archives, records of releases, accidents, incidents, reports?

A9: (Ms. Rangel) The Preliminary Assessment went through archives, historical records, construction diagrams, etc. to see if there were any potential sources of AFFF. The Navy used that information to inform the decision for Area A. For Area B, the Navy is still investigating because there has not been anything in the historical records that indicate a release.

Q10: (Mr. Kajihiro) No releases in the deep part of the tunnel?

A10: (Ms. Rangel) No. In the deep part of the tunnel, the Navy did sample several wells and the results were below the screening level or non-detect.

C12: (Mr. Kajihiro) Thank you.

Ms. Kawasaki asked the RAB members if there were any more questions, there were none. She confirmed that there were also no questions from the online audience before moving to the public questions.

Q11: (Mr. Mike Dau) Is the Navy checking for PFAS and fuel?

A11: (Mr. Heidner) This project is checking for PFAS.

Q12: (Mr. Dau) Only?

A12: (Mr. Heidner) Correct.

Q13: (Mr. Dau) But should the Navy also look for fuel?

A13: (Mr. Heidner) The Navy has several teams doing joint sampling. One team is looking for fuel and our team is looking for PFAS.

C13: (CDR Dunn) Absolutely, there is a concurrent effort going on called the Site Assessment that is investigating all the fuel related incidents and infrastructure.

Q14: (Mr. Dau) At the same wells?

A14: (CDR Dunn) At many of the same wells, and in a larger area of the facility.

Q15: (Mr. Hanaloa Helela) The Navy mentioned that they have not done fingerprinting. How does the Navy know Area B is different from Area A?

A15: (Ms. Rangel) After the first quarter results were received, the Navy did basic fingerprinting to compare the different PFAS compounds and there was a vast difference in the compounds at Area B versus the compounds in Area A, even in values below the screening levels.

Ms. Kawasaki confirmed that there were no more community questions and moved the meeting on to the next presentation.

Red Hill Environmental Restoration, Navy Website Orientation – Ms. Tracy Ibarra, NAVFAC Pacific

Before the presentation began Ms. Tamashiro informed the RAB that the website was still a work in progress and explained the website was created in response to the public's request to be able to access documents related to the Navy's projects at Red Hill.

Ms. Tracy Ibarra introduced herself and began the presentation.

The website is structured to highlight the status of the two ERN sites that are located at Red Hill. Those two sites are the former Oily Waste Disposal Facility (OWDF) and the previously discussed Red Hill PFAS Remedial Investigation. There are also sections for accessing ER Program documents and learning about community involvement. There are also links to other sources of information such as the home page for the general ERN website and the Safe Waters website that is a repository for information related to the Red Hill fuel-related investigations.

Another feature of the website is a "what's new" ticker. This graphic will post alerts when any new information regarding the sites has been posted or when community events such as RAB meetings are occurring. This is designed to inform site visitors without them having to search through the website.

Information for each site consists of a short write up along with a map of the site. Each site also has its own section. In the OWDF section, there are records going back many years as work has been going

on at this site for a long time. This is presented alongside contemporary information and media. Information and maps that are more specific to the former OWDF site are also available. Further down on the webpage, there is an interactive timeline of operations at the former OWDF. This timeline highlights past, present, and future planned activities at the site. Analytical data from groundwater monitoring is available for download, and fact sheets to help explain the data and data validation reports. The technical documents that present the design of the investigation are also available for download.

The Red Hill PFAS Remedial Investigation is laid out very similarly. Since it is a much newer project there is less information and data available. The draft Work Plan and letters from regulatory agencies are available for download. The presentation that was given during this RAB will also be added to the webpage.

The website also contains a section that explains how to access the ERN Administrative Record, where additional documents related to Red Hill and many other projects can be viewed and downloaded. Documents related to Red Hill can be found by searching “Red Hill” in the search bar.

The community involvement section contains more information about the Administrative Record as well as information repositories. It also contains information about the Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam-Kalaeloa RAB, including previously discussed documents such as the draft CIP and draft RAB charter. There is also a form available to express interest in becoming a RAB member. The Navy is working on making a digital version of the form that is fillable.

Ms. Kawasaki asked if RAB had any questions. CAPT White added a few points.

CAPT White asked Ms. Ibarra if future surveys like the Environmental Concerns Survey discussed earlier in the meeting could be posted to the website. CAPT White expressed his hope that this website would be a useful and transparent resource for the community and would be a major improvement to the online resources that had been formerly made available. CAPT White also noted that this website is a testament to the achievements resulting from the collaboration made possible by the RAB program. CAPT White praised the team behind the website development for their hard work getting the site ready so it could be presented live at the meeting.

The RAB members then proceeded with questions.

C1: (Ms. Curtis) Thank you.

C2: (Ms. Ibarra) You are welcome.

C3: (Mr. Kajihiro) All websites are progress in work or failures. *(laughter)*

C4: (Mr. Huber) Mahalo nui loa from the community and all the RAB members. The website is impressive thus far.

Ms. Ibarra took a moment to highlight how the new ERN website is also reachable through the previously established Red Hill Safe Waters website under the related links section.

Q1: (Mr. Kajihiro) Thank you, the website is beautiful, easy to navigate, and very accessible. Is there a reason that the website only includes Red Hill as opposed to the overall Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam RAB? You have documents for the two Red Hill sites, but there are a lot of other sites. Are you considering expanding the website?

A1: (Ms. Tamashiro) This website pertains specifically to the work for Red Hill, as it was requested that the Navy share Red Hill information. Information for our other active Environmental Restoration sites in Hawaii is available in the Administrative Record, which excludes Red Hill documents. Currently, our focus for this website is on Red Hill information. If the public is concerned about other sites, the Navy will consider expanding the scope of the website.

Q2: (Mr. Inouye) Is there a way to contact the webmaster for broken links and such? Would the Navy consider adding a frequently asked questions section to the website in the future?

A2: (Ms. Ibarra) The Navy wants comments and suggestions on how to make the website more user friendly and engaging and will make notes about adding a frequently asked questions section.

C5: (Mr. Inouye) I just retired from IT, so I was just wondering.

Ms. Ibarra demonstrated how the link that had previously seemed broken on the website was now functioning properly and demonstrated how it could be used to access the Administrative Record website search page.

C6: (Mr. Inouye) It would be good to have a search box on the front page too.

C7: (Ms. Ibarra) Yes, the Navy is working on unique links to specific Environmental Restoration Program Navy documents for the live launch of the website.

Q3: (CAPT White) Mr. Inouye wanted a search function on the website's first page as well, do we have one?

A3: (Ms. Ibarra) That is something the Navy can certainly explore.

C8: (Mr. Inouye) Right, at the very front on the website.

C9: (Ms. Ibarra) Yes.

C10: (Mr. Curtis) The Navy should consider adding a map of the other sites (including site names) so it is easier to search for the Administrative Record using the site name.

C11: (Ms. Ibarra) Noted.

Ms. Kawasaki asked the room if there were any questions from the public.

C12: (Ms. Pcola-Davis) Great Job. The effort put into the site is obvious (100% gold quality standard).

Q4: (Ms. Lauryn Hansen) In terms of going to the actual repository where all the site assessments are held, some of them are currently available for download including the Community Involvement Plan. How many of those linked are currently available for download? And are there plans to expand that number, or in your opinion, are the currently available documents sufficient for describing the current condition at Red Hill?

A4: (Ms. Ibarra) The documents that are available right now for each webpage, whether that be the former Oily Waste Disposal Facility or the Red Hill PFAS Remedial Investigation, under their respective sections: Data Reports of Current Activities, is currently a complete list of documents based on where the site is in the CERCLA process and what the current activities are. For example, for

OWDF, the Navy has documents going back to 1980 and it did not seem practical to list all documents that are available. The documents on the webpage itself are more focused on the current activities, what is currently going on the site with the investigation. The Environmental Restoration Navy program documents in the Administrative Record are available in case the public would like to look at documents beyond what the Navy is currently investigating. Yes, the links on each of the webpages indicate those PDFs are available now for download.

Ms. Kawasaki asked the room if there were any more comments or questions. After confirming that there were none, CAPT White then moved on to discussion of the agenda for the next RAB meeting.

VIII. SCHEDULING OF NEXT RAB MEETING

CAPT White expressed a desire to lay out the path forward for the approval of the RAB charter. CAPT White asked for confirmation that, if all the agreed upon changes were made to the charter, the charter could be approved and signed by the RAB members at the next meeting in August. The RAB members confirmed they agreed that the charter could be signed. CAPT White asked Ms. Tamashiro when the next meeting is scheduled to take place. Ms. Tamashiro responded that the proposed date is August 27th, 2025. CAPT White asked Mr. Curtis if the RAB would want to open the nominations for new RAB members now or wait until the next meeting. Mr. Curtis stated a desire to open the nominations as soon as possible so that new members could be brought on as soon as the new RAB charter is signed. CAPT White agreed to this proposal and confirmed that the Community Co-Chair would be sent a list of the names of new RAB member applicants once the Navy received them. CAPT White then asked Mr. Curtis if the RAB should vote on nominations at the August meeting or wait till the meeting after August. Mr. Curtis preferred that the nominations be voted on at the August meeting as soon as the RAB charter is approved. Mr. Huber seconded the idea.

IX. QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

There were no additional questions from the meeting attendees.

X. CLOSING

Ms. Kawasaki gave closing remarks, thanked attendees for coming, and adjourned the meeting at 7:45 p.m.

For additional information, please contact:

*Public Affairs Officer, Code 09PAO
Naval Facilities Engineering Systems Command, Hawaii (NAVFAC Hawaii)
400 Marshall Road
JBPHH, HI 96860-3139
(808) 471-7300
Email: NFHI_PAO_DL@us.navy.mil*

Project reports discussing environmental investigation and restoration efforts that were discussed tonight can be obtained from the following Navy information repositories:

<i>Naval Facilities Engineering Systems Command, Pacific 258 Makalapa Drive, Suite 100 JBPHH HI 96860 Tel. (808) 472-1428</i>	<i>University of Hawaii at Manoa Hamilton Library Hawaiian and Pacific Collection 2550 McCarthy Mall Honolulu, HI 96822 Tel. (808) 956-8264</i>	<i>Pearl City Public Library 1138 Waimano Home Road Pearl City, HI 96782 Tel. (808) 453-6566</i>
---	---	--

ATTACHMENT A
LIST OF ATTENDEES
PEARL HARBOR-HICKAM-KALAELOA RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD (RAB)
MEETING

OAHU VETERANS CENTER, HONOLULU, HAWAII

April 16, 2025

- | | |
|----------------------------|------------------------|
| 1. Lynn Brockway | 28. Jenifer Larson |
| 2. Maverick Carey | 29. Kelly Ann Lee |
| 3. John Chesnutt | 30. Joyce Lin |
| 4. Joy Cline | 31. William Manley |
| 5. Henry Curtis | 32. Kim Markillie |
| 6. Mike Dau | 33. Eli Martin |
| 7. Shanda Delos Reyes | 34. Madison Owens |
| 8. Ben Dunn | 35. Susan Pcola-Davis |
| 9. James Gauer | 36. Teresa Quiniola |
| 10. Susan Gorman-
Chang | 37. Charlotte Rangel |
| 11. Monica Gramling | 38. Robert Sadorra |
| 12. Natasha Griswold | 39. Ellie Shimatsu |
| 13. Sanae Hartmann | 40. Ron Shimabuku |
| 14. Laurn Hansen | 41. Tara Sutton |
| 15. Niels Heidner | 42. Jocelyn Tamashiro |
| 16. Hanaloa Helela | 43. Janice Toma Shiira |
| 17. Alicia Hendrix | 44. Belinda Turran |
| 18. Robert Huber | 45. Cruz Vina Jr. |
| 19. Steve Hurff | 46. Francie Whitfield |
| 20. Tracy Ibarra | 47. CAPT White |
| 21. Guy Inouye | 48. Dayna Yoshizaki |
| 22. Lucrina Jones | 49. Kristen Young |
| 23. Kyle Kajihiro | 50. Hanna Zheng |
| 24. Stephanie Kawasaki | |
| 25. Melanie Kito | |
| 26. Robert Kleinman | |
| 27. Pete LaPlaca | |