FINAL MINUTES OF THE

PEARL HARBOR-HICKAM-KALAELOA
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD (RAB) MEETING

OAHU VETERANS CENTER, HONOLULU, HAWAII

APPROVED ON 20 MAY 2026

I. JANUARY 14, 2026 ATTENDANCE: SEE ATTACHMENT A.

II. OPENING

Ms. Stephanie Kawasaki, facilitator of the meeting, opened the meeting at 6:00 p.m. and introduced Ms. Jocelyn Tamashiro, Environmental Restoration (ER) Program Manager at Naval Facilities Engineering Systems Command (NAVFAC), Hawaii. Ms. Tamashiro spoke briefly about topics to be covered and housekeeping items for the meeting.

Ms. Kawasaki asked the Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) members to introduce themselves.

Captain (CAPT) Samuel White, RAB Navy Co-chair and Commanding Officer of Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam (JBPHH), introduced himself.

Colonel Gregory Hammond, Deputy Commanding Officer of JBPHH, introduced himself.

Ms. Susan Gorman-Chang, RAB member, introduced herself.

Ms. Francie Whitfield, RAB member, introduced herself.

Mr. Robert Huber, RAB member, introduced himself.

Mr. Kyle Kajihiro, RAB member, introduced himself.

Mr. Ernie Lau, ex officio RAB member, introduced himself.

Ms. Joyce Lin, ex officio RAB member, 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 then discussed the ground rules and structure for the meeting.

Mr. Guy Inouye, RAB member, arrived and introduced himself.

III. REVIEW OF AUGUST 2025 MEETING MINUTES

CAPT White explained that the meeting agenda had been adjusted due to the resignation of Mr. Henry Curtis, from his position as RAB Community Co-chair, and that the RAB would need to discuss the nomination of a new Community Co-chair.

Ms. Tamashiro asked if any RAB members had any changes or corrections for the August 2025 meeting minutes. There were no objections, and all RAB members agreed; the meeting minutes were approved.

IV. NOMINATION OF NEW RAB COMMUNITY CO-CHAIR

CAPT White acknowledged Mr. Curtis' contributions to the RAB, including working to resume the RAB meetings, approving the new RAB charter, expanding RAB membership, and advocating for the community.

Ms. Susan Pcola-Davis, RAB member, arrived and introduced herself.

Ms. Tamashiro presented the qualifications and responsibilities for the Community Co-chair as required by the RAB charter.

Mr. Hanaloa Helelā, RAB member, arrived and introduced himself.

Ms. Tamashiro asked if any RAB community members would like to self-nominate for the position. Mr. Huber nominated Mr. Kajihiro, and Mr. Helelā nominated Ms. Whitfield.

CAPT White clarified that the current discussion is to identify those members who would like to self--nominate for the position.

Mr. Kajihiro stated that he would defer to Ms. Whitfield; Ms. Tamashiro asked those interested in the position to share reasons why they would be interested in leading the RAB.

Comment (C1): (Ms. Whitfield) My name is Francie Whitfield. I served with the neighborhood board for four two-year terms before I got onto the RAB and I see a lot of potential for community outreach, as well as honing my skills with some of the other things on the list. I accept the nomination.

CAPT White asked if any other members were interested in the position, and none were. There were no objections from the RAB members, and the RAB voted on Ms. Whitfield's nomination. Ms. Whitfield was elected as the new Community Co-chair.

CAPT White explained that this would be his last meeting with the RAB, and Colonel Hammond would be present at the next meeting as his relief. He stated that the change of command for the Joint Base would be in July, and after that a new commander would serve as the Navy Co-chair.

Ms. Tamashiro explained that the goal of the RAB is to share information with the community about what the Navy is doing to clean up the environment and to listen to community input on restoration input. She reminded attendees that the RAB does not cover or discuss releases from current operating facilities, and that the meetings are separate from the closure of Red Hill and any drinking water sampling that the base is doing.

V. NEXT RAB MEETING

CAPT White reminded RAB members that according to the RAB Charter, the RAB will meet three times per year. CAPT White proposed the next meeting be held on May 13, 2026. There were no objections. The next RAB Meeting was scheduled for May 13, 2026.

VI. SITE TOUR RECAP

Ms. Tamashiro informed attendees that the RAB completed a site tour on January 10, 2026, to the former Aiea Laundry site and adjacent property, St. Elizabeth School. Ms. Tamashiro asked if any RAB members had follow-up comments or questions from the tour.

C1: (Mr. Kajihiro) I appreciate the tour. I learned a lot, and it was more complex than I realized…also being able to tour the school property. I appreciate the work that goes into that.

C2: (Mr. Lau) Jocelyn, you did a great job of setting up the site visit. It was informative, and you were patient with our questions. I have one recommendation, and that is to use the deep groundwater basal monitoring well and add that to the Red Hill monitoring well network. We will be formally submitting a request to the regulators to add them to the inventory of monitoring points for the Red Hill contamination situation.

C3: (Ms. Whitfield) Thank you for the site visit of St. Elizabeth Church to see where they are doing the sampling and where the wells are. I am glad how much has progressed to comfortable levels. I mentioned a suggestion from the community about the grassy lot mauka of the parking lot adjacent to St. Elizabeth church, between the parking lot and the freeway. Someone suggested having a dog park or similar. That would be further down the road, but it is good to know where it is at.

C4: (Mr. Helelā) I wanted to add to Ernie's suggestion about adding that basal well to the Red Hill network. Whatever we can do to formalize that request and move that along is significant. It is one more well on the network.

Q1: (Ms. Gorman-Chang) I appreciated the tour and the work that went into it. I was impressed in the preschool with the tabs drilled down through the foundation into the soil to pull up air samples, and that cleaning solutions or anything that could be a false positive are removed to make sure that it was from the site if some screening level was exceeded. I have a question. The wells were abandoned in 2012 when the screening levels were acceptable at the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and Hawaii Department of Health (DOH) levels. Have the screening levels changed in the current day? Is it appropriate to abandon the wells if those screening levels are different? Because what is an acceptable level is going down.

Ms. Tamashiro introduced Ms. Tracy Ibarra, the remedial project manager (RPM) for the Aiea Laundry site, to answer the question.

A1: (Ms. Ibarra) I was your site tour lead on Saturday. I hope everybody enjoyed it and learned something. It was great to spend time with the community and answer your questions. For that question on the screening levels, we had that discussion on site as well. EPA does update or reevaluate their levels every year, and EPA is in attendance tonight [and are] our regulatory partners who work on Aiea Laundry. At that time, there were screening levels established, and the data showed there were no issues and that was the basis for well abandonment. We also consider the DOH environmental action levels (EALs) as well. Those wells had concentrations below those levels, and that was the rationale for EPA and DOH agreeing with us to abandon those wells. There are current 2025 levels and more recent DOH levels as well, but because we abandoned those wells, we do not have current data. But at the time that the levels were established, the data was below the screening levels and the decisions to abandon the wells were made.

Q2: (Ms. Gorman-Chang) I understand why they were abandoned in 2012, and you explained that to us Saturday. My concern is current levels. Is it appropriate to abandon wells when we may learn more that those levels were too high, and now they are lower? Once you make that decision, is that it? We can never use those wells again for testing, or what is the plan going forward? Does that make sense? Not asking why the decision was made. I understand why the decision was made in 2012, but going forward, I am concerned that the levels that are considered safe have changed.

A2: (Ms. Ibarra) The answer to that is we also partner with our regulators. When I say they are abandoned, we cannot go back and collect data from those same exact locations. The wells were abandoned per the Department of Health guidance. They were over-drilled and grouted up. We cannot collect data from that point any longer.

C5: (Mr. John Chesnutt) I am John Chesnutt with the EPA. I am here with my colleagues from the superfund division. We closely look at the data with the Navy and DOH, and we will get the trends, and if they are stable or decreasing around those benchmark numbers, we would collaborate with them to decide whether those wells should be abandoned or not. If the toxicity values were to change over time, we could go back and build new wells. That is always an opportunity because by the time we have made the decisions in context of all the data, we know what the general trends and values are throughout the site. So, if the numbers change, we will know they are generally in this range around the facility, and we can go back and build the wells.

Q3: (Ms. Gorman-Chang) Have the levels changed significantly?

A3: (Mr. Chesnutt) Not significantly. On the vapor side, we made a significant change in a trichloroethylene (TCE) value. That one got more stringent. At the same time, we had a perchloroethylene (PCE) number that lessened. We went in the opposite direction. We reevaluate those on an annual basis nationally. We are working with the Navy on many sites to keep track of the current screening levels in the five-year review process, which was on the agenda until Henry resigned, and we had to talk about selecting a Community Co-chair. For a future meeting, five-year reviews can be discussed.

C6: (CAPT White) That is coming next. We will be briefing on the five-year reviews on May 13th.

C7: (Mr. Chesnutt) For a site like Aiea Laundry, we got to the point where we thought the entire site was under control. There are some values we are looking at over time, so these sites are never forgotten. They will review them every five years, and the key thing is whether toxicity values have changed over the last five years. There are lots of steps in there. But the point is that we could put new wells in.

C8: (Ms. Gorman-Chang) I wanted to make sure that you were checking in and reevaluating- and that abandoned did not mean forgotten. Thank you.

Q4: (Mr. Lau) There are now drinking water standards for per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS). The laboratory methods for PFAS testing only recently got developed and approved by the EPA. Is there any way PFAS levels in the groundwater at Aiea can be checked? We mentioned adding the unplugged basal monitoring well to the Red Hill monitoring well network, which could test for PFAS, total petroleum hydrocarbons (TPH), and other contaminants. Can sites be revisited for a different contaminant? Technology or knowledge about the risk from the emerging contaminant is more available now. Maybe in the five-year review?

C9: (Mr. Chesnutt) We will put your comment about adding that basal well to the network on a list of topics for the Navy, DOH, and EPA to talk about moving forward and how your suggestion and comments are addressed. I cannot speak for the whole body tonight, but thanks for that comment, and we will talk with the Navy about that.

C10: (Mr. Lau) Thank you. And Tracy did an excellent job leading the site visit on Saturday.

CAPT White commented that these discussions are the goal for the site visit, and that the next site visit would be for Pearl Harbor [Sediment site] in August. CAPT White urged the RAB to consider which sites they would like to visit next.

C11: (Ms. Lin) I thank Jocelyn for coordinating the site visit and Tracy for providing background information on the different sampling that has been done, the soil vapor pin points. Within the preschool classroom itself, there were at a minimum one or two air purifiers. These purifiers have been in the preschool classroom since 2016. It has been about 10 years now. I want to recommend during the soil vapor sampling – I know you take an air sample for 24 hours – can you also take a sample of the air purifier? While the air monitoring collects a 24-hour period sample within the classroom, those air purifiers are being turned on daily in the school. Within the filters, they are collecting an annual sample of whatever contaminate that comes through during a 24 hour sampling. I recommend taking a sample of the air purifier filter, as well as the AC filters, because those are there 24/7.

There were no more questions or comments from the RAB members or from the public.

VII. TECHNICAL PRESENTATIONS

Former Naval Air Station Barbers Point Sanitary Landfill Remedial Action Update Kalaeloa, Oahu, Hawaii – Ms. Carrie Plath, NAVFAC Hawaii

Ms. Carrie Plath introduced herself to the audience as an RPM with NAVFAC Hawaii and began her presentation. Ms. Plath began with an overview of the presentation and a simplified version of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) process, explaining that the Former Naval Air Station (NAS) Barbers Point Sanitary Landfill (the Site) was currently in the Remedial Action (response complete) stage of the CERCLA process.

The site is located within the Navy property boundary at the former NAS Barbers Point. Ms. Plath pointed out surrounding land use, including commercial, industrial, recreational, and residential areas. The groundwater beneath the site is a non-drinking water resource, and the Site is south of the underground injection control line which is established by DOH. Residential housing areas are upgradient of the Site.

The Barbers Point Sanitary Landfill received municipal waste from 1942 to 1976, and waste was burned, then covered with soil. Waste included pesticide containers, oily rags, and bagged asbestos. After 2009, the Barbers Point Sanitary Landfill cover consisted of soil and compost of varied thickness.

Previous investigations at the Site include initial assessments and investigations conducted between 1983 and 1998. During these investigations, no serious contamination problems were found in soil or groundwater, and no significant human health or ecological risks were identified. A Remedial Investigation (RI) was conducted from 1994 to 2015. Identified chemicals of potential concern included metals (antimony and lead), TPH, and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons. However, no unacceptable risks were identified, and the groundwater was found not to be impacted by the landfill. Results of the RI included recommendation for a remedial alternatives evaluation to eliminate potential future exposure to landfill waste.

A 2017 Feasibility Study (FS) evaluated and screened remedial alternatives that would ensure protection of human health and the environment. The selected remedial alternative was an impermeable cover with land use controls (LUCs). This selected alternative was then identified in the Proposed Plan and documented in the 2021 Decision Document. The impermeable landfill cover and LUCs were selected to protect current and future human and ecological receptors from direct exposure to the landfill waste materials and soil, and to prevent off-site migration of wastes or contaminants.

Ms. Plath presented a cross-section diagram from the remedial design, showing the landfill cover and drainage. The impermeable cover consists of an 18-inch soil cap over a geosynthetic liner, which includes a geomembrane that overlays another foundation layer that has been compacted. Below the impermeable cover lays the waste which was regraded. When rainwater infiltrates, it travels along the synthetic liner and into the drainage basin, which is composed of riprap and armor stone.

The remedy also includes LUCs and long-term maintenance and monitoring. LUCs restrict site use and require that periodic site inspections are performed. Signs around the site display "NO DIGGING," warn of subsurface soil contamination, and provide NAVFAC Hawaii contact information. Eight groundwater monitoring wells and six landfill gas probes allow for long-term monitoring of conditions at the site.

Remedial action construction activities included: regrading and landfill surface compaction; foundation layer and landfill gas collection system placement; installation of impermeable landfill cover and landfill gas vents; installation of groundwater monitoring wells and landfill gas monitoring probes; installation of warning signs; soil cap construction; and site restoration. The remedial action was completed in August 2024, and the Remedial Verification Report was completed in January 2026. The Remedial Action Completion Report is currently in progress.

Future activities at the site include long-term monitoring and maintenance. Landfill gas vents will monitor methane concentrations, and landfill gas probes will monitor and confirm that landfill gas is not migrating offsite. Groundwater monitoring wells will be used to monitor groundwater for regulatory compliance. Annual site inspections will document site conditions, and CERCLA five-year reviews will be completed for the site to ensure the remedy remains effective. Landfill cover maintenance will be conducted, including maintaining fencing, signage, groundwater monitoring wells, landfill gas vents, soil gas probes, the landfill soil cap, and the impermeable cover.

Ms. Plath indicated that for more information, attendees could visit the Administrative Record website, which is the official repository for environmental sites. A quick response (QR) code in the presentation provided access to these Administrative Records. Ms. Plath stated that attendees should look up "NAS Barber's Point" in the Administrative Record to find documents related to the Site.

Ms. Plath concluded her presentation, and Ms. Kawasaki opened the floor for questions from the RAB.

Q1: (Mr. Huber) Thank you for your presentation. I have a question on the airstrip. Was there any monitoring regarding firefighting foam used on the airstrip? Since the dump is close by, it is in easy proximity to get rid of the waste. Is there any record of that?

A1: (Ms. Plath) We conducted a background study of historical uses during the initial assessments. It was a municipal landfill. There were municipal wastes and some other items, but nothing from the airfield.

Q2: (Mr. Huber) What years was the municipal use?

A2: (Ms. Plath) Until 1976, when it was closed.

Q3: (Mr. Huber) It was closed. And then the Navy took it over?

A3: (Ms. Plath) No, it was used by the Navy for the NAS Barber's Point municipal waste.

Q4: (Mr. Huber) Was there anything else it was used for?

A4: (Ms. Plath) Not that I am aware of.

Q5: (Mr. Huber) So would the airport have access to it?

A5: (Ms. Plath) No.

Q6: (Mr. Lau) To follow up on Robert's question on aqueous film-forming foam (AFFF), which contains PFAS. This is a municipal landfill. Is there a liner system on the bottom of the landfill or a leachate collection system network underneath it?

A6: (Ms. Plath) It is unlined.

Q7: (Mr. Lau) It is unlined, a hole in the ground where they threw garbage in from the base. I know from the DOH's survey of municipal landfills in Hawaii that they have found significant levels of PFAS in leachate, which is the rainwater picking up chemicals as it goes through the landfill. Not industrial or construction, but municipal. You have your monitoring well network. Is there any reason the eight monitoring wells monitoring the groundwater in the caprock aquifer cannot test for PFAS? Can those monitoring wells monitor for PFAS to determine if, before the cover was put in place, any kind of leachate had penetrated through the landfill itself and gotten to the groundwater?

A7: (Ms. Charlotte Rangel) Thank you for your comment. Regarding this particular landfill, we have been in discussions with DOH, but there has not been any concern of PFAS because they did burn all the municipal waste. They were not shoving stuff in. If, at some point in time we feel that per Department of Defense (DOD) policy, we need to evaluate landfills – because that is not currently on our priority list – we will go back. The site is not "we are done, and we will walk away and never see it again." It is policy and we have our priority sites. If landfills end up on that [list], we will go back and reassess.

Q8: (Mr. Lau) You should test for PFAS in the existing monitoring-well network because it is well known that PFAS is in many household products that can release that into the environment. In this area, is there a groundwater table below the landfill? In the caprock?

A8: (Ms. Rangel) Yes, shallow groundwater.

Q9: (Mr. Lau) Assuming that the groundwater in the caprock may be flowing, do you know if there is a hydraulic gradient below the landfill, moving makai toward the ocean?

A9: (Ms. Rangel) All groundwater flows toward the ocean.

Q10: (Mr. Lau) Okay, thank you. Does your cover system intercept, go down to the groundwater, and prevent flow that may be occurring below and moving beyond the landfill that carries contamination outside the limits of this cover? Have you eliminated that there may not be a natural flow of groundwater passing below the landfill and moving toward the ocean?

A10: (Ms. Plath) With the groundwater monitoring network, we have had wells in the Navy property, and they have been monitored since about 2005. We have groundwater data for this area.

Q11: (Mr. Lau) Have you found contamination under the landfill in the groundwater?

A11: (Ms. Plath) Based on the remedial investigation? It is below the screening levels.

Q12: (Mr. Lau) But you did not test for PFAS?

A12: (Ms. Plath) No, we did not.

Q13: (Mr. Lau) We were not testing for PFAS in 2015?

A13: (Ms. Plath) No.

C1: (Mr. Lau) That was a more recent development. My suggestion would be to test for PFAS in the groundwater, in your existing monitoring-well network to determine if the landfill released PFAS contamination to the environment.

Q14: (Ms. Lin) On slide five on the previous investigations conducted between 1983 to 1998, it mentions no serious contamination problems of the soil or groundwater. What are not serious contamination problems?

A14: (Ms. Plath) That was what was reported in the initial assessment. Subsequently, we conducted the risk assessment. The risk to human health and ecological receptors is based on the exposure to the waste in the landfill. Impermeable cover reduces that exposure.

Q15: (Ms. Lin) Further down, it says "no unacceptable risk." What are "acceptable risks?"

A15: (Ms. Tamashiro) As part of the CERCLA process, we do risk evaluations based on toxicity levels that were established by EPA and DOH. The term "no unacceptable risks" means that the levels that were calculated for risk fell within the acceptable range for contamination. The range for DOH is typically one in 10,000 to one in a million. Saying no unacceptable risks means that the risk calculations fell within that range. Does that answer your question?

Q16: (Ms. Lin) Sort of, and not really. Have those acceptable risk levels changed over time?

C2: (Ms. Rangel) Are you asking about the screening levels and how those relate to the risk?

C3: (Ms. Lin) I was looking for specific examples of what are acceptable risks, if there are any.

A16: (Ms. Rangel) For example, if multiple contaminants are below the screening level even when added together in a risk calculation, they are considered below an acceptable risk. It is all with calculations and a hazard assessment of 1…when they total up, if it is less than 1, it is still present but it is an acceptable risk. It does not present any long-term health risks. If it is above, that would be an unacceptable risk. That is what would trigger a remediation. Are you asking for an actual number?

C4: (CAPT White) We should not have said "no unacceptable risk." If we deleted those three words and only said "groundwater not impacted by landfill," that would address the issue. When you say there is no unacceptable risk, a logical person will ask, "What is the acceptable risk, what is not an acceptable risk?" Now you have to figure out where that cutoff is, that says what is acceptable risk and what is not. I will turn it over to the engineer to my left.

C5: (Colonel Hammond) Thank you, CAPT White. We could put this issue on the parking lot and address this next time. The calculation of determining the acceptable risk is part of the CERCLA process, as Jocelyn said, and we can show you how it is calculated. It is not the Navy arbitrarily coming up with a number. There is an established process. Tonight, we are not prepared to go through that

process. We can address that as a topic next time to help the community members understand how we are thinking about these cleanup sites in terms of risk and human health.

C6: (CAPT White) It is a fair point, though, when you make a statement about acceptable and unacceptable risk. For our briefs in the future, we have to be careful how we say that. If we are accepting a risk on somebody else's behalf, we should say what that value is, who is making that decision to accept what risk, and what an example of that is. Like Colonel Hammond said, that was not well thought out. More to follow.

Ms. Kawasaki informed the RAB that there would be 2 minutes remaining for questions for the RAB members.

C7: (Mr. Huber) For the CERCLA five-year review coming up, I agree with Ernie on PFAS. This is a great time to include well sites for PFAS testing as part of the five-year review. Thank you.

C8: (Ms. Tamashiro) We hear your comments about PFAS, but we do have to adhere to the DoD policies. We will take your comments under advisement, but we are required to follow our policies.

Q17: (Mr. Kajihiro) When you do the risk assessment calculation, it is assuming that there is not a receptor, right? By putting in a cap, you prevent people from touching that contaminated soil. Because the karst in Ewa is porous, have you tested out in the ocean if anything is coming out? If that is a potential reception site, and would the screening level change for the risk assessment?

A17: (Ms. Plath) The site is going into long-term monitoring. We will be monitoring groundwater from the wells and then evaluating those against our regulatory requirements, especially for landfills. But we can take into consideration additional areas to sample based on the outcome in our annual report.

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

Mr. Niels Heidner introduced himself to the audience as the lead RPM for the Red Hill PFAS RI and began his presentation. Mr. Heidner began with an overview of the presentation and a simplified version of the CERCLA process.

A list of all response actions relevant to the Red Hill PFAS Remedial Investigation (RI) to date were presented at the bottom of the slide, starting with the November 2022 AFFF accidental release that led to the initiation of the RI. Several spill response activities have been conducted that included working with state and federal regulators to develop a work plan, initiating an expedited action of quarterly groundwater sampling over one year across the Red Hill Facility, and beginning the drilling of new monitoring wells near the site of the 2022 accidental AFFF release. The results of all four quarterly monitoring events were shared during the presentation.

The RI evaluated two investigation areas. Area A is the initially established PFAS investigation area where the November 2022 accidental AFFF release occurred, and where petroleum was observed in monitoring wells. As a result of PFAS detections during the 2023 baseline groundwater monitoring event, Area B, located in the western part of the facility, was incorporated in the RI. Area B has been extended beyond its initial boundary based on results of the Quarter 1 (Q1) groundwater sampling results that showed PFAS concentrations in groundwater monitoring wells within Area B that are above project screening levels (PSLs).

The locations of the monitoring wells and the quarterly groundwater monitoring results for Area A were presented. In Area A, one shallow groundwater monitoring well that was installed in 2025 had PFAS concentrations exceeding the PSLs in both Quarter 3 (Q3) and Quarter 4 (Q4) sampling results. No PFAS were detected above PSLs in any other Area A deep or shallow groundwater monitoring wells, including two new deep wells that were sampled for the first time in Q3 and Q4. PFAS concentrations remained consistent across all four sampling events, suggesting that there is no significant seasonal fluctuation in groundwater PFAS concentrations in Area A.

The locations of the monitoring wells and the quarterly groundwater monitoring results for Area B were presented. In area B, 8 deep wells and 6 shallow wells had detected PFAS concentrations above the PSLs. PFAS concentrations above the PSLs in shallow wells are concentrated in the western wells, whereas PFAS concentrations above the PSLs in deep wells are more prominent in the eastern wells. Similar to Area A, PFAS concentrations remained consistent across all four sampling events, suggesting no significant seasonal fluctuations in groundwater PFAS concentrations in Area B. Based on these results, further investigation in both Areas A and B is necessary.

The Navy, EPA, and DOH held a two-day scoping meeting in September 2025 to discuss previous sampling results and to refine the sampling plan. During the meeting, the Navy and regulatory partners agreed on proposed sampling locations, types, and quantities to address remaining data gaps; the agreements are reflected in the Revised Draft Work Plan, which will be available for public review in February 2026 on the Red Hill Environmental Restoration, Navy (ER,N) website. The presentation included a QR code and link to the website.

A figure was presented with proposed soil sampling locations in Area A. Because the data in Area A showed PFAS and petroleum in shallow groundwater, but not in deep groundwater, the next phase of the RI will focus on conducting additional soil sampling. Sampling focuses on several key areas including former storage tank locations, excavated areas, and along the northern site boundary. If shallow groundwater is encountered during soil sampling, the Navy will also install at least one more shallow groundwater monitoring well in Area A. If data collected from the proposed sampling locations are insufficient to define the boundary of PFAS contamination in both soil and groundwater, then sampling efforts will be expanded in future phases of the RI, as necessary.

A figure was presented with proposed soil and groundwater sampling locations in Area B. Wells to be sampled include wells along the site boundary and previously installed monitoring wells near Adit 3, the former Oily Waste Disposal Facility, and the future Water Treatment Facility. Soil samples will be taken at locations along the northern and southern site boundaries, near Adit 3, near the former Oily Waste Disposal Facility, and in the western portion of the facility. If shallow groundwater is encountered at the soil sampling locations, a temporary monitoring well will be installed to collect a groundwater sample. Similar to Area A, if data collected from the proposed sampling locations are insufficient to define the boundary of PFAS contamination in both soil and groundwater, then sampling efforts will be expanded in future phases of the RI, as necessary.

Additional permanent monitoring wells will be installed, bringing the total number of wells sampled for the RI to 49. Additional wells include one deep well in Area B northwest of the existing wells and two deep wells in Halawa Industrial Park. After the new wells are installed, there will be two rounds of groundwater sampling across all 49 wells – one round in the rainy season and one round in the dry season. These two rounds of groundwater sampling will be in addition to the quarterly groundwater sampling already completed.

The goal of the sampling is to define the boundary of PFAS in the groundwater that is above the PSLs. The results will determine if the current monitoring-well network is sufficient or if more monitoring

wells are required. As updated regional screening levels become available, the PSLs will be updated in accordance with the established DoD policies. Next steps include finalizing the work plan, conducting field work, and performing laboratory analyses. Once results are obtained, data will be analyzed to determine subsequent steps and preparation of the RI report.

Since the previous RAB meeting, the Red Hill ER,N website has been updated. Attendees can download project documents, including the interim groundwater monitoring data files, directly from this website.

Mr. Heidner introduced Ms. Ibarra, who presented the updated website. Additions to the website include data validation reports and summary reports of groundwater monitoring data for all four quarters of expedited PFAS sampling at Red Hill available for download; DoD PFAS policies available for review; RAB meeting minutes available for download; an electronic RAB member application form (with the next RAB membership vote taking place in August 2026); and a "What's New" banner highlighting recent changes to the website. The administrative records link on the website will be updated, likely in February; during the update, the link will temporarily not be operational.

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

Q1: (Mr. Huber) On slide five…in Halawa Industrial Park, it is unusual. Toward the ocean, there are deep monitoring wells with PFAS. With that runoff, is there a possibility of cesspools or cisterns that you have checked into with the City and County regarding sewers? There are cesspools in unlikely neighborhoods throughout Oahu. Positively 40 percent of sewage contains PFAS. That is alarming to me. I am wondering if that could affect Halawa Industrial Park.

A1: (Mr. Heidner) Adjacent to the Red Hill facility is South Halawa Stream, which runs as the boundary on the north side of the facility. This area is concrete lined. When viewed from the Red Hill side, there are outfalls from drain lines in the concrete embankment in that area. We are working with the City and County to get approvals for the two wells we are planning on having drilled in the industrial park. We have not specifically targeted City and County sewer lines. We are looking at drilling basal wells to try to capture the extent of contamination.

Q2: (Ms. Pcola-Davis) Can you go to slide four? In quarters one and two, the findings were less than the PSLs. In quarters three and four, that changed. Is that an accumulation or an average of all those wells, or was there a specific well on that picture the data came from?

A2: (Mr. Heidner) The well that came online in quarter three was sampled again in quarter four. Is this the green well right here?

C1: (Ms. Pcola-Davis) Yes.

C2: (Mr. Heidner) That was installed as part of our investigation, so it did not exist at the time of the quarter one and quarter two data set. We targeted where there might be contamination from the known release, and we were correct.

Q3: (Ms. Pcola-Davis) Okay, so that quarter three and quarter four relates only to that new well?

A3: (Mr. Heidner) Those ranges, yes.

Q4: (Ms. Pcola-Davis) That green dot, inside the square. On slide five, I am going to ask the same question. What well were you measuring for the data from quarters one through four? Can you just highlight it?

A4: (Mr. Heidner) The table on the left is an accumulation the results from all wells on the screen currently.

Q5: (Ms. Pcola-Davis) It is an average?

A5: (Mr. Heidner) It has a minimum and a maximum. For this quarter, the lowest concentration was 10 parts per trillion, and the highest was 48.

Q6: (Ms. Pcola-Davis) But what well did that represent?

A6: (Mr. Heidner) I would have to check the data sheets.

C3: (Ms. Pcola-Davis) I would like to be able to attribute the numbers to a specific well, because I want to know if you are averaging those numbers. Thank you for the presentation. I would like to commend anybody that is working on this website. It is an outstanding job. It is remarkable how far it has come. Keep going, and I will keep saying good stuff about you.

C4: (Mr. Heidner) There are data summary sheets on the website now that might help fill in those gaps for you.

Q7: (Mr. Lau) Kudos on the website, Jocelyn and Tracy. It is a great site that is evolving and getting better, so thank you. I have questions about some of the documents posted there. One document from the Department of Health dated August 7th regarding comments on the remedial investigation work plan. They did make a comment here in the general comments number one. This is coming from EPA, and EPA is here. I am referring to a document that is off the website. Comment number one says the site should be the entire Red Hill Bulk Fuel Storage Facility and not just Areas A and B. Given the lack of documented information on where PFAS was previously used and the lack of a full preliminary assessment and site investigation, there is insufficient information to narrow it to just areas A and B. That would be the EPA document. I also have a question about DOH. You said you follow the DOH requirements – their EALs or their technical memorandums on how to take samples and what to test for. But the DOH comments on the RI work plan draft from August 12th, where there are discussions of previous sampling data, concentrations of PFAS compounds are not consistently compared to DOH tier 1 unrestricted EALs. They also mention that the method of collecting the samples was not consistent with their approach for the decision unit, multi-increment sampling approach, or DU-MIS method. I want to have clarification here. Do you follow the Department of Health requirements in the CERCLA investigation? Or are you following the guidance from DoD leadership?

A7: (Mr. Heidner) I will start at the beginning. This PFAS RI is broken into Area A and Area B. A lot of that is for ease of communication, because there are two source areas based on the data collected at this time. That does not limit the wells that we sample. We sampled all wells in the network at the Red Hill facility. If we have data that would lead us to expand Area A and therefore incorporate more of the facility, we would.

Q8: (Mr. Lau) When the baseline survey for PFAS was done by Navy Red Hill Task Force, they found PFAS detections over at Aliamanu Military Reservation across the freeway from the Red Hill property. Does that mean your investigation should also be out there? There was also detections near the Aiea Halawa Shaft across the valley in Aiea where a temporary water treatment system for PFAS has been

installed by Commander Dunn. Him and his team are here. Because there are detections in the past, should you expand the PFAS investigation? Not to just Areas A and B, but the entire Red Hill site, and offsite where Navy monitoring wells have been drilled and PFAS has been detected.

A8: (Mr. Heidner) Thank you for your question. I appreciate your level of detail. Currently, we are looking at the wells on the facility and using a phased approach to follow the plume that we are investigating. If we find that the plume expanded towards those 2 wells to the west, one across the highway and one towards Aiea, we will absolutely incorporate those. We are taking an iterative approach and using a fine-toothed comb to find the plume being investigated. There is too much of a chance that there would be unrelated data that could muddy our data, and as we take an iterative approach, this will be less likely to happen.

Q9: (Mr. Lau) I fully support the EPA's general comment number one in your letter that it should be expanded. The investigation initially started because of the November 2022 incident. But when you started to do that baseline survey and more testing in 2023 and found PFAS at various levels of concentration, that is a reason for expanding the investigation instead of limiting the investigation. Please take a bigger look at this. They are testing shallow groundwater at the Oily Waste Disposal Site, which is above the groundwater in Halawa Valley, where the Industrial Park is. Is that correct?

A9: (Mr. Heidner) Yes.

C5: (Mr. Lau) The detections are highest in that shallow groundwater, and now the testing is going to be for soil. The contamination of PFAS is coming from the Red Hill site. Because it is available in groundwater, well above the groundwater levels in the industrial park area, it will not be the industrial park. But it seems to originate on the Red Hill site, and perhaps the soil sample will indicate that it is in the soil before it gets down into that shallow groundwater or deep basal water. I will stop there.

C6: (Mr. Heidner) What was the question?

Q10: (Mr. Lau) The first question is, will you comply with the DOH tier one EALs in your investigation? Number two, will you expand the investigation to the entire Red Hill site and also go off site? Because the data from Navy-controlled monitoring wells detected PFAS.

A10: (Mr. Heidner) For your first point, we reference the tier one EALs from the DOH. We only compare our data, as far as project screening levels, to the promulgated data, which is peer-reviewed, and the tier one DOH levels currently are not promulgated. If they are promulgated, we will consider incorporating those into our PSLs. But currently, we are using EPA's RSLs.

Q11: (Mr. Lau) When you say promulgated, you mean the DOH has to adopt those administrative rules before you follow them? Is that correct?

A11: (Ms. Rangel) When they calculate the EALs, they need to use peer-reviewed toxicity values, and DOH currently does not use peer-reviewed toxicity values. There are two EPA RSLs not included because they do not use peer-reviewed toxicity values. The comments you are referencing are from August of 2024, and there was a two-day scoping meeting in September of 2025 to resolve a number of these comments because we could not get to an agreement, which is why it has taken so long. We compromised on the EALs and the [multi-increment sampling. (MIS)]. We came to an agreement to not use the MIS sampling, and DOH accepted that in this phase.

Q12: (Mr. Kajihiro) What is MIS?

A12: (Mr. Heidner) MIS stands for multi-increment sampling.

A13: (Mr. Kajihiro) Are these other sites that Ernie was referencing off from the areas you are investigating? Does that fall under other investigations? If it is not in your iterative process, is there another investigation that is looking at it? How do you remediate those detections?

A13: (Ms. Tamashiro) We follow the DoD policies and start at the source of where we know there was contamination, which is the Red Hill facility for this project. We step out from there and follow the contamination until we have found where it ends. As Ernie was saying, they have found contamination at other locations in the Board of Water Supply wells that are far enough away from the Red Hill Fuel Storage Facility, and there are potential sources in between the Red Hill Facility and the Board of Water Supply well that would call into question what the source is. For the Navy to continue our investigation, we need to step out and take that iterative approach from our known source, which is the Red Hill Facility. Are we looking at other potential sources and other projects? Yes, where there is known usage, storage, or releases of AFFF. There are other sites that we are looking at. They may not necessarily correlate with where Board of Water Supply has been finding PFAS, but we are undertaking other investigations.

Q14: (Mr. Kajihiro) Thank you for the website. It looks great. On the sign-up form for new members, there were two other RABs. Are those active? I have not heard anything.

A14: (Ms. Tamashiro) We intended to have one form, but those other two RABs, the central Oahu RAB and the Waianae RAB, are not currently active. We would like to reactivate them. If anybody is interested who meet the criteria of living, working, and representing those areas, we welcome them to apply. And we would like to do what we did here and reinvigorate those RABs.

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

Q15: (Ms. Lauryn Hanlen) My name is Lauryn Hanlen. My question might be most relevant for Charlotte. You mentioned that the EAL guidance by the State of Hawaii was not sufficient to be considered for remedial investigation at this point because it is not based on peer-reviewed literature. However, they do use a lot of peer-reviewed studies in their establishment of these EALs, and in the toxicity realm they are considered some of the most comprehensive guidance nationally. I was curious if you could elaborate more on what the differences between the EALs and the ones you are using in terms of what level of peer-reviewed standard that they are not meeting.

A15: (Ms. Rangel) Thank you for that question. The EPA RSLs typically use the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR). With the EALs, if you look for the PFAS [RSLs], they get a lot of stuff from the state of Michigan or the state of Texas. It is not that ATSDR, whereas with the other contaminants that the EALs use, they do use more of those peer-reviewed toxicity values.

Q16: (Ms. Hanlen) Is there sufficient information within ATSDR at this point for the DOH to use and apply?

A16: (Ms. Rangel) They could use those to form their EALs. We would look at and evaluate them and go to our subject matter experts at Naval Facilities Engineering and Expeditionary Warfare Center (EXWC) to get them approved. There are a couple of states that we have gotten approval to use their state values.

C7: (Mr. David Yomes) Is the state and city government that has several landfills across the state using the same policies as the military for contaminants? Are they measuring the same, or are we adding

onto the military as far as what they need to check for their landfills? The Waimanalo landfill is full of contaminants. I need to know what the state and the city is doing with their landfills. If the military complies with what the state and city is doing, that should be okay. What we asked of the [federal] government should be the same as the military. As far as the Red Hill situation is concerned, I was one of two community members in the initial Red Hill Task force. For the Red Hill situation, the community understands what happened. The community needed answers, they got the answers, and we need to stay on top of the situation. That is why this board was created. But we also need to accept the military as part of our community. They are my neighbors, and we need to collaborate with them to take care of the situation that we have within our state and move on. But we cannot blame the military. That is why I mentioned the double standard. Hopefully, the [state] government is doing the same thing. I know it is not happening at the Waimanalo Landfill. Once that closes, the contamination will be so great because that is the biggest landfill on Oahu. What are they going to do with that landfill? How are they going to trap the contaminants that are already there? What is the government doing with the contaminants there, what kind of testing are they doing, and is the testing exactly what the military has to test for? Or are we adding on to the situation?

C8: (CAPT White) Maybe Ernie can elaborate on the topic. Do you think that the rules are applied evenly throughout? It is an interesting question. Before we dismiss this question as irrelevant to this RAB meeting, it is something that should be noted, it is good to know because ultimately the same water, regardless of the source of contamination, is being consumed and everyone here deals with it.

C9: (Mr. Lau) First of all, I do not know what the requirements are for landfills because it is not my area of expertise. I went into drinking water. But for Mr. Yomes, I know the DOH has tested for PFAS in all the municipal landfills that are owned by the counties or the city government. They tested the leachate a couple of years ago and found significant levels of PFAS contamination. There is a lot of contamination. I am not sure if what is being tested for at the municipal landfills owned by city or state government is the same as what is being required for the Navy. I do not know the answer. But again, the DOH did a survey of wastewater treatment plants, landfills, and sites contaminated with AFFF – Kahului airport was heavily contaminated – and the landfills had PFAS contamination at significant levels and other contaminants in the landfill. That is all I can say.

There were no further questions from the public.

VIII. CLOSING

CAPT White acknowledged what was accomplished during the last year of RAB meetings, including creating the Red Hill ER,N website, improving presentations, and improving transparency and discussions. CAPT White shared hopes for the future that these meetings would drive what is presented, inform where site visits are held, would result in the community being heard, and expand the RAB to a full 21-person membership.

Ms. Whitfield acknowledged neighborhood board members for attending and expressed hopes to pool resources through the board system. Ms. Whitfield acknowledged that when the RAB meetings restarted in 2022, there was a lot of pain in the community, and the RAB meetings helped community members know what work has been done already to heal the land.

Colonel Hammond expressed looking forward to working with the RAB and communities at the next meeting in May, and closed the meeting at 7:50 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:

Naval Facilities Engineering Systems Command, Pacific *258 Makalapa Drive, Suite 100* *JBPHH HI 96860* *Tel. (808) 472-1428*	*University of Hawaii at Manoa Hamilton Library Hawaiian and Pacific Collection* *2550 McCarthy Mall* *Honolulu, HI 9682* *Tel. (808) 956-8264*	*Pearl City Public Library* *1138 Waimano Home Road* *Pearl City, HI 96782* *Tel. (808) 453-6566*

ATTACHMENT A

LIST OF ATTENDEES

PEARL HARBOR-HICKAM-KALAELOA RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD (RAB) MEETING

OAHU VETERANS CENTER, HONOLULU, HAWAII

January 14, 2026

1. Audrey Asahina
2. CAPT Brinkman
3. Lynn Brockway
4. Maverick Carey
5. John Chesnutt
6. Rebecca Crall
7. CDR Dunn
8. Susan Gorman-Chang
9. Kurt Fevella
10. Colonel Hammond
11. Lauryn Hanlen
12. Hanaloa Helelā
13. Niels Heidner
14. Lawrence Higa
15. Frank Hopkins
16. Robert Huber
17. Tracy Ibarra
18. Guy Inouye
19. Jeff Johnson
20. Lucrina Jones
21. Kyle Kajihiro
22. Camille Kalama
23. Stephanie Kawasaki
24. Pete LaPlaca
25. Jeni Larson
26. Ernie Lau
27. Melanie Lau
28. Joyce Lin
29. Sharon Lin
30. Bill Manley
31. Kim Markillie
32. Vanessa McCowan
33. Sherry Pollack
34. Susan Pcola-Davis
35. Carrie Plath
36. Aaron Poentis
37. Andrew Price
38. Charlotte Rangel
39. Steve Sahetapy--Engel
40. Matthew Sepp
41. Jamie Simic
42. Tara Sutton
43. Jocelyn Tamashiro
44. Janice Toma Shiira
45. Bryceson Tugade
46. Belinda Turran
47. CAPT White
48. Francie Whitfield
49. Stacey Whitten
50. Meredith Wilson
51. Nick Wood
52. David Yomes
53. Dayna Yoshizaki
54. Hanna Zheng
55. Malia Zinn