

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

APPROVED ON SEPTEMBER 9, 2026

I. MAY 20, 2026 ATTENDANCE: SEE ATTACHMENT A.

II. OPENING

Ms. Stephanie Kawasaki, facilitator of the meeting, opened the meeting at 6:00 p.m. and briefly covered the meeting's purpose as a place for the United States (U.S.) Department of the Navy (Navy) and the local community to collaborate. Ms. Kawasaki then invited Ms. Francie Whitfield to offer a pule (prayer).

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

Ms. Whitfield, RAB community co-chair, introduced herself.

Mr. Guy Inouye, RAB member, introduced himself.

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

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

Ms. Joyce Le, ex officio (i.e., nonvoting) RAB member, introduced herself.

Mr. Kyle Kajihiro, RAB member, introduced himself.

Ms. Helene Takemoto, RAB member, introduced herself.

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

Colonel (COL) Gregory Hammond, RAB Navy co-chair and Deputy Commanding Officer of Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam (JBPHH), introduced himself.

Ms. Kawasaki asked the room if there were any other officials in attendance who would like to introduce themselves. None were forthcoming. COL Hammond asked Mr. John Chesnutt to introduce himself. Mr. Chesnutt introduced himself and Ms. Kristen Young as representatives of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Region 9 and ex officio RAB members.

Ms. Grace Simmons introduced herself as a representative of the State of Hawaii Department of Health (DOH) Hazard Evaluation and Emergency Response Office and ex officio RAB member.

Ms. Kawasaki outlined meeting rules, specifying the order in which meeting attendees can ask questions, directing off scope or time intensive topics to a "parking lot" board for follow-up, and noting that she may interrupt as needed to keep the meeting on schedule. Ms. Kawasaki then asked the moderator, Ms. Dayna Yoshizaki, if any RAB members were attending via Zoom. Ms. Yoshizaki confirmed that Mr. Robert Huber, a RAB member, was attending online.

Next, Ms. Kawasaki 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.

III. BOARD MEMBER ABSENCES

Ms. Tamashiro began reviewing the agenda for the meeting. The first order of business for the meeting was to address the status of an absentee RAB member, Mr. Dennis Yuen. Ms. Tamashiro stated that Mr. Yuen was a member of the RAB prior to the pause in meetings from 2019 to 2024, but that he had not attended a meeting or responded to any emails since the resumption of RAB meetings in June 2024.

COL Hammond suggested that based on this information, the RAB should vote to remove Mr. Yuen as a member. Ms. Whitfield brought the motion to the floor.

Comment (C1): (Ms. Whitfield) I move to have Mr. Yuen removed from the RAB. Are there any seconds?

Question (Q1): (Ms. Takemoto) Should we ask him if he is interested rather than unilaterally removing him? Maybe he is not getting the notices?

Answer (A1): (Ms. Whitfield) We have emailed him.

Q2: (Ms. Takemoto) Has he responded?

A2: (Ms. Whitfield) No.

Q3: (Ms. Takemoto) Could he be called?

A3: (Ms. Tamashiro) We do not have any contact information other than email. We have been emailing him since June of 2024 and have not received a response.

Following this discussion, Ms. Pcola-Davis seconded Ms. Whitfield's motion to remove Mr. Yuen as a RAB member. Ms. Whitfield called for a vote of the RAB. Ms. Takemoto voted to oppose the motion. All other members voted in favor and the motion was passed.

IV. DISCUSSION ABOUT RECORDING MEETINGS

Ms. Whitfield raised the issue of whether video recordings of future RAB meetings should be made available to the public for discussion. She suggested that audio and video from meetings should be released as a supplement to the meeting minutes along with timestamps to match different discussion topics. She also suggested that this recording could be made available within 1 week of the meeting.

COL Hammond stated that the Navy is committed to transparency and that audio recordings along with video of the meeting presentation screen could be made available. He was not able to commit to timestamps being made available or the recording being available within 1 week of the meeting but insisted it would be made available as soon as possible. He then asked the RAB if they would like to begin recording the current meeting.

Ms. Le expressed her approval of the idea, noting that Mr. Ernie Lau (ex officio RAB member) could not attend this meeting and that these recordings could be valuable for RAB members who were not

able to attend future meetings. She also expressed a desire for the recordings to be available as early as possible.

Ms. Pcola-Davis proposed that the motion, as described by COL Hammond, be voted on. Ms. Gorman-Chang seconded the motion, and it proceeded to a vote. The motion passed unanimously and was adopted. From this point recording of the meeting began. COL Hammond emphasized that the Navy would work to post recordings as soon as possible.

V. REVIEW OF JANUARY 2026 MEETING MINUTES

Ms. Whitfield asked if any RAB members had any changes or corrections for the January 2026 meeting minutes. Mr. Kajihira moved to accept the existing minutes. Ms. Gorman-Chang seconded the motion, and it was passed unanimously.

VI. DISCUSSION ABOUT RAB COMMITTEES

Ms. Whitfield described her thoughts on a theoretical future proposal to form committees within the RAB to assist the co-chair on specific topics. She proposed that the most critical committees that could be added to the RAB are a Technical Review Committee and an Outreach Committee. She also suggested that more committees could be added as RAB membership increases. In particular, the Outreach Committee could be expanded greatly into a variety of subgroups to enhance the distribution of information to the community. Some of these subgroups might involve relations with neighborhood boards, social media, website development, and other focuses.

Ms. Whitfield proposed some possible committee assignments and focuses for current RAB members:

- *Ms. Pcola-Davis*: Technical review and website specialist.
- *Ms. Gorman-Chang*: Outreach assistant coordinator and neighborhood board specialist.
- *Mr. Hanalua Helelā*: Outreach coordinator, Hawaiian organizations, and distribution specialist.
- *Mr. Lau*: Technical review and water quality specialist.
- *Ms. Le*: Technical review and outreach assistant coordinator.
- *Mr. Kajihira*: Technical review assistant manager and map specialist.
- *Mr. Inouye*: Technical review manager, outreach specialist, and community co-chair alternate.
- *Mr. Huber*: Technical review and data specialist.
- *Mr. Vina*: Technical review and outreach specialist.
- *Ms. Takemoto*: Technical review presentations and website specialist.
- *Mr. Rosario Prizzia*: Technical review and website specialist.

Ms. Whitfield emphasized that these plans remain provisional and are subject to review by the RAB members.

Q1: (COL Hammond) The Navy is excited about the committee proposal. One of the goals of the RAB is to facilitate the flow of information between the community and the installation, and it sounds like these committees will help do that more effectively. I wanted to confirm that if a website is developed, it is clear on the website that it is not an official U.S. government website and it does not reflect the views of the Navy but instead those of the community RAB members.

A1: (Ms. Whitfield) There is no plan to have a website development specialist right now, just a website specialist who will review the current website and see if there is any input we can provide.

Q2: (COL Hammond) I see. So the idea is to look at the existing Environmental Restoration, Navy (ER,N) website and provide more meaningful feedback to the Navy?

A2: (Ms. Whitfield) Yes.

Q3: (Ms. Pcola-Davis) The agenda item for this topic describes this as a discussion of a proposal for RAB committees. But it is not proposed for a vote today, am I correct?

A3: (Ms. Whitfield) Correct. I decided to postpone setting up committees until the next meetings because hopefully we will have more community members join the RAB before that time.

Q4: (Ms. Pcola-Davis) Are we running our meetings with regards to the Sunshine Law of Hawaii? Do we know?

A4: (Ms. Whitfield) I am trying to, but I don't know how well I am doing.

C1: (Mr. Kajihiro) I believe the Sunshine Law applies to state bodies. We are not a state body, so it may not apply here.

Ms. Pcola-Davis asked COL Hammond if he had any comment on the matter. COL Hammond stated that he was unaware of the Sunshine Law of Hawaii and could not comment.

C2: (Ms. Pcola-Davis) The Sunshine Law indicates that the public needs to be able to participate in one way or another. This group actually already has a public commentary period. Where we are getting to with committees is what under the Sunshine Law is called a permitted interaction of members. If we are not going to be operating under the Sunshine Law, then I won't go any further. But if we are, I will have more to say for the next meeting.

Ms. Whitfield expressed a desire to comply with the Sunshine Law of Hawaii and suggested it could be discussed by committees or in future meetings. Ms. Pcola-Davis added that this may not be necessary if the law does not apply to the RAB.

Q5: (Ms. Tamashiro) Will there be an expectation from my ER Program team for additional participation or work for these committees outside of this primary RAB meeting?

A5: (Ms. Whitfield) I think if we need any guidance we could make a request to you, but it wouldn't be mandatory. As a part of the RAB's objective to work with the community, the committee members could function as a liaison that could funnel questions to the ER [Environmental Restoration] Program team. Does that help?

C3: (Ms. Tamashiro) That does help. I think it's a tremendous amount of information and you could really help share it with the community. I just want to ensure that there is an understanding that we have limited staff and that any requests should come to myself and COL Hammond through Ms. Whitfield. We would also need to establish a way to document these requests and any actions that are taken in our Administrative Record. We would need to be able to make sure what comes out of these smaller committees is documented properly.

Ms. Whitfield emphasized that this was a reason she had only established one committee so far, the Executive Committee, and that this committee could discuss these matters and bring it to the Navy before future RAB meetings. It was confirmed that the Executive Committee included all currently serving RAB members, and that all RAB members would also be on the Technical Review and Outreach Committees. Members might focus on a specific committee going forward based on their subject knowledge and interests.

VII. SCHEDULING THE NEXT RAB MEETING

COL Hammond proposed that the next RAB meeting would be scheduled for September 16, 2026, the third Wednesday in September. Ms. Gorman-Chang mentioned that the Red Hill Community Representation Initiative meetings were held on the third Thursday of each month, and that it was difficult for people to attend back-to-back meetings. COL Hammond said that he would be happy to schedule meeting on September 9, 2026, instead. There were no objections and the next RAB was scheduled for Wednesday, September 9, 2026.

VIII. SITE TOUR

COL Hammond informed the RAB members that the Navy was able to support the next site tour on August 8, 2026, from 8:00 to 10:00 a.m. The tour will be focused on the Pearl Harbor Sediment site and be conducted with a boat. The RAB members had no concerns with this plan.

Ms. Whitfield acknowledged the presence of Hawaii State Representative, Mr. Garner Shimizu, in the audience.

IX. INTRODUCTION OF ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION STAFF

COL Hammond asked Ms. Tamashiro to introduce herself and her team members in attendance. Ms. Tamashiro introduced Ms. Yoshizaki, the Environmental Director of NAVFAC Hawaii, followed by the Remedial Project Managers (RPMs) Ms. Carrie Plath, Ms. Rachel Gilhooly, Ms. Charlotte Rangel, Ms. Audrey Asahina, Ms. Hanna Zheng, Mr. Niels Heidner, and Ms. Jeni Larson.

X. FOLLOW-UP REQUEST TO EXPAND RED HILL MONITORING WELL NETWORK

Ms. Tamashiro addressed a letter sent by ex officio RAB member Mr. Lau to the EPA and DOH. COL Hammond mentioned that the letter itself and the response from the regulatory agencies are available on the Red Hill ER,N website under the per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) section.

Mr. Chesnutt of the EPA addressed the letter. Mr. Chesnutt noted he was not aware that the letter would be discussed until shortly before the meeting and that Mr. Lau would not be present to participate in the discussion. Mr. Chesnutt explained that on January 22, 2026, after the January 14, 2026, RAB meeting and the previous site tour of the Aiea Laundry site, Mr. Lau sent a letter requesting that a currently unused deep basal aquifer groundwater monitoring well at that site be added to the Red Hill PFAS monitoring well network.

Ms. Le, who worked with Mr. Lau on the letter, expanded on the topic further by explaining that after discovering monitoring well (MW) 16 during the Aiea Laundry site visit, she and Mr. Lau hoped it could be added to the monitoring well network due to its proximity to the Navy's Aiea-Halawa drinking water shaft. Ms. Le recalled, "During the field visit, we asked the Navy staff there to see if they can include that monitoring well into the sampling and they told us that they can't make that decision and it would be based on what the regulators require them to do. And, therefore, we wrote a request letter to EPA and DOH requesting that you include monitoring well 16 into the PFAS testing and monitoring."

Ms. Le then covered the content of the response letter from EPA and DOH. She described how the response letter denied the request for the addition of MW16 to the monitoring well network due to the site being located over 1 mile from the Red Hill facility and because there is currently no data demonstrating a link between contaminants from the Red Hill facility and MW16. Ms. Le then discussed some of her and Mr. Lau's concerns with this response.

C1: (Ms. Le) Where is the current data referred to in the response letter? We are not sure what data shows that there is not a link between the contaminants at the two facilities. If possible, we would like to see that data. Also, as mentioned earlier, the location of MW16 is only a quarter mile from the Aiea-Halawa shaft. Also adjacent to the Aiea-Halawa shaft is the Navy's MW24 which, during the 2023 PFAS baseline testing, showed a detection of PFAS. So what data is being used to show that PFAS has not traveled past that barrier? The Navy's groundwater flow simulation model shows that there is a potential for contaminants from Red Hill to travel in the direction of MW16. So, I think that it would be beneficial to include MW16 in the sampling and monitoring so we can start building a history of data for this area.

Q1: (Ms. Pcola-Davis) First, I absolutely agree. The well is there; we may as well use it. I am a little surprised that the EPA did not come prepared to discuss this. You seem a little surprised that we are discussing this, so I am disappointed. I am wondering, who can actually make this decision? Is it up to the regulators, and are you the regulator who can make that decision?

A1: (Mr. Chesnutt) I wouldn't agree that it is that black and white regarding the responsibility for the decision. It is quite a collaborative effort. I would like to work more collaboratively on agenda setting in the future as I didn't see this issue on the agenda until a few days ago. I didn't know what the objectives were for this discussion tonight, I could have brought my technical team with me had I known. I am not trying to avoid the issue and am happy to talk about it more.

Q2: (Ms. Le) This letter was also signed by Ms. Simmons of the DOH. Could you comment on the response?

A2: (Ms. Simmons) Sure. The DOH actually defers to the EPA regarding the well monitoring system. In our comment, we suggested that MW16 be incorporated into the overall investigation looking for PFAS source contamination. [Unfortunately, the PFAS working group did not pass this proposal.] Also, I don't want to speak for EPA, but it is our understanding that we can investigate but we will have to review with the technical team available.

C2: (Mr. Chesnutt) Over the last couple RAB meetings, the Navy has been giving updates on the Red Hill PFAS investigation at Adit 6 and the Oily Waste Disposal Facility. Our response to the letter was based on that and the conceptual model of the data coming from that. In our opinion, the Navy has proposed a robust next phase of investigation expanding out from those areas, and we are not suggesting that the Navy cannot add MW16 later, but we are first stepping out sampling from the source areas of the spill based on the standard Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) process. We may add further sampling based on the results of this next sampling area if we think contaminants are heading in that direction. We ask for your patience while we acquire and analyze the data. The Navy does propose these plans, but we review them and are very actively involved in preparing for the next phases of the investigation.

C3: (Ms. Tamashiro) My recollection from the Aiea Laundry site visit was that we discussed exactly this. When we do our CERCLA investigations, it is an iterative process where if we find that we have not delineated the extent of the contamination, then we step-out our sampling, but we always start at the source. I also do not recall us saying that we were waiting for the EPA or DOH to tell us what to

do. We know what to do; we follow the CERCLA process. I do understand that the Board of Water Supply (BWS) has proactively installed monitoring wells in the Halawa Valley. So I am curious to learn what data you have found, if any, that supports the idea of PFAS coming out from Red Hill.

Q3: (Ms. Le) We do regularly sample our monitoring wells and that data is available on our BWS website. To follow up on what Mr. Chesnutt and you said about perpetually expanding the sampling at Red Hill and beyond, I think it is important to think back to the contamination event of November 2021 and learn from it. Do we really need to follow the CERCLA process to a T? If you're only reacting once you detect PFAS outside of Red Hill, then that is already too late.

A3: (Ms. Tamashiro) I would like to say that there are numerous potential sources of PFAS between Red Hill and the former Aiea Laundry facility. And that is why the step-out process is so important. We could put a well in the Halawa Valley and find that the PFAS is potentially not related to the Navy.

Q4: (Ms. Le) Would it not be easier for us to just test an existing well? And compare what you are detecting at the Red Hill facility to what is being found at the former Aiea Laundry facility?

A4: (Ms. Tamashiro) If we found PFAS at the Aiea facility, how would we know it came from Red Hill instead of another source that is not Navy-related?

Q5: (Ms. Le) If it is another source, then we can look for that at another time. But at least we can tell that the source is not Red Hill, correct?

A5: (Ms. Tamashiro) Fingerprinting for PFAS is not a certified method. So, any testing that is done would be qualitative and we would be unable to definitively say the source is not Navy-related. There is an industrial park there; PFAS could come from any of those businesses that might use stain repellent, water repellent, or numerous other industrial sources.

C4: (Ms. Le) That is correct. But what is important is that we grab the samples now, and when technology allows, we can make that comparison in the future.

C5: (Mr. Kajihira) I think this discussion of trying to say "it's not ours" is not productive and does not meet the spirit of addressing our problems. It is not just PFAS that is a concern; there is still the petroleum spill that we don't fully understand how it is moving. So, I don't see what the harm is to sampling from this well that already exists and characterizing what is happening underground. We still don't know how the water moves, and we keep drilling holes to try and better understand it. I understand that with CERCLA, you start with the point source and move out from there, but petroleum is not regulated under CERCLA, and we still need to understand what is going on there. A precautionary approach should govern rather than a risk assessment approach, because it is leading to this thing of trying to split this off and say, "it's not ours; it's someone else's." The issue is really about cleaning it up and understanding what is happening with the contaminants. So I would urge that the EPA and DOH reconsider their position and open up that monitoring well and start sampling from it. I can only see the benefit of more data on how the groundwater is moving.

Q6: (Ms. Gorman-Chang) I want to ask the EPA, what is the downside of using that well?

A6: (Mr. Chesnutt) At this point, we are focused on the Red Hill PFAS investigation, and we want to keep our focus on that source. If you sampled that monitoring well and there was a detection of PFAS, I'm not sure how that data would help our investigation at Red Hill. There is a lot of contamination at the source area at Adit 6 and the Oily Waste Disposal Facility, and we are making good progress on exploring that. We are putting a lot of pressure on the Navy to expedite that process, and the Navy

Remedial Project Manager has put up a really robust plan for the next step-out. I think it would be really challenging if they found a low level PFAS reading and I'm not sure what that would tell me about the Red Hill site.

C6: (Ms. Gorman-Chang) [It would tell you] that the water is contaminated. You are the EPA; there is a bigger picture here. This is our water; if it is contaminated, then we need to deal with it. Your job is not to see if the Navy polluted a certain area. Your job is that if the water is poisoned with PFAS or anything else, you need to help us deal with it. That is your job.

C7: (Mr. Chesnutt) My job is at this Superfund site.

Q7: (Ms. Gorman-Chang) And you close your eyes to everything else?

A7: (Mr. Chesnutt) The Red Hill site is the specific focus of my job right now. The PFAS across the island you can find anywhere, and it will not necessarily be from the Navy. My job specifically is to look at releases from the Navy right now and I'm putting my resources towards that, not looking at PFAS across the island. The state and the drinking water authorities might be more focused on the objective of looking at PFAS across the island.

Q8: (Ms. Pcola-Davis) This was asked earlier and I don't think it was answered. What is the downside? Is there a downside to collect one more data point?

Ms. Kawasaki interrupted the discussion due to time constraints, requiring that the meeting move along to leave time for the technical presentations. The discussion of Mr. Lau's letter was tabled and moved to the parking lot board.

Ms. Tamashiro moved on to a review of recent changes to the Red Hill ER,N website. She highlighted how documents relating to any ER Program sites at JBPHH can be accessed by going under the "Red Hill ER,N Documents" tab and following the instruction there. The other change discussed was that under the "PFAS Remedial Investigation" tab, a figure was added showing the location of the groundwater monitoring wells and whether they are shallow groundwater wells or deep groundwater wells. Ms. Tamashiro expressed hope that these changes will help address issues that had been previously raised with the content and useability of the website.

XI. TECHNICAL PRESENTATIONS

Five-Year Review Results – Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam, Oahu, Hawaii – Ms. Jocelyn Tamashiro, NAVFAC Hawaii

Ms. Tamashiro began the presentation by giving a background summary of the five-year review process. Five-year reviews are conducted within the remedial action and site closeout/long-term monitoring stages of the CERCLA process, which is what governs the Navy's ER Program. Once a remedial action is completed at an ER Program site, the Navy will begin conducting five-year reviews at that site. Five-year reviews are necessary because, under the CERCLA process, if a site is not cleared for unlimited use following a remedial action, periodic reviews must be conducted to ensure that the remedy remains protective of human health and the environment.

Five-year reviews are not required following interim removal actions, treatability testing, or pilot testing unless the removal action is documented as part of the record of decision (ROD) for that site. The frequency for a five-year review is no less than every 5 years, and it is Navy and U.S. Marine Corps policy that the first ROD for an installation is the trigger date for a five-year review of the entire installation.

Ms. Tamashiro added that the sites being covered in this presentation all had five-year review requirements as part of their remedies. These sites are divided into three categories. Sites that fall within the borders of the former Pearl Harbor Naval Complex are all on the EPA's National Priorities List (NPL). This five-year review cycle covered 10 NPL sites. Sites that fall within the former Hickam Field and other outlying parts of JBPHH are considered non-NPL. The non-NPL sites are divided into sites that are regulated under CERCLA and petroleum-only sites, because petroleum is excluded under CERCLA. This five-year review cycle had 13 sites in both non-NPL categories.

Five-year reviews have six components: Community involvement and notification, document review, data review and analysis, site inspection, interviews, and a protectiveness determination. Over the course of implementing these components, a five-year review must answer three questions. First, is the remedy still functioning as intended by the decision documents? Second, are the exposure assumptions, toxicity data, and other remedial action objectives that were used at the time of the initial remedy still valid or have circumstances changed? Finally, has any other information come to light that could call into question the remedy's protectiveness?

Ms. Tamashiro then reviewed some of the remedies in place at NPL sites within JBPHH. These include land use controls, which include controlling site use, signage, barriers such as fences, notices, and inspections; long-term monitoring, which involves periodic sampling of the contaminated material over a longer timeframe; engineering controls, which are when the contaminated material is physically contained such as with a concrete cover; and removal action, which covers methods of removing the contaminated material directly, such as excavation.

Of the 10 JBPHH NPL sites, 8 sites have remedies that were determined to be protective. Of the 2 sites where the remedy was found to be not protective, 1 was the Pearl Harbor Sediments site where the remedies documented in the ROD have not yet been fully implemented. Once the remedial action has been completed across the entire site, the remedy is expected to be protective. The other site was the Former Pearl City Junction site, which was given the status of "protectiveness deferred." This site was impacted by insecticides and other chemicals. The land is currently leased for commercial use with the owners of the property being restricted by environmental covenants that require them to comply with rules that will keep the remedy protective. Recently, documentation from the current landowner that is required to ensure that the current remedy is still protective has not been provided. For that reason, the site is considered to have a status of protectiveness deferred until this documentation can be acquired. The Navy has escalated this issue with their real estate team in order to be able to proceed with this site and provide proper information to the current landowner.

Among the JBPHH non-NPL sites that fall under the CERCLA program, 11 out of the 13 sites have remedies that were considered protective. Of the two remaining sites, the Former Burn Pit/Disposal Area site was considered as not applicable because additional remedial action was completed and the site was recommended for unrestricted use. Based on the DOH's concurrence, no further five-year reviews are necessary for this site. The other remaining site, Landfill LF01, is located within the Hickam airfield. The site was formerly used for the disposal of lubricants, paints, solvents, sludges, and municipal waste. Previous investigations identified metals, chemicals related to historical burning, and polychlorinated biphenyls impacting soil at the site. The five-year review protectiveness status for this site has been defined as "protectiveness deferred" because the Navy has yet to complete DOH-recommended soil sampling to evaluate whether contamination remained after the completion of the Remedial Action. The additional soil sampling is scheduled to be completed before the next five-year review, at which point a definitive protectiveness determination can be provided.

Of the 13 non-NPL petroleum-only sites, 11 sites have remedies that were found to be protective. Of the 2 remaining sites, Site ST14 was found to be not applicable because management of the site has

been combined with a separate site that is currently undergoing a remedial investigation. Therefore, the five-year review cannot be completed until the entire site is out of the remedial investigation phase. The last site, Site ST02, was given the status of “protectiveness deferred.” Site ST02 was a facility that was formerly used to pump fuel through pipelines to upland storage facilities. Previous investigations identified petroleum-related chemicals in the site soil, groundwater, and soil vapor. The remedy for this site included groundwater sampling as a part of long-term monitoring. A review of the groundwater monitoring data has led the Navy to believe that the petroleum plume is stable but may not be fully delineated in the areas near the Waiawa stream. The Navy is in consultation with DOH on the best way to resolve these questions and has deferred completion of the five-year review protectiveness determination until this has been resolved.

Ms. Tamashiro completed her presentation with a review of the follow-up actions for the sites that were not determined to be protective after their five-year review process. She highlighted that the next round of five-year reviews would be in 2029 for NPL sites and 2030 for non-NPL sites. She reminded the audience that, like other ER Program documents, plans related to these five-year reviews can be found at the Red Hill ER,N website, the Administrative Record, and select libraries.

Before opening the room to questions from the RAB members, Ms. Kawasaki reminded everyone to be respectful with their questions and to not target specific individuals. She also reminded the RAB that the meeting was very tight on time and that there would only be a limited amount of time for questions. Ms. Kawasaki asked Ms. Yoshizaki if there were any questions online; Ms. Yoshizaki confirmed that there were none.

Ms. Gorman-Chang raised a question about the Unexploded Ordinance (UXO) 2 site. Ms. Gorman-Chang used a poster with images and figures of the site to help illustrate her question.

Q1: (Ms. Gorman-Chang) I apologize if my earlier comments were inappropriate. My question is about the UXO site. I have an update; UXO washed up at Cove Three in Kapilina today. I spoke with the security guard, he said it was white phosphorous. The Navy bomb squad came and took something away. And you say that this site’s remedy of putting up a sign is working. My question is, where is it recorded when an incident like this happens between five-year reviews? And were you aware of this?

Ms. Tamashiro introduces Ms. Plath, the RPM for site UXO 2, to answer this question.

A1: (Ms. Plath) When we do get a report from the public via the phone number on the signs at the site, it first goes to the Navy Explosive Ordinance Disposal (EOD). The ER Program team then works with EOD to record incidents like this one. Because this site is post-remedy, these incident recordings will be included in the annual report for the site as well as future five-year reviews.

Q2: (Ms. Gorman-Chang) And are we privy to those reports?

A2: (Ms. Plath) Yes.

Q3: (Ms. Le) I am fairly new to these investigations, so I have a clarifying question that can be addressed by the Navy, EPA, or DOH. How is it possible that land that has been contaminated can be transferred to new owners before it has been fully remediated by the responsible party?

C1: (Ms. Tamashiro) Are you referring to the Former Pearl City Junction site?

C2: (Ms. Le) Yes, or any other site with the same ownership scenario.

A3: (Ms. Tamashiro) In particular, the Former Pearl City Junction site already had a ROD and the remedy was land use controls. That condition was written into the property transfer deed, and the property owner was made aware of the contamination at that site and the restrictions that came with it such as restrictions on digging.

Ms. Tamashiro asks Ms. Plath if she could provide more information.

C3: (Ms. Plath) During the five-year review process, we realized that the documentation, the ROD, and some of the communications with the current property owner, a Home Depot, were not sufficient. So we are working with our real estate team to make sure everything is communicated and that the Navy is able to complete its annual reports. The remedy at this site is land use controls. They are not to dig or excavate and, if they do, they must ensure that workers are sufficiently protected. All of that information is available in the ROD. From my research, I've found that property was transferred first from the Navy to the State and then from the State to the current landowners.

Q4: (Ms. Le) So as long as they write it in the deed, they can transfer the property to anyone before it is completely remediated?

Ms. Plath referred the question to the EPA.

A4: (Mr. Chesnutt) In general, the Superfund Law allows property to be transferred under CERCLA Section 120(h) once the cleanup is completed. The cleanup being complete does not mean that the site will be remediated all the way to unrestricted use, as Superfund site standards are based on reasonable anticipated use. In this case, the remedy was chosen with the context that the area was not going to be residential and was going to be used for this type of retail space. So the remedy was selected and signed among EPA, State, and the Navy to be a protective remedy for this site. The parking lot functions as a cap keeping the contamination in place and undisturbed. As long as the remedy is in place and is being monitored, Superfund allows for property transfers.

Ms. Kawasaki asked if there were any questions from the general public. There were none.

Per- and Polyfluoroalkyl Substances Investigations Update – Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam, Oahu, Hawaii – Ms. Jocelyn Tamashiro, NAVFAC Hawaii

Ms. Tamashiro stated that this technical presentation came at the request of Mr. Lau, who was hoping for an update on the PFAS investigations at JBPHH outside of Red Hill.

Ms. Tamashiro then reviewed a table showing the project status of 23 PFAS sites. She explained that there were several steps to conduct for each site before field work is conducted. The dates in the table under "Start of PFAS Remedial Investigation" are the dates when the work for each site was awarded. After that, the next step is a Scoping Meeting to establish a plan of action with regulators for the site before a work plan review and eventual field work. Ms. Tamashiro showed on the chart that all of these projects are in the early stages, with only a few having had their scoping meeting. Ms. Tamashiro expressed hope that this information is what Mr. Lau was looking for.

Ms. Pcola-Davis recommended color coding the table to match the colors of the General Service Areas on the accompanying figure. COL Hammond agreed that this would be an improvement and stated that the change would be implemented.

Q1: (Mr. Kajihiro) I think that the Trump administration recently rolled back some regulations covering PFAS. I am wondering how that affects these sites.

Ms. Tamashiro referred the question to the parking lot board because the Navy has not received any guidance on these recent changes at the time of the meeting. Ms. Kawasaki asked the room if there were any additional questions. There were none.

XII. FINAL QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS AND CLOSING REMARKS

Ms. Whitfield and COL Hammond raised the issue of deadlines for applications to become a RAB member. Ms. Tamashiro reminded the room that applications to become a RAB member are available on the Red Hill ER,N website under the “Community Involvement” tab, and that the September RAB meeting was the only meeting of the year where new RAB member applications would be discussed. COL Hammond asked Ms. Tamashiro when the due date for new RAB member applications would be. Ms. Tamashiro could not remember the exact date but was under the impression that it was 2 weeks before the September RAB meeting. Ms. Tamashiro reminded all that the due date can be found in the RAB charter, which is publicly available on the ER,N website.

Ms. Pcola-Davis wondered if there would be more time for questions and answers. Ms. Kawasaki confirmed that Ms. Whitfield had no more closing remarks. COL Hammond assured Ms. Kawasaki that his closing remarks would be brief. Ms. Kawasaki re-opened the floor for questions.

Q1: (Ms. Gorman-Chang) Regarding the CERCLA five-year review document, I just wanted to thank the people for all the work that went into that. I read the whole thing and it was very informative. I have some questions. In Chapter 8 – Building 6, page 8–7, it states “the six groundwater monitoring wells installed as part of the site investigation were decommissioned prior to the last site inspection.” My questions are, who determines that these monitoring wells can be decommissioned, why are they decommissioned if they are an important part of groundwater monitoring, and can they be brought back into service?

Ms. Tamashiro first confirmed which section of which document Ms. Gorman-Chang was referring to.

A1: (Ms. Tamashiro) So for Building 6, you are asking about monitoring wells. That would fall under the long-term monitoring remedial action, and that is not part of the remedy for this site.

Ms. Tamashiro directed the question about the status of the wells to Mr. Heidner, the RPM for this site.

C1: (Mr. Heidner) Those wells have been cemented to surface and cannot be reopened. Groundwater monitoring is not part of the remedy for that site.

Q2: (Ms. Gorman-Chang) Going back to the Former Pearl City Junction. I wanted to note that South of MW-06, that whole span of land is an urban garden. Do we know that the garden is safe from contamination, and does it need to be compliant with the rules against excavation?

A2: (Ms. Tamashiro) That’s a good question. When I look at the table of remedial actions, I see that the remedy for this site did not include groundwater monitoring. That would fall under the long-term monitoring remedial action.

C2: (Ms. Gorman-Chang) But it does say do not disturb the soil or excavate? Was that not a part of it? You are not sure if Home Depot is doing that because they are not communicating with you. I’m just concerned about the urban garden, or even if Home Depot has a garden section.

Ms. Kawasaki suggested the question be moved to the parking lot board to wait for when Ms. Tamashiro has an opportunity to look into the issue more thoroughly. Ms. Tamashiro agreed and the question was tabled. Ms. Pcola-Davis confirmed with Ms. Kawasaki that this was the questions and

answers portion of the meeting. Ms. Pcola-Davis suggested to Mr. Heidner and Ms. Tamashiro that for the Red Hill PFAS investigation, there should be more differentiation between the deep and shallow groundwater monitoring wells on the tables and figures of the summary documents that RAB members have received. Also, that in the same report, the Navy should provide more detailed information on the different forms of PFAS that could be present at the site.

Q3: (Mr. Kajihiro) Regarding the application form for new RAB members, will the community co-chair receive a summary list of all of the names of the applicants?

A3: (Ms. Tamashiro) The answer to that is that the application comes to myself as well as our Public Affairs Office. I believe the charter says the Navy will compile the list of applicants and will communicate with the community co-chair on who has applied.

Ms. Tamashiro also corrected her earlier statement and confirmed that per the charter, new RAB member applications are due 21 days before the next RAB meeting, making the deadline August 19, 2026.

Q4: (Ms. Le) I have a question regarding the sampling for the Red Hill PFAS remedial investigation. I was wondering if additional PFAS sampling is going to be done? I think on the Red Hill ER,N website, it has only four quarters of testing results. Is there going to be a quarter five coming up soon?

A4: (Ms. Tamashiro) The next phase of work is actually the remedial investigation. The four quarters of groundwater sampling are not something that is typically done up front in this kind of investigation. We were asked to do the sampling up front by the regulators in order to help identify areas where we should be focusing our remedial investigation. So, to answer your questions, we are going to be doing additional sampling of groundwater, but that is going to be after we install all of our wells. At that point, we are going to do two more rounds of sampling that will be conducted over a period of a year. Then we will synthesize all of the data, from the four quarters, from the two rounds of sampling that are a part of the remedial investigation, and from the soil data. That will all be used to update the conceptual site model for the site and identify potential source areas. Should we need to step out further from the site, this will help us decide on which areas to focus on.

Q5: (Ms. Le) So these two rounds of additional sampling, these are the two rounds of sampling mentioned in the work plan, is that correct?

A5: (Ms. Tamashiro) Yes.

C2: (Ms. Le) We are working on providing a comment letter for that work plan, and one of our suggestions is to actually increase that sampling period to four, as in every quarter, instead of just two. I know in the work plan, it says the two rounds will be enough, but I don't see that as a well-rounded comprehensive set of data. Because you have four seasons and, even though Hawaii doesn't really observe all the seasons, you never know what differences there can be. Such as this last March when we had very intense rain. Weather like that could mobilize PFAS that was in the ground with the rain. So my suggestion would be to increase the rounds of sampling from two to four at a minimum, more would be great. Thank you.

C3: (Ms. Tamashiro) Thank you for your comment.

Ms. Kawasaki turned the meeting over to COL Hammond for closing remarks. He thanked the community and the RAB members for their feedback, as well as Ms. Tamashiro and the Navy ER Program staff for their hard work preparing materials for the meeting. He reminded community

members interested in joining the RAB to submit their applications and RAB members whose 3-year terms are coming up this year to notify the co-chair if they would like to renew their membership. After thanking the local and state government officials in attendance, as well as the regulators, COL Hammond closed the meeting at 7:56 p.m.

For additional information, please contact:

*Public Affairs Officer, Code 09PAO
Naval Facilities Engineering Systems Command (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 MEETING
OAHU VETERANS CENTER, HONOLULU, HAWAII**

May 20, 2026

- | | |
|----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 1. Jayde Addison | 30. Tara Sutton |
| 2. Melodie Aduja | 31. Helene Takemoto |
| 3. Audrey Asahina | 32. Jocelyn Tamashiro |
| 4. John Chesnutt | 33. Watson Tanji |
| 5. Rachel Gilhooly | 34. Bryceson Tugade |
| 6. Susan Gorman-Chang | 35. Belinda Turran |
| 7. Dustin Goto | 36. Cruz Vina Jr. |
| 8. Colonel Gregory Hammond | 37. Wendell Wen |
| 9. Jeff Hart | 38. Francie Whitfield |
| 10. Niels Heidner | 39. Stacey Whitten |
| 11. Robert Huber | 40. Leighton Wong |
| 12. Darlene Ige | 41. Nick Wood |
| 13. Guy Inouye | 42. Demitria Wright |
| 14. Jeff Johnson | 43. Ka'ōlinokaimana Yasuoka |
| 15. Lucrina Jones | 44. Dayna Yoshizaki |
| 16. Kyle Kajihira | 45. Kristen Young |
| 17. Stephanie Kawasaki | 46. Hanna Zheng |
| 18. Jeni Larson | 47. Malia Zinn |
| 19. Joyce Le | |
| 20. Marce Manucas | |
| 21. Kim Markillie | |
| 22. Eli Martin | |
| 23. Susan Pcola-Davis | |
| 24. Carrie Plath | |
| 25. Aaron Poentis | |
| 26. Charlotte Rangel | |
| 27. Steve Sahetapy-Engel | |
| 28. Garner Shimizu | |
| 29. Grace Simmons | |