1	COMMISSION ON WATER RESOURCE MANAGEMENT
2	STATE OF HAWAI'I
3	
4	
5	
6	REGULAR MEETING
7	
8	June 20, 2023, 9:03 a.m.
9	DLNR Boardroom, Kalanimoku Bldg. 1151 Punchbowl Street, 1 st Floor
10	Honolulu, Hawai'i 96813 & Online Via Zoom
11	Online link to the video recording of the June 20, 2023
12	Commission on Water Resource Management meeting: https://vimeo.com/838441296
13	110 CPS . 7 / VIMCO . COM/ 000 I II 200
14	
15	
16	BEFORE: SANDRA J. GRAN, CSR NO. 424
17	Registered Professional Reporter
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:
2	Dawn N. S. Chang, Chair
3	Michael G. Buck, Commissioner Neil J. Hannahs, Commissioner
4	Aurora Kagawa-Viviani, Ph.D., Commissioner Wayne K. Katayama, Commissioner
5	Joanna <u>L.</u> Seto, Department of Health Designee
6	
7	STAFF PRESENT:
8	Miranda Steed, Deputy Attorney General Alexa Deike, Legal Fellow
9	Ryan Imata, Groundwater Regulation Branch Chief
10	Katie Roth, Planning Branch Chief Ayron Strauch, Ph.D., Hydrologist
11	Dean Uyeno, Stream Protection and Management Branch Chief Barrett Won, IT Specialist
12	M. Kaleo Manuel, Deputy Director, CWRM Kathy Yoda, Commission Secretary, Pro Tem
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

PROCEEDINGS:

1.3

2.4

CHAIR CHANG: (Gavel.) Aloha mai kākou. My name is Dawn Chang, and I am chair of the Water Commission. Thank you very much for joining us today. This is the June 20th, 2023, meeting of the Commission on Water Resource Management. It is now 9:03. We are holding this meeting as a hybrid meeting; some of us are here in person -- actually, most of us -- in the Kalanimoku Building Boardroom in Honolulu, and we're also holding this meeting remotely via Zoom, and it can be watched live on YouTube.

For those who are here to testify on Zoom, we will let you into the meeting when we will be hearing the item you wish to testify on. Please remember to turn off your YouTube when you are in the main Zoom meeting room, or we will get an echo. When you enter, please be sure to keep your camera off, microphone muted, until the commission calls on you for your public testimony. We ask that members of the public testifying on agenda items limit your testimony to three minutes so that we can get to -- get to hear from everyone. And please remember not to use the chat for any comments because that presents a Sunshine issue. People may also testify via telephone at the number posted online. Please let our commission secretary know your name and what agenda item you are here to testify on. You can also email your testimony via email kathy.s.yoda@hawaii.gov or dlnr.cwrm@hawaii.gov.

For all meeting participants, I would like to stress the importance of speaking slowly.

1.3

2.4

I am now going to read the contested case statement for the record if I can find it. Yikes.

DEPUTY MANUEL: It should be at the back of the agenda.

CHAIR CHANG: Back of the agenda. Aha, I found it.

I found it.

In some of the matters before the commission, a person may wish to request a contested case hearing. If such a request is made before the commission's decision, then the commission will consider the request first before considering the merits of the item before it. A person who wants a contested case may also wait until the commission decides the issue, then request a contested case after the decision. It is up to you. Any request made -- must be made orally by the end of the meeting and followed up by written writing within ten days. If no request for a contested case is made, the commission will make a decision. The department will treat the decision as final and proceed accordingly.

All right. I am now going to take roll call of the commissioners. I will go first in -- those that are present in the room.

I'll start first with Wayne.

COMMISSIONER KATAYAMA: Wayne Katayama.

1	COMMISSIONER HANNAHS: Neil Hannahs.
2	CHAIR CHANG: Dawn Chang.
3	COMMISSIONER BUCK: Michael Buck.
4	COMMISSIONER KAGAWA-VIVIANI: Aurora Kagawa-Viviani.
5	MS. SETO: Joanna Seto for the Department of Health.
6	CHAIR CHANG: And I also have on the line oh, do
7	we do we not have
8	DEPUTY MANUEL: Yeah, he's excused.
9	CHAIR CHANG: Oh, okay. I'm sorry. Wayne Meyer is
10	excused, so we actually, Paul Meyer. I am going to get it
11	together. I'm just so excited because I've got [my bud] Mike Buck sitting
12	next to me, but I apologize. So our commissioner, Mr. Meyer,
13	is not here today, so all of the commissioners are here in the
14	boardroom.
15	And we actually have a reason why we're all here
16	today. It's because today is Commissioner Mike Buck's last
17	meeting. Let's give him a round of applause.
18	(Applause.)
19	CHAIR CHANG: We are extremely grateful for the time
20	that Mike has been here. I mean, Mike has been here both
21	he sat on the other side of the table as as a member of
22	DLNR staff for many years, retired, thought he was going off
23	into the sunset and do farming, but we pulled him back to sit
24	on the Water Commission. We've been extremely grateful for
25	his eight years?

COMMISSIONER BUCK: 1 Yeah. 2 CHAIR CHANG: Eight years. This won't be the last 3 time we see Mike. 4 (Laughter.) 5 CHAIR CHANG: I suspect that we are going to find an 6 opportunity for our paths to cross again. Taking Mike's place will be a new commissioner, who 8 is -- who is new, but not necessarily new to the commission, 9 Larry Miike, so he'll join us at the meeting in July. 10 But thank you again on behalf of both the department and the commission, Mike, for your years of dedicated service 11 12 and for providing this commission -- I've read through many 1.3 minutes -- just great guidance here. So thank you very much. 14 (Applause.) CHAIR CHANG: I'd also like to introduce staff. 15 16 Kaleo, if you could introduce yourself? DEPUTY MANUEL: Aloha, Chair and Commission. Kaleo 17 Manuel, Deputy, Water Commission. In person, we have Katie 18 19 Roth, who's the head of our Planning Branch. We also have Dr. 20 Ayron Strauch, who is with our In-Stream Protection Branch. 21 We also have Kathy Yoda, who is TAing into our commission 22 secretary position. And then we have Alexa Deike; she's our 23 legal fellow. And then Barrett Won, obviously, with our IT. 2.4 And then online, we have Ryan Imata, head of our Groundwater 25 Regulation Branch, and then Dean Uyeno, head of our Stream

1	Protection and Management Branch. And at that time, I think
2	that's that's all the staff that's present, Chair.
3	CHAIR CHANG: Thank you very much.
4	We also have present Deputy Attorney General Miranda
5	Steed. Thank you, Miranda.
6	So with that, we do have an agenda. I don't believe
7	we're taking anything out of order, Kathy, and we're going in
8	the order of the agenda. Okay.
9	So, Commissioners, the first item on the agenda is
10	Item A1. It is the approval of the minutes of June nope.
11	It is the approval of the minutes of May 16th, 2023.
12	Is there any written testimony, Kathy, on this
13	agenda item?
14	MS. YODA: No.
15	CHAIR CHANG: Okay. Anybody here in the public to
16	testify?
17	(No response.)
18	CHAIR CHANG: I'm not seeing any.
19	Any comments or questions by the board members on
20	the minutes of May 16th, 2023?
21	COMMISSIONER KAGAWA-VIVIANI: I just have minor
22	correction of some acronyms and grammar.
23	CHAIR CHANG: Okay.
24	COMMISSIONER KAGAWA-VIVIANI: So we'll be working on
25	the words and then send it to Kathy.

1	CHAIR CHANG: Thank you very much.
2	Any other comments or questions to the minutes?
3	(No response.)
4	CHAIR CHANG: Do I have a motion to approve the
5	minutes as with minor corrections?
6	COMMISSIONER HANNAHS: Moved.
7	COMMISSIONER KATAYAMA: Second.
8	CHAIR CHANG: The motion has been moved and seconded
9	to approve the minutes of May 16, 2023. We're going to take a
10	roll call vote.
11	Kathy, do you guys usually do that for the first
12	one?
13	MS. YODA: Yes.
14	CHAIR CHANG: Okay. We'll take a roll call vote.
15	Wayne? Oh, go ahead.
16	MS. YODA: Wayne Katayama.
17	COMMISSIONER KATAYAMA: Approved.
18	MS. YODA: Neil Hannahs.
19	COMMISSIONER HANNAHS: Approved.
20	MS. YODA: Michael Buck.
21	COMMISSIONER BUCK: Approved.
22	MS. YODA: Joanna oh, I'm sorry. Aurora Kagawa-
23	Viviani.
24	COMMISSIONER KAGAWA-VIVIANI: Approved.
25	MS. YODA: Joanna Seto.

1	COMMISSIONER SETO: Approved.
2	MS. YODA: Chair Chang.
3	CHAIR CHANG: Approved.
4	Thank you very much. The meeting minutes of May
5	16th, 2023, have been approved.
6	MOTION: (HANNAHS/KATAYAMA)
7	To approve the minutes with minor corrections.
8	CHANG/BUCK/HANNAHS/KAGAWA-VIVIANI/KATAYAMA/SETO
9	UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED
10	CHAIR CHANG: The next item on the agenda is Item
11	B-1, it is the adoption of the Maui Water Development Plan,
12	and if you can put the testifiers into the Zoom room and we'll
13	call you when we're ready to take public testimony.
14	Thank you, Katie.
15	So we'll take a staff presentation. Thank you.
16	MS. ROTH: Morning, Chair and
17	CHAIR CHANG: Good morning.
18	MS. ROTH: Commissioners. Katie Roth, Planning
19	Branch of the commission. Item B-1 is the adoption of the
20	Maui Island Water Use Development Plan for incorporation in
21	the Hawai'i Water Plan. You may remember a few months ago,
22	back in March, staff gave an overview of the (inaudible)
23	submittal and the plan itself, so in the interest of time, I'm
24	not going to go into the details that were presented then.
25	That is available; that recording is available on the website.

Those that -- that presentation included an overview of some of the major themes and concerns that were raised during public testimony as well as staff's recommendations and responses to those concerns. The submittal you have before you includes the same items. That begins on page 7, and then the staff recommendation on page 11 includes the underlying items that you'll see.

1.3

2.4

I wanted to highlight that after the March 21st presentation, there was additional outreach done by staff with DWS, Maui County, and members of the Haiku community. That was in response to certain items and themes that were identified. We really wanted to make sure that we addressed them sufficiently so that we could come to you today with recommendations and an item that you felt comfortable approving, knowing that we had done our due diligence and additional outreach. So some of the recommendations you see have been tweaked slightly based on those conversations with certain stakeholders and the county.

I guess at this time, I would just say that staff believes that the plan itself meets all the statutory requirements set forth in the State Water Code, and it sufficiently addresses the recommended elements in the Hawai'i Water Plan framework pertaining to updates of the County Water Use and Development Plan. So we feel that the plan you see today is sufficient and meets every -- all of the requirements

needed to be approved.

1.3

2.4

I will reiterate the recommendation, so we have that on record. Staff recommends that the commission adopt the Maui Water Use and Development Plan for incorporation into the Hawai'i Water Plan. Commission staff will also commit to work with the County of Maui on the following:

- 1. Maui DWS will hire a consultant to write a Maui Island Water Use and Development Plan summary document of the plan for public consumption. The summary document should clearly articulate what charts, figures, tables, and data have been amended and, when relevant, provide links to the updated data source.
- 2. Commission and Maui DWS will incorporate the findings of the USGS Study on Climate Change Impacts on Groundwater Recharge into water planning documents, including the Maui Island Water Use and Development Plan and updated sustainable yields.
- 3. Maui DWS will organize meetings annually with the Kahikinui, Hana, Koolau, Central, Lahaina, and Wailuku Aquifer Sectors stakeholder groups to better quantify the water needs of residents, including traditional kuleana users, rural residents, and small farmers. Feedback and data from these meetings will be incorporated into a future update of the Maui Island Water Use and Development Plan.

Maui DWS will report back -- 4. Maui DWS will

report back to the commission within one year with an update 1 on the status of the USGS hydrological study of the Haiku 2 3 Aquifer. And 5. Commission staff will continue to work with 4 5 Maui DWS to support development of their water conservation 6 programs, including water loss control components that implement the findings of completed annual water audits. 8 I'd also like to mention that we have Council Member 9 Shane Sinenci on the line along with Eva Blumenstein for DWS, and I believe Director Stufflebean is also in attendance 10 virtually if you have additional questions. 11 12 CHAIR CHANG: Thank you. 1.3 MS. ROTH: And with that, I will be available for 14 any questions you have. 15 CHAIR CHANG: Commissioners, do you have any questions for staff? 16 17 COMMISSIONER BUCK: Maybe a quick recommendation on your Recommendation 3 is all-encompassing; you might want to 18 19 at least recognize this soon-to-be-formed East Maui Water 20 Authority or something just to -- just to make sure that we're 21 aware of what's going on 'cause that probably includes three 2.2 or four of these annual meetings. 23 MS. ROTH: Yes, absolutely. And that was something 2.4 that was discussed during public testimony and in 25 conversations with the County.

```
COMMISSIONER KAGAWA-VIVIANI: So -- sorry.
 1
 2
                COMMISSIONER BUCK: No, go ahead.
 3
                COMMISSIONER KAGAWA-VIVIANI: I have a question on
 4
      Recommendation 5, which focused on working with Maui DWS to
 5
      support development of [fair] their water conservation programs.
      And
      given Maui DWS is, like, one of several providers, you know,
 6
 7
      how -- is there a -- when you say their water conservation
 8
      programs, that is limited to Maui DWS. [This may be] Is there
      [broadened]broader
      [to] support for island-wide conservation.
 9
10
                MS. ROTH: Yes, absolutely. So the water audits
11
      themselves include more than just the DWS systems, but I think
12
      that's some good feedback. (Inaudible) is only referring to
1.3
      Maui DWS. So if that's something you want to amend --
14
                COMMISSIONER KAGAWA-VIVIANI: Yeah.
15
                MS. ROTH: -- we can definitely do that.
                COMMISSIONER KAGAWA-VIVIANI: Okay.
16
17
                           I will say that the -- the water audits,
                MS. ROTH:
18
      especially in the Lahaina area, are being used as part of our
19
      assessment of the water use permit applications that we've
2.0
      been receiving --
21
                COMMISSIONER KAGAWA-VIVIANI:
                                              Riaht.
22
                MS. ROTH: (Inaudible), so we're trying to
23
      understand where efficiencies can be made not just in the
2.4
      public, but in the private systems as well.
```

yeah, I was gonna propose that you just change it from "their" to "island."

CHAIR CHANG: Any other questions?

1.3

2.4

COMMISSIONER HANNAHS: Yes. Katie, the submittal is really clear that this fulfills a statutory obligation that we have to have a plan. How does this strengthen our water management? These will be the County of Maui.

MS. ROTH: That's a good question. So these plans themselves, obviously, as you know, are often imperfect. It takes many years to write them, so they're never going to be perfect (inaudible). That's why we try to approach them as living documents where they can be refined and updated as needed. I'd probably refer to -- to the county and their implementation plan for specifics on how this will be used to move Maui County forward in terms of their water development and water resource protection initiatives, but that's also part of the exhibits that needs to be -- that needs to (inaudible).

I think one of the important points to keep in mind is that this plan was developed in accordance with the old Hawai'i Water Plan framework from 2000, and we are in the process of updating that framework. And so we hope to consider a lot of other issues, cultural issues that aren't specifically maybe brought out or explicit in the existing plans that you see coming before you, but it's something that

we want to incorporate into future updates as it's a huge 1 component that is often missing from these plans. 2 3 COMMISSIONER HANNAHS: Thank you. And I'll wait to hear more from Maui, Maui officials. Thank you. 4 5 CHAIR CHANG: Okay. Oh, go ahead, Joanna. 6 COMMISSIONER SETO: For Item 1, is there a due date 7 for that summary? 8 MS. ROTH: So it's in process now, but I can let Eva 9 comment more specifically on where they're at, but I believe 10 it's in process, and they should have it done in six to nine 11 months. 12 COMMISSIONER SETO: Okay, thank you. 1.3 CHAIR CHANG: My question -- my only question is, 14 what is the impact if we don't approve this plan? MS. ROTH: That's a good question. Well, it's 15 16 already being used by the county for a lot of their capital 17 improvement projects and planning efforts. So if we do not approve it, I believe they're still going to use it in some 18 19 way to guide their process and what -- and what they hope to 20 achieve with water resource protection on the island. Again, 21 defer it probably to the county to provide more specific information about how not approving at this time would impact 22 23 the outcome. I know that they've worked very hard many 2.4 years --25 CHAIR CHANG: Yes.

1	MS. ROTH: to get to this point. I know that
2	it's been a long process, and not all the parties have been
3	satisfied. Unfortunately, I think that's just how it goes
4	sometimes when you do outreach over many, many years. But
5	yeah, I think the county might be able to comment a bit more
6	about what impacts specifically not adopting the plan would
7	have.
8	CHAIR CHANG: Okay, awesome.
9	If there are no other questions, I'm going to invite
10	the county to provide us comments.
11	COMMISSIONER_BUCK: Very diplomatic.
12	(Laughter.)
13	CHAIR CHANG: Council Member Shane Sinenci, would
14	you like to speak first?
15	COUNCIL MEMBER SINENCI: Okay. Aloha kākou and
16	aloha, Chair Chang.
17	CHAIR CHANG: Aloha.
18	COUNCIL MEMBER SINENCI: I'm happy to be aloha nō. I'm
19	happy to be here in support of the commission's
20	recommendations. We are supportive of the commission creating
21	a summary of the report, and also we support having regular
22	updates made to the plan, including the Board of Water Supply
23	and the council's input. This will be important for community
24	outreach and and just general awareness. We've heard loud
25	and clear from the community that they want to see up-to-date

1	data within the plan, and I'm supportive of having the
2	Department of Water Supply update those numbers over time. So
3	again, we just wanted to express our mahalo and for your
4	consideration of this plan. As Katie said, it has been a
5	monumental task over the last couple of years, and many
6	stakeholders were involved in the process, and so and
7	again, mahalo for coming to our communities and hearing their
8	concerns. Thank you.
9	CHAIR CHANG: Council Member.
10	Commissioners, do you have any questions for Shane?
11	Shane, I just had a clarification. In what you
12	your comments this morning was that the commission will
13	provide a summary. Is that that's the Maui it's not
14	you're not looking at the the Water Commission staff to do
15	the summary, right?
16	COUNCIL MEMBER SINENCI: Yeah, we're correct.
17	We're just supportive of the commission's recommendations.
18	CHAIR CHANG: Okay, okay. Very good, very
19	good. Thank you.
20	No other questions?
21	(No response.)
22	CHAIR CHANG: I have Director John Stufflebean, Maui
23	County Department of Water Supply.
24	DIRECTOR STUFFLEBEAN: Aloha.
25	CHAIR CHANG: Aloha.

1.3

2.4

virtually. Again, John Stufflebean. I've been the director since January, so I'm -- I'm new here. And I understand that there were many concerns and opposing testimonies in adopting the plan, and I believe that the commission deputy and his staff have worked diligently with -- with both the Department of Water Supply county staff and community members to address these concerns. So, you know, I've read through the plan, and I found that it reflects many of -- kind of the department goals and is guiding us in the right direction. And it -- it spells out strategies that both diversify our water supply, work towards solutions and work closer with other water purveyors -- there are several other water purveyors on Maui -- and with other county agencies to consider all the resources.

And I want to just kind of briefly go through a few of the things that we're working on now that -- that kind of came out of the plan that are, you know, basically implementing the plan. As was said earlier, even though it hasn't been adopted, we're using it. You know, it's -- it's a very valuable plan in that it just -- it utilized so much input from the community and other sources, so --

So, first of all, in terms of watershed protection, we are -- we are -- for years, we've been doing grant funding to -- to fund non-profits to do watershed protection. We're

looking at increasing that in the future. Maybe that's -that might even be the most important thing that we're doing
to protect the source, so that will continue.

1.3

2.4

We're also protecting our water from contamination.

We have a bill that's just been introduced to county council

to establish wellhead protection in overlay districts so that

there's less risk of well contamination, you know, in the area

of the wellheads.

We've got a lot going on in water conservation. We -- we're retrofitting all of our meters with Smart Meters.

Smart Meters allow the meters to be read remotely, which has a couple of advantages. One is the meter reader doesn't have to physically go to the meter, but the other advantage is it provides real-time information on water use. And back in my -- I came from California. My career back there, we did a study in one of the cities I was in, and the Smart Meters decreased water use 15 percent -- we did a pilot study -- because people can get real information on how much water they're using and it also detects leaks. So if -- like, if the meter is running 24 hours non-stop, you get a note, hey, you may have a leak, so it really helps with water conservation.

We're also -- have landscape incentives and guidelines as well as requirements. And we're working out a water conservation bill to introduce to the -- to the county

council and our water board that will -- it will beef up our water conservation requirements.

1.3

2.4

And a big one is our tiered structure. As the other islands do, we have a tiered structure, and council has just approved a revision to our tier structure where we increase the upper tier a lot. And so basically, you know, the -- the lifeline water rate didn't change much, but the top tier, we increased 24 percent. So that's -- that was found to be maybe one of the most important things you can do. You know, money talks, right? So to -- you know, to -- to encourage people to -- to reduce water use, especially those that are using a lot. We also implemented -- council will be -- has approved a new rate for hotels and resorts that's a higher rate so that they pay more for the water.

And we do have some gray water initiatives going as well. We've got one going in one of our parks and getting ready to put in another one. So we see those as templates that can help, you know, increase gray water use throughout the county.

We also have some strategies that deal with climate change. We're supporting the collaborative hydrological efforts studies of impacts of climate change and future well development on groundwater health. And we have an ongoing study with USGS to -- to assess the effects of scenario-based recharge change on groundwater in the Maui aquifers as demand

increases. And we're adding stream gauges and monitoring wells and other tools to assess what's happening with climate change.

1.3

2.4

In terms of source, we are -- for our central system -- you probably know Maui has 12 separate water systems, which is so interesting 'cause I'm fairly new here. On our central system, we're exploring new basal well development in the southern portion of the Waihee Aquifer and East -- East Maui well development as well.

And we're currently conducting a feasibility study to be followed by USGS assessment on the interaction between the groundwater and surface water and potential impacts from pumping the Haiku Aquifer.

For Upcountry, we're exploring new well development in the Makawao Aquifer and the Haiku to meet demand on the Upcountry meter priority list. And we're assessing the new raw water reservoirs to increase reliable supply with consideration adopted to other in-stream flow standards. And we're also considering alternative structures and processes to expedite the issuing of meters. And that's a whole 'nother meeting. I won't get into the meter list, but we're looking at about four or five different strategies to help us -- to help us address that meter list in a more efficient way.

And on the west side over at Lahaina-Kapalua area,

Kaanapali, we're pursuing new wells and also working with Maui

Land and Pine and Hawai'i Water Services to integrate -- you know, to look at how we can integrate our systems better to most efficiently utilize the water in the area.

1.3

2.4

And then, finally, to address drought and system resiliency, we're formalizing demand response plans and mutual agreements with the private water purveyors to address water shortages. It was said earlier when -- we can declare a water shortage, but it's really helpful if all the other water companies on the island also declare a water shortage. So we're looking -- you know, we see that as a really important element.

We're developing wells to improve reliability as it a -- as a contingency in areas that are dependent on surface water. The wells are -- you know, tend not to respond as quickly to -- obviously, to rainfall events. And then we're looking to -- you know, three of -- three of our main water supplies in three of our main areas are the ditch systems, and so we'll continue relying on those, so we're exploring how we invest in those systems to make sure that they're -- they're adequately maintained. And we're assessing the Wailuku Water Company system and potentially other legacy systems as well.

So, in summary, the plan serves us as a long-term guide; that's the value of it. It provides us a framework in which to -- to plan our efforts, and I believe it's a good foundation that we can update. Obviously, that's mentioned

many times. We need to update this regularly and -- and we'll work with the community and commission staff to do that in each sector.

And we're also -- just as a reminder we're tackling the Molokai Water Use and Development Plan, and we also have funding for the Lanai Plan coming up in this fiscal year.

So mahalo for your attention. Thank you.

CHAIR CHANG: Thank you very much, Director.

Any questions?

1.3

2.4

COMMISSIONER HANNAHS: Yes, Director. So congratulations on your -- your new post. We welcome you to this role of public service, and we thank you for your testimony. We're particularly grateful that the county is taking upon itself to kind of invest in watershed protection and in those transmission systems, those ancient transmission systems which are really -- really undermining the prudent use of a very valuable resource.

My question is, you've got different bodies there. You've got the administration's water management team, you've got boards, and then you've got a new board for -- coming, that's coming up on the scene. Will the plan help in put -- giving them one page to work off of and kind of get everybody on the same page? And you might have a different role in that, but we're all working for the same set of objectives. Is this -- is this plan kind of a navigational star in that

1 sense?

2.1

DIRECTOR STUFFLEBEAN: That's an excellent point.

Yeah, there are many players involved in the water world, and, you know, really, partnerships are essential to making progress in water and, again, to making sure that everyone's kind of heading true north together. And so, yes, absolutely, this plan -- this plan will help guide all of us to make sure we're all headed the same direction and -- and making progress towards a better future. That's a really good point. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER HANNAHS: That's it. Thank you.

CHAIR CHANG: Any other questions? Mike.

COMMISSIONER BUCK: Yeah, a comment. Again, congratulations on your new post, and I echo Commissioner Hannahs's comments. Maui County was the first county that established a watershed partnership and the first county that actually (inaudible), so I -- I definitely encourage that. Just really curious. Briefly, you came from California; you guys don't lack for water issues. What's it like coming to Hawai'i? Are there things that you brought that can help, or are we out in front, or are we way behind?

DIRECTOR STUFFLEBEAN: I wouldn't say you're in front or behind. It's different, for sure. I mean, there are -- there are certainly some -- you know, many of the kind of skills and knowledge I developed in California that are very

1.3

2.4

helpful here. They're very -- a lot of similarities. But for sure, there are unique situations on the islands and on Maui, especially, which I'm having a fascinating time learning because, you know, I -- well, I've never seen that one before. I've -- you know, I've certainly had many of those moments, you know. So I -- you know, I bring in, you know, 40-plus years of water experience in California and Arizona. And actually, in Missouri as well, but that isn't quite as relevant because they have lots of water there. But, you know, so certainly it helps and, you know, and there's certain basic principles that -- that I bring with me.

For example, the value of partnerships which we just talked about. In California, there's 400 water and wastewater agencies, you know, that have to work together and, you know, not to mention the state and the federal and cities and counties and so on. And then also kind of the -- the need to have -- and I'll just say one more thing, the need to have what we call a diversified water portfolio where, you know, you need to have multiple sources of water and be -- have a resilient redundant system. And so we're working on that both in terms of the sources and then also in terms of the -- the transmission and delivery systems to make sure they're -- they're, you know, robust and redundant and can handle the -- you know, the things that always happen to disrupt the system.

COMMISSIONER BUCK: All right. So thanks very much.

CHAIR CHANG: Any other questions?

1.3

2.4

I -- I have one. John, this plan -- undoubtedly, there were challenges with communities, so -- but it seems like, you know, Council Member Sinenci did a lot of good work in reaching out, as did the rest of the commission. How are you proposing to engage -- continue to engage the community in this ongoing dialogue on water?

DIRECTOR STUFFLEBEAN: Well, sure, I mean, very actively and -- you know, and, you know, Eva -- Eva leads that effort, and I think a lot of good work has been done and -- and Shane has been also great in this, from my understanding. You know, I believe there's a -- certainly the -- we need to engage with the community in many ways, robustly, often, and listen to the community. You know, we can't always do exactly what the community wants, you know, sometimes you have to say, Well, that's not exactly what we can do, but -- but absolutely, we need to listen.

And so, you know, it's -- I go out in the community, I've been to hundreds and hundreds of community meetings in my career. And, you know, we had just one -- we had a couple up in recently Upcountry, and it was extreme. It was 300 people at the Kula Community Center. And, you know, listening to their concerns, they bring a lot of valuable information which we need to hear, and we need to understand it, and we need to consider that as we make our decisions. So I'm a strong

advocate of community participation and will continue to do 1 2 that, very actively be involved with that. And then, you know, Eva will help me with how that's done here in Hawai'i, 3 4 which is -- there's a lot to it here, for sure. 5 CHAIR CHANG: I'm encouraged by your comments. 6 Thank you very much. 7 Any other comments? 8 COMMISSIONER KATAYAMA: Chair, may I ask? 9 CHAIR CHANG: Sure. Yes, please. COMMISSIONER KATAYAMA: Thank you, Chair. 10 11 Hi, John. Thank you for the presentation. The 12 action list that you just described, how and when would that 13 be embedded in the water use plan that's before us today? 14 DIRECTOR STUFFLEBEAN: I think it's in there. I 15 mean, almost everything -- I believe everything I said has a 16 direct link to the plan. So I didn't -- I didn't quote the sections, but, you know, essentially everything that we're 17 18 doing has a link back to the plan. 19 COMMISSIONER KATAYAMA: So, is there a quantitative 20 measure of what your targets are for reuse and reduction 2.1 that's part of the plan and as it's tied into your general 22 development plan for Maui as well as community development 23 plans? Because at some point, you know, these uses will come 24 before us for us to approve, and I guess it'd be helpful if we

had some assurances that -- that the allocations are based on

25

action plans that you've just described.

1.3

2.4

DIRECTOR STUFFLEBEAN: Right, yeah, that is the case. I'll probably -- I think I will defer to Eva for that in terms of the -- the quantitative connection to the plan because she's much more familiar with it than I am, having worked on it for -- for many years.

So, Eva, I'll let you -- let you tackle that one if you don't mind.

CHAIR CHANG: Go ahead. Eva, go ahead.

MS. BLUMENSTEIN: Mahalo, Chair. Yeah, in response to the commissioner's question, yes, there are quantified targets for each strategy, in fact, that relates to resource use. So in terms of recycled water, you -- you have the demand and supply projected through year 2035, so in terms of targeting buildout of R1 or other recycled water use, or whether it's groundwater development or conservation targets, you have those quantified, you know, in five-year increments.

And then the strategies kind of have the short- to long-term implementation range. Some of these projects will be, you know, further scoped out over a very long time, and some of them, like the director mentioned, are already in the works. So, yeah, so there are targets in there that we are working through tracking in the implementation matrix so we can report progress to our board and council and to you folks.

DIRECTOR STUFFLEBEAN: And I'll only add to that

that I will not hesitate to exceed the targets.

(Laughter.)

1.3

2.4

COMMISSIONER KATAYAMA: Does that also -- those targets apply to the other purveyors other than the Board of Water Supply, or these action items -- basically, you control all of those a hundred percent? As we go into the different regions, how are those going to be managed, under whose auspices?

MS. BLUMENSTEIN: That's a really good question. I mean, this is one of the challenges, right, with having the county developing a water use development plan that applies to private water purveyors and other users. So in terms of the county agencies investing in recycled water expansion, stormwater use, etc., you know, the plan does that, so it's -- you know, that -- this is also the driver or the guidance for capital improvement program and budget priorities for other agencies that, you know, recycle water falls under the Department of Environmental Management, etc.

For private purveyors, you know, there's subtle incentives in the plans, and there are other -- there are tools that on the county level can be -- we can implement strategies through land use controls or land use approvals. So if this is, say, in a new development, the strategy in the water use development plan is to use x resource, and that project comes in for land use approvals, and we ask the

planning commission to -- to look at that as a guidance, and we put those comments in already in discretion of permit review. But yeah, we don't -- obviously, we don't have the authority to impose conservation or allocations on the private providers. That's, you know --

COMMISSIONER KATAYAMA: Yeah, I think that's a good model to be actively commenting on land use issues. Good. Thank you.

CHAIR CHANG: Any other -- yeah.

1.3

2.4

COMMISSIONER KAGAWA-VIVIANI: Yes, I have a comment.

Thanks, Eva. I think one thing that -- I'm excited to hear what Director Stufflebean said. You know, I mean, one thing, it sounds like Maui DWS can do a -- sort of set the pace and set an example with, say, Smart Metering and kind of setting new standards for monitoring uses and -- and conservation. I know it's not in the plan, but it would be exciting to see -- you know, as you guys get more data and more real-time data, to be able to have dashboards or something and -- and it doesn't need to be put in the plan, but just to have that in mind as to where things -- where you folks maybe can take it. I think Maui is really setting -- has the opportunity to set new models for the rest of the islands given the whole array of challenges and opportunities, so --

Yeah, thanks for articulating that, I guess, and --

and helping us kind of listen and see where some of those gaps are too. You know, because if you guys set -- set an example, then maybe the -- it allows us as a commission to then point out to the other private purveyors like, Hey, look, it's doable, and we should all be doing this in terms of conservation and kind of innovating. So, kind of appreciate the work that's been put in to take in that feedback and -- and be more responsive.

CHAIR CHANG: Great comment. Thank you.

Any other questions?

1.3

2.4

Eva, did you want to -- did you want to add anything more to the discussion? Because --

MS. BLUMENSTEIN: Well, thank you, Chair. Well, I just want to really say we really appreciate the -- both the commission staff and the deputy that they -- you know, they're taking the time to scrutinize the plan and to further engage with the community members, you know, after this went through council here on our end. So, yeah, I just want to assure you, you know, every voice that came forward was heard and considered to craft these strategies, and we think that the -- the proposed conditions in the staff's submittal, you know, we can do that, that can be implemented, and that would allow the plan, you know, to go forward.

Oh, I want to respond also to Commissioner Hannahs's question -- or was it the Chair's question on what happens if

1.3

2.4

the plan is not approved. So as Director Stufflebean -- you know, he gave a couple of examples of how we already lean on the plan. We're using it as the guidance for capital improvement programs and budget priorities. You know, it was adopted by ordinance. But, of course, the plan has a dual function. It should be a guidance document for the commission as well, so -- so I think that is -- you know, for us, if it was not approved, the next update will go through the whole process again with community engagement, going to our board, public hearings, new council review and approval.

But if it's not approved by the commission, of course, it's not incorporated into the Hawai'i Water Plan, so you -- you don't have a tool, you know, to serve that, that purpose. I think that would be the real downside, you know. There's a lot of valuable guidance in there, we believe, for the -- for the commission as well. So yes, I mean, we feel this is already -- we're gonna continue scoping out project strategies in the plan so there will be even more opportunity for community participation there over the time, so -- even revisiting demand and supply as we're scoping out this project. So it's a living document. And I just want to mahalo everyone that put so much effort into the process.

COMMISSIONER KAGAWA-VIVIANI: All right. So I do have a quick question on the living nature of the document.

Right now, it's a PDF posted to the county website, and as it

gets updated, I noticed some sections had the draft watermark. Does that mean the -- the document itself will be versioned, or is it going to be -- I want to understand how the public is going to access the living document as it gets updated. Just the technical details, yeah.

1.3

2.4

MS. BLUMENSTEIN: Yeah, yeah. So the PDF document that now has the links to come from the table of content, we have the draft watermark removed, of course, then I think you have the tracking -- the matrix of -- you know, the summary of the implementation of the strategies and, you know, a tracking sheet. So we will have that available to the public as well, so that's something that gets shared with our land use planning departments, our board, and council as needed so we can kind of just track and see how that evolves over time.

Then in further updates of the plan, I'm pretty sure we're not going to tackle the island as a whole again. It could be by aquifer sector or by, you know, watershed or moku or whatnot, so that way, it's a little more manageable. I mean, it's still, you know, a year-long process, but -- so I see that as the updates are done, you know, it would be focused on -- on a particular aquifer sector and the same thing, just posted, you know, for -- for public review as we go through that process.

COMMISSIONER KAGAWA-VIVIANI: I have a simple suggestion. Actually, I started doing it. You can create a

navigation pane in PDF, so a senior version, because it allows 1 2 you to navigate from page 1300 back to the TOC back to -- you know, and jump around sections. So I think that would ease 3 4 access and review and feedback and maybe ameliorate any kind 5 of frustrations. So, thank you. 6 CHAIR CHANG: No, thank you. That was very helpful. COMMISSIONER KATAYAMA: Chair, quickly. CHAIR CHANG: Go ahead. 9 COMMISSIONER KATAYAMA: Eva, what's the status of 10 the Molokai and Lanai Water Use Development Plans? MS. BLUMENSTEIN: Mahalo, Commissioner. We have the 11 12 consultant, Townscape, halfway through, a little more than 1.3 halfway through, updating the Molokai Water Use and 14 Development Plan. A lot of the community engagement is 15 completed, demand projections are done, and we're now vetting resource options or presenting resource options to the 16 17 community. So they have still a ways to go. We put in -- we had funding approved for this next 18 19 fiscal year, FY '24, to commission a consultant to help us 20 update the Lanai Water Use and Development Plan. So, you 21 know, it's a multi-year process, but thinking, you know, we'll 22 contract towards the end of this year to begin that process. 23 COMMISSIONER KATAYAMA: So what -- where do you view 2.4 the horizon for these plans that you'll have something that --25 to present?

MS. BLUMENSTEIN: So for -- for Molokai, I'd say 1 2 earliest March 2024 to be -- a draft plan to be presented to 3 our board. We will brief the commission at the same time. 4 The board has 180 days to review and provide their comments 5 before we present a bill for an ordinance to our county 6 council. This Maui plan took three years through county 7 council, so I'm not quaranteeing how long that's gonna take. 8 (Laughter.) 9 MS. BLUMENSTEIN: You know, as soon as that's been 10 adopted, then it'd be presented to the commission. And for Lanai, I would say, you know, a minimum of three years as 11 12 well. 1.3 MS. ROTH: And I will also mention that the Molokai 14 Plan will be -- there will be a briefing (inaudible) group that are the consultants to the commission. 15 16 COMMISSIONER KATAYAMA: Okay. 17 MS. ROTH: So we are going to organize that. COMMISSIONER KATAYAMA: Great, that's great. 18 Super, 19 thank you. 20 DEPUTY MANUEL: There -- just to add, there's going 21 to be a bunch of planning components of the Hawai'i -- parts 22 of the Hawai'i Water Plan coming to the commission. Oahu, we 23 have a couple that the board wants to present on as well. 2.4 We're trying not to have more than one per meeting because 25 it's so thick and it's robust, and it is a planning document.

So it's just trying to manage the agendas, but they're coming. 1 2 You will -- you will see a bunch of these planning documents 3 coming in the near future. 4 CHAIR CHANG: Very good. 5 Any other questions? 6 (No response.) CHAIR CHANG: Eva, this is a rather large document. 8 Is it nimble enough? 'Cause you say it's a -- it's a living document, but I'm assuming you also use -- utilize the 9 10 adaptive management approach that -- as things change. Do you 11 feel that the document and the process is nimble enough that 12 as you get information, you can make appropriate -- whether 1.3 it's changes or updates? And how does that work out as a 14 practical matter? 15 MS. BLUMENSTEIN: Thank you, Chair. I appreciate 16 that. And I think we're still figuring out, you know, for the 17 different kind of strategies, how we apply them, but in general, I mean, we use it frequently because, I mean, this is 18 19 -- since it was adopted by council, it kind of gives us the 20 justification to, you know, whether it's investing in water 21 resource protection or, you know, well-head protection or 22 funding projects, so -- so as a tool, it is useful, you know. 23 We have -- we have the implementation matrix to refer to. 2.4 But in terms of updating data for -- I mean, for 25 example, we have -- we're looking at feasibility studies to

1.3

2.4

assess resources in different aquifer systems right now, and part of that process, we have a consultant kind of vet or revisit the demand and supply projections to see, are they still valid? You know, they were done — they're five years old and whatnot. Then, you know, turns out they're fairly valid, but for Central — so, for example, we had projected we need another 8 million gallons a day by year 2035; turns out we need 11 mgd by year 2040. So it's — it's a living document in that it's constantly — you know, we track private purveyors' water use, those that report, and we track our own water use, obviously, and kind of adjust those projections as we go and as projects are scoped out.

CHAIR CHANG: No, thank you, that's very helpful. I mean, I think it is helpful to have a document that can be sort of the central location of current information, you know, a framework for planning, but it is helpful to have the document that is, you know, constantly updated and reflects real-time, but it is something — a document that it's not — it can be a guiding document for more than just government or the county, but others as well, so that's good. Okay, thank you very much.

Any other questions? I've also -- thank you, Eva, and thank you, John, for your testimony, your comments.

I also have on -- is it Gina Young? Is Gina on?

DEPUTY MANUEL: I don't see her, Chair.

1	CHAIR CHANG: Not there?
2	DEPUTY MANUEL: Maybe Red Hill.
3	CHAIR CHANG: Is Don Lono?
4	(No response.)
5	CHAIR CHANG: Nope. Anybody else, then, Kathy, on
6	the line on Zoom?
7	COUNCIL MEMBER SINENCI: Those are my committee
8	staff members, Chair.
9	CHAIR CHANG: Oh, okay, all right. Thank you.
10	Thank you.
11	Is there anyone else in on Zoom that would like
12	to participate or provide us a comment on Item B-1?
13	(No response.)
14	CHAIR CHANG: Okay. Seeing no hands being raised.
15	COMMISSIONER BUCK: Move to approve Item B-1.
16	CHAIR CHANG: Okay, I have a motion to approve. Do
17	I have a second?
18	COMMISSIONER KATAYAMA: I'll second it.
19	CHAIR CHANG: Okay, very good. I have two seconds
20	and a motion and two seconds. All in favor, say aye.
21	(Response.)
22	CHAIR CHANG: Any opposed?
23	(No response.)
24	CHAIR CHANG: The motion has been unanimously
25	approved.

```
MOTION: (BUCK/KATAYAMA/SETO)
 1
      To approve B-1 as submitted.
 2
 3
      UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED
 4
                (Applause.)
 5
                CHAIR CHANG: Congratulations, County of Maui.
 6
      Thank you very much. Thank you, Katie. All right.
                                                            Thank you
      again.
 8
                So now we will move on to Item B-2, and Item B-2 is
 9
      approval of Stream Channel Alteration Permit Application,
      SCAP.5954 -- dash -- well, 6, and special conditions.
10
                Do we have a staff presentation?
11
12
                DEPUTY MANUEL: Yep, Dean.
1.3
                CHAIR CHANG: Okay. Oh, Dean. Go ahead, Dean.
14
                MR. UYENO: Good morning, Commissioners. Dean Uyeno
15
      with the commission's Stream Protection and Management Branch,
16
      presenting on Item B-2. This is, as Chair mentioned, approval
17
      for -- requesting approval of a Stream Channel Alteration
      Permit SCAP.5954.6 by the County of Maui Department of Public
18
19
              The project proposes to restore a section of an
20
      embankment covering an area of approximately 5,000 square feet
21
      along the Wailuku River for flood protection purposes in the
22
      Millyard Light Industrial Subdivision at Wili Pa Loop,
23
      Wailuku, Maui. Commission staff stands by the submittal, and
2.4
      if I may, I'm just gonna read through the recommendations.
25
                So Recommendation 1 is that the commission approve
```

the Stream Channel Alteration Permit subject to the standard conditions in Exhibit 4 and the special conditions below.

1.3

2.4

Condition 1A. In conformance with the County of Maui Planning Department's recommendations incorporated by reference in Exhibit 1, the permittee shall certify to the Maui Planning Department that no increase in base flood water surface -- water -- excuse me, base flood water surface elevation will occur.

Item 1A. In conformance with the Division of
Forestry and Wildlife recommendations incorporated by
reference in Exhibit 2, the permittee shall avoid construction
and operational impacts of state-listed species, minimize the
movement of plant or soil material between work sites as they
may contam- -- contain detrimental fungal pathogens such as
rapid ohia death, vertebrate and invertebrate pests such as
coqui frogs and little fire ants, or invasive plant parts such
as miconia moling which could harm our native species and
ecosystems. And consult -- and lastly, consult with the
Native -- excuse me, Maui invasive species community to help
plan, design, and construct the project, learn of any
high-risk invasive species in the area and ways to mitigate
their spread.

Item 1C. In accordance with the proposal by the Maui Department of Public Works acknowledging the sensitivity of the project location, the permittee shall implement the

following best management practices: 1 Limiting repair activities to one-half of the stream 2 3 cross-section at a time. 4 Limiting construction work to what can be installed 5 and stabilized by the end of the working day for areas within 6 the ordinary high water mark. Use of a plastic-lined sandbag coffer dam around the 8 stream work area. 9 Use of silt fence above the ordinary high water mark 10 around the construction access operating area and staging in 11 stockpile areas. 12 Use of dust fences around the staging and stockpile 1.3 area. And lastly, sediment filtering and treatment for 14 15 dewatering discharge. 16 Item 1D. Issuance of the permit is subject to SHPD 17 concurrence. If SHPD requires conditions, we'd delegate to the deputy director to attach those as conditions. 18 19 Item 1E. The permittee shall ensure streamflow 20 connectivity around the project site at all times, with no 21 more than 50 percent of the stream channel width being 2.2 diverted around the project area to enable fish passage. 23 And lastly, Item 1F. To ensure coordination through 2.4 the project, the permittee shall notify the Commission on 25 Water Resource Management staff and representatives of Hui o

```
Nā Wai 'Ehā within one week of when the project is scheduled
 1
 2
      to start, any issues that may arise during the project work,
      and when the project is scheduled to be completed.
 3
 4
                And that concludes staff's presentation.
 5
                CHAIR CHANG: Thank you, Dean.
 6
                MR. UYENO: I believe -- I believe we do have
 7
      consult -- the consultants for the project on the call.
 8
                MS. RIVERA: Hi, good morning. Thank you, Dean.
 9
      Thank you, Commissioners and Chair. My name is Gwendolyn
10
      Rivera. I'm with Munekiyo Hiraga. We're the consultants for
11
      the County of Maui on this project. Also on the call, we have
12
      Kristi Ono from the County of Maui Department of Public Works.
1.3
      We also have Mark Roy from Munekiyo. And from Austin Tsutsumi
14
      & Associates, the engineers, we have Adrienne Wong and Rick
15
      Evans to address any questions you may have.
16
                CHAIR CHANG: All right, thank you.
17
                Commissioners, do you have any questions either for
      staff or for the consultant?
18
19
                COMMISSIONER KAGAWA-VIVIANI: I do.
20
                CHAIR CHANG: Yes.
21
                COMMISSIONER KAGAWA-VIVIANI: So maybe this is for
22
      the engineers.
                      I was just -- in reviewing the Fish and
23
      Wildlife comments about kind of the -- the hardening of the
2.4
      stream bank, I just was wondering if you could explain or
25
      recap your response on how this wouldn't. I was particularly
```

concerned about the potential for downstream scour right below 1 and is that an issue and why it's not, and how -- how the 2 3 design of the structures addresses that. So I'm not sure who 4 the best person to -- to respond would be. Maybe PE. 5 MR. EVANS: Yeah, I guess I can take that. I'm with 6 Austin Tsutsumi, the civil engineer on this project. We -you know, it's not gonna speed up the flow beyond this -- this 8 bank. It's going to -- just in the area where -- where it 9 interacts with the hardening, it'll -- it'll accelerate in 10 that area, but then we used a roughened grouted riprap edge so that it mitigates the velocity increase there, and we don't 11 12 expect any increase in velocity downstream. And we did a 1.3 hydraulic analysis throughout the area from upstream of the 14 project through to downstream to verify those hydraulic 15 conditions. COMMISSIONER KAGAWA-VIVIANI: I think just -- yeah, 16 17 it just helps to know that -- how you guys have thought about it and considered, so thank you. 18 19 CHAIR CHANG: Any other questions or comments? Yes, 20 Wayne. 21 COMMISSIONER KATAYAMA: Just a quick question. The 22 600 cubic yards that will be excavated, to meet the Forestry 23 requests of minimizing the movement of soil, how would that be 2.4 reused or recycled? Would it be on-site?

MR. EVANS: The 600 --

25

COMMISSIONER KATAYAMA: -- cubic yards of excavation 1 2 that's listed. 3 MR. EVANS: Yeah, so what -- what's happened with 4 the stream bank is it's eroded into a near -- you know, it 5 used to be at a -- at a sloping embankment, and now it's 6 eroded to a near vertical condition. And replacement without doing a vertical wall, which we wanted to avoid doing a wall, 8 is -- we sloped it at the maximum possible gradient that we 9 could, and that is what's required in -- bringing in a fill to 10 sort of replace what -- what has been lost from past erosion. Does that answer your question? 11 12 COMMISSIONER KATAYAMA: So, no. Well, the material 1.3 that's being excavated, Forestry is concerned about vectoring 14 pathogens, so would that material be reused in sort of 15 reconstruction of the embankment, or are you gonna store it on 16 site, or what's the -- how are you going to handle that? 17 MR. EVANS: That is a -- I would expect that the material wouldn't be removed from the site, that it would be 18 19 -- whatever is excavated would be reused on-site, so I don't 20 -- I'm not sure what the -- how to better answer that. 21 Gwen, would you have anything to add on that one? It's more of a biological kind of question. 22 23 MS. RIVERA: In terms of the -- the placement of the 2.4 excavated material? 25 MR. EVANS: Yes.

1	MS. RIVERA: Perhaps I could
2	COMMISSIONER KATAYAMA: I guess, is it leaving the
3	site?
4	MS. ONO: Excavating. This is Kristi Ono with the
5	County of Maui Department of Public Works. Given the concern,
6	I'm sure within the area, we could find a use for that
7	material, and it does not need to leave the site.
8	COMMISSIONER KATAYAMA: Yeah, it's not a lot. It's
9	only 600 yards. So the plan is that you will reuse it
10	somewhere backfilling in that area to address Forestry's
11	concern?
12	MS. ONO: Yes. If it's not appropriate material to
13	reuse specifically for this project, I'm sure within the area
14	of the Wailuku River, we can find a use for it as there are,
15	you know, maintenance practices done nearby that could likely
16	use material.
17	COMMISSIONER KATAYAMA: Okay, good. Thank you.
18	CHAIR CHANG: Any other questions or comments?
19	(No response.)
20	CHAIR CHANG: Do I have any those are the only
21	people on the list. Do I have any other Kathy, anybody
22	else on the Zoom that is here to provide comments on Item B-2?
23	MS. YODA: No.
24	CHAIR CHANG: Okay. Hearing no other comments, do I
25	have a motion on this matter?

```
1
                COMMISSIONER KATAYAMA: So moved to approve.
 2
                CHAIR CHANG: The motion has been moved --
 3
                COMMISSIONER KAGAWA-VIVIANI: Second.
                CHAIR CHANG: -- and seconded. A motion has been
 4
 5
      moved and seconded to approve Item B-2, the approval of the
 6
      Stream Channel Alteration Permit. All in favor, please say
 7
      aye.
 8
                (Response.)
 9
                CHAIR CHANG: Any opposed?
10
                (No response.)
11
                CHAIR CHANG: All right, thank you very much.
                                                                The
12
      commission has approved Item B-2.
1.3
      MOTION: (KATAYAMA/KAGAWA-VIVIANI)
14
      To approve B-2 as submitted.
15
      UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED
16
                CHAIR CHANG: So let's -- you know, I'm going to
17
      take a five-minute break, and then we will come back to do
18
      Item B-3.
19
                (Pause in proceedings: 10:00 a.m.-10:07 a.m.)
20
                CHAIR CHANG: All right. (Gavel.) We're back in
21
      session. Thank you very much. We are going to go to Item B-2
      -- B-3, B-3, B-3. B-3, approve Stream Channel Alteration
22
23
      Permit SCAP.5974.3 by Castle & Cooke Homes Hawai'i.
2.4
                Staff, is there --
25
                MR. UYENO: Aloha and good morning again,
```

Commissioners.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

CHAIR CHANG: Good morning.

Item B-3, this is Dean Uyeno again with MR. UYENO: the Stream Protection and Management Branch presenting Item And this is requesting approval of the Stream Channel Alteration Permit, SCAP.5974.3, by Castle & Cooke Homes Hawai'i, Incorporated. The project proposes to convey and discharge on-site stormwater runoff into Kipapa Stream that has been consolidated and treated in the Koa Ridge Stormwater Treatment Facilities. The proposed Drain Line 2, or DL2, is designed to accommodate the peak runoff from the second phase, which is the northern portion of the Koa Ridge Development. The drain line will be approximately 1600 feet in length and will consist of two box culverts that discharge into a 12-foot wide trapezoidal channel with articulated concrete blocks that terminates in a riprap channel lining and concrete rubble masonry stream bank protection at Kipapa Stream. A 10-foot by 8-foot box culvert would be constructed in Row G to connect to the upstream portion of Drain Line 2. And staff stands by its submittal.

And if I may just read the recommendation that the commission approve the Stream Channel Alteration Permit application that proposed to convey and discharge on-site stormwater runoff into Kipapa Stream that has been consolidated and treated in the Koa Ridge Stormwater Treatment

1	Facilities subject to the standard conditions in Exhibit 3 and
2	the special condition below, which is approval of subject of
3	approve excuse me, approval is subject to SHPD
4	concurrence. If SHPD requires conditions, authority shall be
5	delegated to the deputy director to attach those as a
6	condition of the Stream Channel Alteration Permit. And that
7	concludes staff's recommendations.
8	CHAIR CHANG: Thank you.
9	Commission, do you have any questions for Dean?
10	(No response.)
11	CHAIR CHANG: Dean, I would I have this little
12	I have to be careful concerns regarding the SHPD. Do they
13	ultimately send you a letter of concurrence?
14	MR. UYENO: Yes. It may take a little while. I was
15	in communication with Susan Lebo on this one, and she did
16	CHAIR CHANG: Okay.
17	MR. UYENO: They were trying to push through this
18	thing. They did admit, admittedly, that they were a little
19	behind.
20	CHAIR CHANG: Okay, very good. Thank you so much.
21	Neil.
22	COMMISSIONER HANNAHS: Dean, what's the risk of this
23	stormwater runoff containing chemicals, petroleum in
24	particular, from the roadway systems or from which they're
25	gathered and depositing that into our our streams?

I would -- actually, I'll probably defer 1 MR. UYENO: 2 to the consultant who is on the call, but my understanding of 3 the stormwater retention facilities is that they will -- they 4 are intending to construct detention basins upstream to settle 5 out any -- any particulate matter and all of that. 6 COMMISSIONER HANNAHS: Particulate, but not 7 necessarily, you know, chemical that's --8 MR. UYENO: Right. And maybe the consultant can 9 speak to that more in detail. COMMISSIONER HANNAHS: 10 Thank you. 11 CHAIR CHANG: Is that Mr. Russell Arakaki? Are you 12 the consultant? 1.3 MR. ARAKAKI: Yes, I am. 14 CHAIR CHANG: Okay, go ahead. MR. ARAKAKI: Good morning, Chair, Members of the 15 Commission. My name is Russell Arakaki. I work for Park 16 17 Engineering, and I am the principal design engineer for the 18 Koa Ridge Off-Site Drain Line No. 2. 19 To answer the question about chemicals, the Koa 20 Ridge project is designing stormwater best management 21 practices to meet the City and County of Honolulu Department 22 of Planning and Permitting's requirements for water quality, 23 so we are following their rules. As far as the design, we are 2.4 designing infiltration methods to get stormwater runoff in the 25 ground where appropriate. There's also filtration systems.

It could be either vegetated filtration or these manufactured treatment devices. So that's all designed or will be designed as part of the Koa Ridge Drainage System. City's reviewing it, they have been reviewing and approving construction plans for the roadways and subdivisions. COMMISSIONER HANNAHS: Thank you, Mr. Arakaki. in your professional view, it'll be effective in mitigating

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

any of those concerns?

MR. ARAKAKI: Yes, it should be.

COMMISSIONER HANNAHS: Thank you.

MR. ARAKAKI: That's -- that's the best technology that's available now, yeah.

COMMISSIONER KAGAWA-VIVIANI: I have a question. This is maybe for Stream Protection, for maybe Dean. What's the sort of ecological status of Kipapa Stream?

MR. UYENO: Kipapa Stream is a fairly -- so it's a tributary to Waikele Stream, which is a pretty urbanized stream. Ecologically -- let me see. I don't have it on hand, but it's -- it's pretty filled with invasive species, especially the lower reaches. If I recall correctly -- I'm trying to pull up the -- sorry, if you'd give me a minute, I'm trying to pull up the -- there was also a biological -- a stream assessment that was completed by ECOS as part of the -what's it called -- environmental impact statement, and they basically found that there'd be no impacts to the biological

resources on the stream.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

COMMISSIONER KAGAWA-VIVIANI: Great. Yeah, yeah.

It'd just be nice to sort of have a little bit more detail around it to demonstrate that. So, okay, I mean, I don't know this stream, so it would help to understand because, I mean, a big construction project will have short-term and long-term implications for this.

CHAIR CHANG: If I can kind of just add on, Dean, and maybe Kaleo, what I am finding is that we don't -- we don't have really good baseline data on a lot of our streams, so, you know, it's very difficult. We're all -- and Mr. Arakaki, I don't question your -- your comments; however, I think scientific data is gonna be really helpful to us in the long run. I am -- I believe if we had good stream gauges -is there a possibility that we could ask -- or maybe I should ask you, Mr. Arakaki, given -- given the project that you're doing, are you guys willing to put in a stream gauge in Kipapa to at least give us some good data to monitor the impacts? We hope you are absolutely correct; no impacts by this activity in the stream, but a -- anecdotal is nice, but having some scientific measure -- so we have a really hard time, the state, putting on stream gauges, but is that a possibility that you could do that?

Oh, Ayron, what do you think?

DR. STRAUCH: (Inaudible) to let him dance.

1	(Laughter.)
2	CHAIR CHANG: Well, only if he's gonna say yes, he
3	can do it.
4	(Laughter.)
5	CHAIR CHANG: You're open to well, I've go
6	ahead, Ayron, introduce yourself.
7	DR. STRAUCH: Ayron Strauch, Stream Protection
8	Management Branch.
9	CHAIR CHANG: Yes.
10	DR. STRAUCH: Waikele Stream is monitored
11	CHAIR CHANG: Okay.
12	DR. STRAUCH: long-term monitoring stations
13	across the state, but it's also heavily regulated.
14	CHAIR CHANG: Okay.
15	DR. STRAUCH: There are other upstream diversions.
16	When you say monitored, Kipapa Stream has been monitored in
17	terms of flow, but you're interested in more the ecological
18	impacts.
19	CHAIR CHANG: Yes, yes.
20	DR. STRAUCH: Which a U.S. stream gauge is not gonna
21	help you with.
22	CHAIR CHANG: Okay. So what will help us with that?
23	DR. STRAUCH: Encouraging DAR or the legislature to
24	fund a stream program in the Division of Aquatic Resources.
25	CHAIR CHANG: Wayne.

1	COMMISSIONER KATAYAMA: Chair, may I ask a question,
2	please?
3	CHAIR CHANG: Yes
4	COMMISSIONER KATAYAMA: Mr. Arakaki, once the
5	stormwater is collected and passed through whatever filtration
6	or processing that you're planning, is that covered by NPDES?
7	MR. ARAKAKI: Yes, it is. It will be. It'll be
8	under the City and County's NPDES permit.
9	COMMISSIONER KATAYAMA: So, isn't there a
10	requirement to measure water quality in the discharge?
11	MR. ARAKAKI: I'm not sure if measurement and
12	analysis of stormwater is in their NPDES program. I would
13	have to get back to you.
14	DR. STRAUCH: So the City and County monitors across
15	the across the island to ensure compliance with the NPDES
16	program, but, you know, they're not monitoring daily, they're
17	monitoring
18	COMMISSIONER KATAYAMA: But isn't the permit issued
19	to
20	DR. STRAUCH: (inaudible) every year.
21	COMMISSIONER KATAYAMA: a system, a person?
22	DR. STRAUCH: The it's the accumulation of every
23	point (inaudible). So it's so, like, for every in the
24	lake (inaudible), for example, every storm drain outfall,
25	there is a permit for the accumulative impact of that.

COMMISSIONER KATAYAMA: But isn't one of the 1 2 requirements looking at analysis of what is in that discharge? 3 DR. STRAUCH: Not on a specific basis, no, and not -- and this is a DOH issue that doesn't fall under us, but 4 5 they -- they don't monitor specifically any individual 6 outfall. COMMISSIONER KATAYAMA: Should they be? 8 DR. STRAUCH: That -- that would be a monitoring 9 burden that would bankrupt the island. 10 COMMISSIONER KAGAWA-VIVIANI: Can I ask a question then of her, DOH? 11 12 DR. STRAUCH: Yes. 1.3 COMMISSIONER KAGAWA-VIVIANI: Commissioner, I mean, 14 how does DOH -- just for our understanding, how does DOH kind of consider the NPDES setting of a project like this? This 15 16 project or a project like this. COMMISSIONER SETO: So I've been out of the Clean 17 Water Branch, which manages the NPDES program, for over ten 18 19 years, so from what I recall, the municipal separate storm 20 sewer system, the MS4 permit, requires the permittee, the City 21 and County, to -- to pre- -- to impose BMPs on themselves as 22 well as like those construction projects where you see the --23 the BMPs in front of the catch basin inlets, things like that. 2.4 And then, as Mr. Arakaki was saying, the constructed

filtration systems, the actual monitoring of the discharge

25

```
into state waters -- I don't recall the frequency of that
 1
 2
      monitoring, but you need to understand that runoff into the
 3
      storm drains is going to be varying on -- on a daily basis
 4
      because you don't know if somebody had a breakdown on the road
 5
      and caused an oil spill that might have happened there. So
 6
      there's monitoring that is done, but I don't know how we can
      tie it into --
 8
                COMMISSIONER KATAYAMA: At this point, it's going
 9
      through a very specific system --
10
                COMMISSIONER SETO: Yes.
                COMMISSIONER KATAYAMA: -- with an outfall --
11
12
                COMMISSIONER SETO: Yes.
                COMMISSIONER KATAYAMA: -- that is very specific.
1.3
14
      So it's being engineered to certain standards.
                COMMISSIONER SETO: Yeah.
15
16
                COMMISSIONER KATAYAMA: And I quess to Mr. Arakaki,
17
      what are those standards? I mean, you must be anticipating
      some kind of input in terms of water quality. So as you're
18
19
      going through the process of treating the water, are you just
20
      looking at solids, or are you looking at other things?
                MR. ARAKAKI: No, it's -- it's solids such as
21
22
      sediment.
23
                COMMISSIONER KATAYAMA: Right, soluble solids.
2.4
                MR. ARAKAKI: Trash debris -- right, trash debris.
25
      But I think the BMPs that meet the City and County rules also
```

look at the removal of other chemical constituents. So one example is a vegetated swale or just a grass swale where you're allowing the runoff to flow through the soil, removing whatever contaminants that are in there.

COMMISSIONER KATAYAMA: Okay.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

CHAIR CHANG: Ayron, can I kind of follow up with I am -- at DLNR, we not only look at -- I mean, we do a lot of -- DAR has a lot of fishing activities. Right? We get a lot of concerns raised by fishermen that they get criticized for impacts to the near shore waters by their fishing activity. We regulate the fishing, but they're saying it's -a lot of it is the mauka activities. So when a permittee comes before us like on a project like this, what -- what mechanisms do we have to try to utilize this process to -because you said, oh, DAR could go to the legislature and develop a -- you know, like a stream program, but what -- and I -- and I want to be very reasonable to -- to the applicants. I mean, I'm not gonna hold them responsible, but what -- what is it that -- is there anything that we can do in our process to help more equitably distribute or at least monitor impacts of different activities that may -- that may have an effect on the streams that eventually flow down to the nearshore waters? DR. STRAUCH: So I think there are two not unrelated

CHAIR CHANG: Yes.

issues, but one is the ecosystem --

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

DR. STRAUCH: -- the biota and monitoring the biota, and the other is water quality and the impacts on the ecosystem both in the stream and in the near shore. And best management practices, which they're very well articulated, that control, say, sediment and nutrients in runoff would benefit both the in-stream and nearshore. But as a -- take a step back and look at the entire watershed, managing impervious surfaces, managing invasive species in the forest, managing riparian zones, which we, as a whole, don't do a great job of. There are definitely specific instances where the state is doing an excellent job managing the forest, but we have lots of forests that don't fall under the state, and so -- and whether it's on private land or whether it's on City County, Federal, coordinating management activities to reduce runoff to increase native vegetation, to improve the health of our ecosystems both within the stream and in the near shore would benefit a host of values: Fisheries, cultural practices, whatever, and both from a water quality perspective and an ecosystem perspective.

So what can CWRM do? I think I'm going to get (inaudible), but we do our best.

CHAIR CHANG: No, you're -- absolutely. But I'm looking more at like -- and bear with me, Mr. Arakaki, you're not -- you know, I mean, I'm not just looking at targeting you, but I mean, applicants come before us, and they're

1.3

2.4

proposing activities. We have conditions, and people can do BMPs, and they can -- but unless we have good data to monitor, we now have -- you know, to have a baseline as to, okay, at this point in time, this is the condition of -- of the stream or the water quality or the ecosystem. However, over time, we've noticed, based upon new information or some measurements, the changes. Now, that may be due far beyond just -- just this particular project, but I think -- how to -- sharing the opportunity of participation by our community members, including our developers, to help the state better manage our resources. And I'm -- I'm just kind of struggling.

But I think, Kaleo, as a matter of policy -- and I'm not going to just pick on Mr. Arakaki, but I think we need to kind of think about that, you know, as conditions. What -- what is it that we can ask the applicant that comes before us? And it might be contributing to a fund so that we can work with DAR on doing, you know, better -- better management. But I just think that the opportunity presents itself when we're going through an application on the known activities that could have an impact on -- on water quality, ecosystem, and -- I'm just -- you know, how do we as -- as citizens of this state collectively try to do -- to do better.

DEPUTY MANUEL: Maybe just -- I totally get it, and we've talked about these issues --

CHAIR CHANG: Yeah, yeah.

1	DEPUTY MANUEL: What is before us and I think
2	what
3	CHAIR CHANG: Yeah.
4	DEPUTY MANUEL: kind of limits us in certain
5	situations, and this is maybe where statutory amendments
6	CHAIR CHANG: Yeah, yeah.
7	DEPUTY MANUEL: or other types of rules are
8	required, is the SCAP is a construction permit. It's a
9	two-year permit
10	CHAIR CHANG: Yeah, yeah.
11	DEPUTY MANUEL: specific to that, and so a lot of
12	the conditions that are recommended
13	CHAIR CHANG: Sure.
14	DEPUTY MANUEL: are tied to that period of time.
15	CHAIR CHANG: Yeah, yeah.
16	DEPUTY MANUEL: What you're talking about is like
17	pre, during, and post
18	CHAIR CHANG: Right, right.
19	DEPUTY MANUEL: kind of monitoring and
20	compliance. And so, tying in other conditions that go beyond
21	that two-year period, we have to have a conversation about how
22	to make that happen, right?
23	CHAIR CHANG: Yeah.
24	DEPUTY MANUEL: And what are what are the tools
25	available to us. But understanding like these individual

```
projects are all part of this larger ecosystem --
 1
 2
                CHAIR CHANG: Right, right.
                DEPUTY MANUEL: -- ahupua'a and the moku that we
 3
 4
      work within, and we all have impacts, whether positive or
 5
      negative, on those resources. So totally open to strategize
 6
                CHAIR CHANG: Okay.
 8
                DEPUTY MANUEL: -- and look at opportunities, and
 9
      then -- and hear you, basically.
10
                CHAIR CHANG: Okay. I do want you guys to think
11
      about it 'cause, I mean, I want to be equitable like -- you
12
      know, this project has a very limited, like, life and
1.3
      potential impact, but if we keep on kicking the can down the
14
      road, I mean, we'll never --
15
                DEPUTY MANUEL: There's cumulative impacts --
16
                CHAIR CHANG: Yeah.
17
                DEPUTY MANUEL: -- yeah, over time.
                CHAIR CHANG: Exactly, so -- but I don't know how to
18
19
      differentiate that.
20
                COMMISSIONER KAGAWA-VIVIANI: I have a thought and a
21
      suggestion.
22
                CHAIR CHANG: Yeah.
23
      COMMISSIONER KAGAWA-VIVIANI: As an educator and also just
2.4
      watching the color of Mānoa Stream change over the last week
25
      very quickly with rain and no rain, would it be --
```

would this applicant be willing to -- and I've seen people do
this with the telecam, like ecologists put a camera on a -- on
a plant so that you can just watch it as it flowers. You
know, would the applicant be willing to maybe work with a
local school -- 'cause that's Mililani, right, right nearby?

CHAIR CHANG: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER KAGAWA-VIVIANI: You know, I mean, potentially work -- for educational and outreach purposes, put a camera above the project site and below, and just let people kind of watch the stream. It's not -- I mean, it is a form of data, but it's --

CHAIR CHANG: Yeah.

1.3

2.4

COMMISSIONER KAGAWA-VIVIANI: Maybe there's a better idea, but I just wanted to put it out there as a way for people to engage with their streams. 'Cause I'm currently working on urban equality. On Maui, we have people who are organized, who are constantly watching the stream, who are in the stream. We don't really have that on Oahu, and so we forget that the stream exists and don't care about it, don't (inaudible) put cash into it on all kinds. So I -- I think, you know, would people be willing to entertain that as an idea for -- for the duration of the project?

CHAIR CHANG: I mean, I think that's an excellent -I think for me, it's -- the community needs to feel a sense of
ownership to these resources. If they don't see it, they

1.3

2.4

don't know about it, and who best but -- but kids. But it does make a difference, and I think -- I'm just trying to find different opportunities and venues and platforms where, one, we're not only engaging and educating, but we're also getting good data for us to make better-informed decisions because that's -- that is my -- you know, there's so much unknown, I mean, I don't even know what questions to ask. But I think when -- when a project comes before us --

DEPUTY MANUEL: I don't know when.

CHAIR CHANG -- you know, sort of that shared responsibility.

So I don't know, Mr. Arakaki, you -- I think you're getting -- this is like, I only came in here for this permit, what -- what is all this about? But, I mean, I think -- I'm hoping you're hearing. I -- obviously, we've got a lot, you know, more to think about with the -- within the department, but I think you kind of hear some of our sentiments. I don't know if you have any thoughts or comments.

MR. ARAKAKI: I just want to add that -- I did mention we're following the city's rules. Part of that rule allows the use of manufactured treatment devices, so these are prefabricated units; they also remove nutrients, heavy metals, other hydrocarbons, other contaminants, so that's also being designed with this drainage system.

CHAIR CHANG: And that I think is significant, one,

to do a comparison between someone who's using sort of this -this less intrusive material versus others who are doing
traditional construction. Is there a difference on the
impacts to our -- our ecosystem? I -- I don't know. All I'm
suggesting is if there's a mechanism for us to utilize these
applications and these projects as they come before us to sort
of share in this inquiry.

DEPUTY MANUEL: And maybe -- maybe if I can, Chair,

DEPUTY MANUEL: And maybe -- maybe if I can, Chair, and maybe a recommendation is we can maybe tap City and County of Honolulu as well as Department of Health's Clean Water Branch to maybe come in and use their, you know, NPDES permit as a way to kind of share, right, the BMPs, the technologies, the work that they have and are currently doing. And then maybe areas where they need more help --

CHAIR CHANG: Yeah.

2.0

2.4

DEPUTY MANUEL: -- or more data, and that's where maybe we could fill the gap on the policy side. Maybe that's a recommendation I can propose and can bring it -- bring them to the commission and see if they're willing to engage at that level.

CHAIR CHANG: I just want to be constructive, but I --

DEPUTY MANUEL: Yeah.

CHAIR CHANG: -- I also realize DLNR, we don't have enough resources to do what needs to be done, but we know

things need to be done. So, okay, thank you for letting me

speak. Go ahead.

COMMISSIONER HANNAHS: Well, I -- I appreciate your

line of discussion, and it gets to, really, if having this

body be more informed as to what those best practices are so that when different consultants or different applicants come

7 before us, we can kind of --

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

CHAIR CHANG: Right.

COMMISSIONER HANNAHS: -- check their proposal against our knowledge. But right now our -- I think our knowledge may be --

CHAIR CHANG: Right.

COMMISSIONER HANNAHS: -- you know, fragmented across the spectrum of membership. And I'm wondering if there's some space or a way we can have an informational briefing from the industry, from the regulatory bodies, as you -- as you have suggested, Kaleo, from landowner developers in terms of what are the -- what should we expect of modern developments these days? What is the highest, you know, standard for what we're creating that would really allow for the development of lands and -- in ways that really are beneficial to the environment and not harmful to the environment.

CHAIR CHANG: Right.

COMMISSIONER HANNAHS: So I think there's -- a lot

```
has changed, I mean, in the industry, and I'm -- they're
 1
 2
      attending to the impacts that they have, and I think it's
 3
      incumbent upon them to raise the standard to be -- to create a
 4
      competitive edge for themselves as consultants, as developers.
 5
      And so let's get a briefing and figure out what those -- where
      they are.
 6
                DEPUTY MANUEL: Yeah, and then -- I'll just jump in.
 8
      And this -- this is actually really exciting because water
 9
      quality is -- is going to be the next -- the focus, in my
10
      opinion, of this commission and Department of Health --
11
                CHAIR CHANG: Right, right.
12
                DEPUTY MANUEL: -- in the next couple of years.
1.3
                CHAIR CHANG: Right.
                DEPUTY MANUEL: With new emerging contaminants and
14
15
      regulations, but also just how do we holistically manage that?
16
      And then, as you mentioned, Chair, the real ripple effect it
17
      has, the mauka-to-makai connection on all of our resources,
      all of our programs here at DLNR. It's real, and finding out
18
19
      how those are connected is going to be really, really
20
      important.
21
                CHAIR CHANG: Very true. And I quess I'm also just
22
      trying to be more equitable. I mean, we cannot hold the last
23
      developer responsible for all of the past. So how do we share
2.4
      some of that management responsibility, whether it's
```

monitoring, whether it's, you know, BMPs? But I recognize

25

1.3

2.4

that we do have to be -- we have to be more proactive. We are constantly reacting to a crisis, so how do we have good information to be more proactive and have -- make an informed decision, but also share proportionately with those that come before us to utilize our public resources. And, you know, how do we get them to help share in that, that opportunity to meet these challenges, but --

Oh. And thank you for entertaining sort of my -- my little -- what I'm -- I am trying to use every opportunity to help supplement DLNR meet its goals and its missions. But thank you very much.

And thank you, Mr. Arakaki. Is there -- do you have anybody else from your team that would like to speak or -- you know, because I noticed you do have several from Castle & Cooke that are here as well as from PAR Engineering.

MR. ARAKAKI: There's one other person from Engineering Concepts, also a design consultant. I don't think Castle & Cooke is on the -- on the video.

CHAIR CHANG: Okay, okay.

COMMISSIONER KAGAWA-VIVIANI: Well, actually there

-- can you just -- because I didn't pull it out mentally from

the submittal, just explain -- you mentioned you're aligned

with best management practices, and you gave more detail about

it's not just a sediment retention basin, but there are more

filtration processes. Do you have any pictures? I mean, I

```
think I saw a, you know, kind of conceptual design. So we can
 1
      better understand, you know, what -- what you folks are doing
 2
      and -- and how it is -- you know, it's -- you're not just
 3
 4
      trying to do minimal compliance, you're actually trying to
 5
      really clear the -- the stormwater.
 6
                MR. ARAKAKI: Let's see if I can pull up a website.
                COMMISSIONER: You're asking someone older to
 8
      (inaudible).
 9
                MR. ARAKAKI: And I'm gonna see if I can share my
10
               Oh, I -- okay, I'm disabled from sharing the screen.
      screen.
11
                CHAIR CHANG: Can we do that, Kathy?
12
                DEPUTY MANUEL: Yeah. You should be able to share
1.3
      now.
14
                MR. ARAKAKI: Got it. Can you see my screen now?
15
                CHAIR CHANG:
                             Oh, yes.
16
                MR. ARAKAKI: Okay. This is one product that we are
17
      -- Castle & Cooke is installing. Stormwater goes in this
      chamber, and it gets filtered through these cartridges --
18
19
                CHAIR CHANG: Okay.
20
                MR. ARAKAKI: -- which removes the sediment, trash,
21
      debris, as well as heavy metals, hydrocarbons. So that this
22
      is just one product.
23
                COMMISSIONER BUCK: Just gotta be sure you don't
2.4
      release the Kraken.
25
                MR. ARAKAKI: Yes.
```

1 COMMISSIONER KAGAWA-VIVIANI: So you've gotta clean 2 it a bit before it gets -- gets to that stage, right? 3 MR. ARAKAKI: That's right. So maintenance, removal of trash and debris. Let's see. This kind of shows 4 5 stormwater going through the chamber, but there's also a trash 6 and debris collection area here; these are the filters, and 7 then it goes out downstream to Kipapa Stream. 8 COMMISSIONER BUCK: Compared to what comes off the 9 stream. 10 CHAIR CHANG: Yeah. 11 COMMISSIONER BUCK: (Inaudible) 12 COMMISSIONER KAGAWA-VIVIANI: What's the capacity of 13 that? Because, like, you know, larger --14 MR. ARAKAKI: Sure. 15 COMMISSIONER KAGAWA-VIVIANI: -- could easily exceed 16 that. 17 MR. ARAKAKI: Yeah. The capacity is nowhere near the peak flows that we're designing the off-site drainage 18 system for. It's typically -- it's very small. It's a 19 20 smaller storm, one inch, one inch of rainfall. 2.1 COMMISSIONER KAGAWA-VIVIANI: But then the swales, 22 too, should also function as well. I quess I'm thinking most 23 sediment transport happens in the bigger events anyways, and 24 so if you're only designing for the small events and -- you're 25 kind of maybe missing some of the most significant --

1	MR. ARAKAKI: Sediment shouldn't be released.
2	Whatever gets in here, the the city's design criteria is
3	not to treat the the peak flow, you know, whether it's the
4	ten-year or or larger storms.
5	COMMISSIONER KAGAWA-VIVIANI: Okay. So it sounds
6	like a conversation with the city.
7	DEPUTY MANUEL: Yeah, I mean yeah.
8	MS. YOUNG: Russell, can I add to that?
9	MR. ARAKAKI: Okay. Doraine Young is on.
10	CHAIR CHANG: Okay.
11	MS. YOUNG: Okay. I'm Doraine Young, and I'm with
12	Engineering Concepts. Sorry, I was having problems with my
13	camera. But I wanted to add that the reason why the city
14	chose a one-inch rainstorm is that's usually 80 percent of the
15	frequency of the rainfall that occurs. So that's the reason
16	why the one-inch storm is used.
17	COMMISSIONER KAGAWA-VIVIANI: Yeah.
18	COMMISSIONER BUCK: Makes perfect logic, right?
19	Eighty percent of the runoff.
20	COMMISSIONER KAGAWA-VIVIANI: Probably. Eighty
21	percent of the runoff happens two percent of the time, you
22	know, so, yeah. I mean, if the coral's getting blanketed,
23	it's happening at the high end. So that sounds like a good
24	conversation to have across the city (inaudible).
25	DEPUTY MANUEL: Yeah. I think it'll be good to talk

```
1
      with the city. I mean, even all of the counties on how
 2
      they're managing stormwater. I mean, we haven't engaged in
 3
      stormwater, but it is a big -- a big issue that we have to
      talk about and falls within the context of the commission
 4
 5
      Water Resource Division. So we'll -- we'll try to bring
 6
      forward, you know, this thread of conversation to the
 7
      commission. It's something that we haven't really focused on,
      but I do think it does have impacts on the commission's
 8
 9
      overall policy setting and decision making, so --
10
                COMMISSIONER KATAYAMA: All right. Russell, when
11
      you designed this system, you must have looked at the effluent
12
      that you are planning to handle in the one-inch events. Have
1.3
      you -- what's the analysis of that water sample?
14
                MR. ARAKAKI: We did not do any water quality
15
      analysis. Currently, it's not a requirement.
16
                COMMISSIONER KATAYAMA: But you're designing a
      system to do something.
17
18
                MR. ARAKAKI: Correct, correct.
                COMMISSIONER KATAYAMA: But you don't know what
19
20
      you're gonna -- that something is that you've gotta handle,
21
      right?
22
                MR. ARAKAKI:
                             That's right. So all the --
23
                (Laughter.)
2.4
                MR. ARAKAKI: All the test -- yeah. All --
25
                COMMISSIONER KATAYAMA: I mean, shouldn't you sort
```

1	of know what you're gonna handle even at the one-inch events?
2	MR. ARAKAKI: Umm.
3	COMMISSIONER KATAYAMA: I'm assuming that it had
4	historical one-inch flows or some flows currently.
5	MR. ARAKAKI: Correct. All of the testing of these
6	systems that we're specifying are done by the manufacturer,
7	and they follow guidelines of, let's say, New Jersey and other
8	jurisdictions. So they need to meet the water quality
9	treatment requirements that were established. This is all
10	approved by EPA and then passed down to Department of Health,
11	and then on to the City and County as part of their NPDES
12	program. So at this time, there's no requirement to look at
13	or measure the pollutants that enter the system and leave the
14	treatment system.
15	COMMISSIONER KATAYAMA: Okay. No, that's fine. A
16	different conversation, but thank you.
17	CHAIR CHANG: I know Russell, I'm sure this is
18	much more than you had thought you were gonna get into.
19	(Laughter.)
20	CHAIR CHANG: He's like, Am I here for the
21	(inaudible)? No, we appreciate you, your patience, and, you
22	know, answering our questions.
23	Any more questions, comments, Commission?
24	(No response.)
25	CHAIR CHANG: Anybody else, Kathy, in the audience?

1	MS. YODA: (Inaudible.)
2	CHAIR CHANG: Commission, are you ready for the
3	vote? Call for the vote.
4	COMMISSIONER HANNAHS: Move to approve.
5	COMMISSIONER KATAYAMA: Second.
6	CHAIR CHANG: Okay. The motion has been moved and
	_
7	seconded to approve staff's recommendation for Item B-3. All
8	in favor, say aye.
9	(Response.)
10	CHAIR CHANG: Any opposed?
11	(No response.)
12	CHAIR CHANG: The motion has been unanimously
13	approved. Thank you very much, Russell and your team. Thank
14	you, Dean.
15	MOTION: (HANNAHS/KATAYAMA)
16	To approve B-3 as submitted.
17	UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED
18	MR. ARAKAKI: Thank you.
19	MR. UYENO: Thank you, Commissioners.
20	CHAIR CHANG: So now we're going to move on to
21	Kathy, is it item C?
22	DEPUTY MANUEL: C-1.
23	CHAIR CHANG: C-1.
24	MR. IMATA: Ready? Good morning, Chair and
25	Commissioners. Ryan Imata. I am the program manager for the

1.3

2.4

Groundwater Regulation Branch. Today I'm going to be presenting to you a briefing on Item C-1. This will be a briefing on the commission's data on wells related to the Red Hill fuel tank crisis. So let me share my screen first. I think you can all see that now, so I'm going to give you a little bit of an overview of my presentation today. It should take about maybe 10 minutes or so. And this is kind of a little bit of a spoiler for you.

So the items I'm gonna go over, first of all, are: What are the commission's deep monitor well data, and what does that tell us about the aquifers in question? Well, the punch line is the aquifers are robust, and they're relatively healthy right now.

The second item I'm gonna be going over is the well pumpage for the three wells on the Navy system, and the good news about that is the Navy wells are being pumped within the allocated amounts that the commission has allocated to them, and chlorides are stable.

The final point I'm going to discuss is the Navy monitor wells that have been both drilled so far and what is being proposed.

So my next slide is showing you the aquifer system areas on Oahu, and that our primary -- can you see my cursor?

Our primary area of concern is generally Waipahu-Waiawa

because this is the extent of the Navy's water system and

their source -- the Waiawa Shaft is up here -- and primarily Waimalu and Moanalua where the Red Hill Tank Farm is located.

1.3

2.4

So, first of all, let's talk about our deep monitor well data. I'm going to show you the areas that -- the three deep monitor wells that I'm gonna sort of talk to you about with respect to what we're seeing in the aquifer.

First of all, there's the Waipio Mauka well. This is -- if you know the area, this is located on the road headed up to the Mililani Mortuary. This is located within the Waipahu-Waiawa Aquifer system area.

We have a Waimalu deep monitor well that's located within the Waimalu Aquifer system area, and we also have our Halawa deep monitor well, which is also actually located within Waimalu, and then this -- this boundary right here is the Moanalua Aquifer system.

So I want to show you -- this is a little bit of a blowup. So these are the Halawa and the Waimalu deep monitor well locations relative to some critical shafts. Right? So this is Halawa Shaft that the board operates, and this is -- this, as you know, has been shut down for quite a while. This is the Red Hill Shaft that the Navy operates. And so I just wanted to give you some -- some reference for the location of the Halawa deep monitor well and the Waimalu deep monitor well, and what this is -- what the data is telling us about the aquifer relative to the shafts.

And feel free to stop me if you have questions on specific slides or anything that I'm saying. That might be easier than -- than going -- going back at the end, but it's certainly up to -- up to you guys.

1.3

2.4

So let's talk about the aquifer health and those deep monitor wells. The commission looks to aquifer health by assessing data which we plot showing historic elevations of a couple of things: The water level that we initially encounter when we drop our equipment down the well, the top at midpoint of the transition zones from fresh to saltwater.

In the following slides, you're going to see data compiled from field investigations that our survey branch has done near our Red Hill facility, and these data are presented as a time series. So, first of all, if you can remember Halawa deep monitor well, Halawa deep monitor well is located on the Halawa Prison site. And this is something that we're not quite sure about, but the thickness of the freshwater lens — and I'll show you the profile in the next slide. The thickness of the freshwater lens located near Halawa deep monitor well is obscured by an up flow of brackish water in the well. And so I'll explain that a little bit more in the next slide. However, the elevations of the top of the transition zone, midpoint of the transition zone, and the location of seawater indicate that the conditions are relatively stable in this region of the aquifer.

1.3

2.4

So going to the next slide, you'll see that there -there were some -- I think a little bit of decline prior to

2010. We're trying -- still trying to figure out what that's
attributed to, but as you can see, since -- since around

2010-2011, this is the water table. This is the top of the
transition zone, this is the midpoint of the transition zone,
and this is seawater. And I will note that, again, the -- the
brackish up-flow has kind of made us question the thickness of
the -- of the brackish lens, but I will also note that -- this
gets a little bit technical, but we have a way of estimating
the midpoint of the transition zone through the -- through the
Ghyben-Herzberg equation.

The Ghyben-Herzberg equation takes into account the water table above mean sea level and calculates the midpoint of the transition zone is about 40 -- 40 times initial head. So if it's one foot, it's 40 feet. If it's two feet, it's 80 feet, and so on. So this line here represents what we would calculate from Ghyben-Herzberg as the midpoint of the transition zone. Fortunately, it appears that the midpoint of the transition zone is still far below the Ghyben-Herzberg calculated midpoint of the transition zone.

So what is this telling us? It's telling us that based on what we know, despite the up-flow or (inaudible) flow of the -- of the brackish water, we think that it's both relatively stable and relatively healthy because this midpoint

is far below what we would calculate as the midpoint of the transition zone. So that's data on our Halawa deep monitoring well.

Next, let's go to Waimalu. So Waimalu is located, I

1.3

2.4

suppose, northwest of the Red Hill fuel tank storage facility. It does appear that the freshwater lens in Waimalu continues to thicken, indicating that it's probable that there's a long-term influx of fresh water from the Ko'olaus.

And the second point is just -- it's something that we're kind of speculating, so it's by no means definitive, but the presence of this increasing thickness of fresh water makes us theorize that there may be a hydraulic buffer for the Halawa Shaft that the deflects releases migrating northwest across Halawa Valley from the storage facility. Again, that's a theory, so we can't define that yet, but as you'll see at the end of my presentation, data is being collected to understand what's happening with respect to the plume and -- and so you'll see that at the end. Okay? So that's Waimalu.

COMMISSIONER BUCK: Yeah, Ryan.

MR. IMATA: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER BUCK: So the theory, that theory, how would that affect contaminants that would come out of the Red Hill facility?

MR. IMATA: Yeah. Thank you, Commissioner Buck. So
I guess our theory is that if there is a high flux of water

coming from the Ko'olaus, there could -- there could 1 2 potentially be a hydraulic buffer between Halawa -- between 3 the bulk storage facility and Halawa Shaft, but that sort of remains to be seen with the data that we are collecting from 4 5 -- or not that we're collecting, but the Navy is, and their 6 consultants are collecting from the deep water -- from the monitor wells. Does that answer your question? 8 COMMISSIONER BUCK: So the volume of the water would 9 deflect any contaminants and stop its westward movement? 10 that -- is that what I'm hearing? MR. IMATA: Yeah, I mean --11 12 COMMISSIONER BUCK: In theory. 1.3 MR. IMATA: I mean, you're -- in theory, I don't know if -- that it would deflect it, but it would suggest that 14 15 because there's a large quantity of water coming down from the 16 Ko'olaus -- and again, you know, the location of --17 Let me back up a couple of slides. So the location of -- the location of Waimalu deep monitor well, it's -- you 18 19 know, it's all the way over here. The facility is actually 20 around here. Right? So --21 COMMISSIONER BUCK: Yeah. 22 MR. IMATA: So, you know, there's this -- you know, 23 one of the -- one of the thoughts that our geologists had was 2.4 that because so much water is coming down and we see a 25 thickening of the lens here, that it -- could that suggest

```
that there's -- rather than having lateral flow this way,
 1
 2
      'cause it's helped to deflect the flow away from Halawa Shaft
 3
      if there's contaminants coming from the fuel storage tank
 4
      facility. That's just -- again, it's just a theory, so I
 5
      don't want to really put too much weight into that right now
 6
      until data is collected from -- from the monitor wells.
                COMMISSIONER BUCK: Ryan, if the theory is
 8
      important, what's the process for either proving it or
 9
      negating it?
10
                MR. IMATA: So I know that as part of the -- and
11
      perhaps Commissioner Seto can -- can address this. I know
12
      that there were portions of the administrative order on
1.3
      consent that required determination of groundwater flow
14
      patterns and -- and groundwater modeling. So I don't know
15
      that our theory would necessarily be -- how do I say this?
      think that we would -- we would understand better if the --
16
17
      the thickening of the lens in the context of what the models
      are estimating. Does that make sense?
18
19
                COMMISSIONER BUCK: Not -- not to me.
20
                (Laughter.)
21
                MR. IMATA: Okay, okay. Just --
2.2
                COMMISSIONER [SETO] KAGAWA-VIVIANI:
                                                     Let me --
23
                MR. IMATA: Go ahead.
2.4
                COMMISSIONER [SETO] KAGAWA-VIVIANI: Go ahead and
                finish this.
25
                MR. IMATA: Oh, no. I was just gonna say that I
```

```
don't think that that -- I mean, it could be -- the data that
 1
 2
      we're collecting from this deep monitor well could certainly
      be used by whoever is preparing the model in estimating
 3
      groundwater flow, but in and of itself, I don't know that --
 4
 5
      that we -- that that provides us enough data to really make a
 6
      defining statement on groundwater flow patterns. Because,
      again, you'll see the proximity of this well to the fuels tank
 8
      -- fuel tank facility, and you see the location of Halawa
 9
      Shaft, it's far enough away that it -- it really is just a
10
      theory right now that would be validated once the model gets
      created and -- and if it's -- if our data can be used as an
11
12
      input parameter to the model, that's a good thing. Right?
1.3
      But I -- I'm not a modeler, I don't understand that component
14
      of it, so, again, I -- I think that perhaps our theory may be
15
      validated by whatever the model tells us, but I'm not sure
      that we can really make any definitive statement about it.
16
                                                                   Ι
17
      hope that made sense.
18
                COMMISSIONER [SETO] KAGAWA-VIVIANI:
                                                     Yeah, quick
                question. Oh, I'm
19
      sorry.
20
                COMMISSIONER BUCK: No, go ahead.
21
                COMMISSIONER [SETO] KAGAWA-VIVIANI:
                                                     Question, Ryan.
                So we -- you're
22
      groundwater, and you focus on --
23
                MR. IMATA: Yep.
2.4
                COMMISSIONER [SETO] KAGAWA-VIVIANI:
                                                     -- sort of what
                you can measure
```

25 from a borehole, and that's just -- but that's just like one

sort of way of looking at health. Have there been --1 2 MR. IMATA: Yep. 3 COMMISSIONER [SETO] KAGAWA-VIVIANI: -- seepage runs done in this area? Can we consider health -- you know, if -- if we have 4 5 gaining streams in this area, and I don't know if there are, 6 can we get a sense of the health? Has -- has staff kind of 7 considered sort of multiple streams of data together? Because 8 we might just be looking at, like, the pulse and blood 9 pressure when we need to be looking at, I don't know, lung capacity, you know, like other -- multiple metrics of -- of 10 aquifer health. 11 12 MR. IMATA: No, that's --1.3 COMMISSIONER [SETO] KAGAWA-VIVIANI: Have we kind of fully squeezed the CWRM USGS data? 14 15 MR. IMATA: Thank you. That's a -- that is a great question. Right now, you know, we're sort of tasked -- we are 16 17 a very small branch within CWRM and really focusing a lot of our efforts on statewide monitoring, especially as emerging 18 19 issues come out in Kona -- that's not emerging, it's been --2.0 it's been emerged for quite a while now -- and Lahaina. And so we -- we have a staff of basically two guys that are going 21 22 out to -- to evaluate (inaudible). We are, incidentally --23 and thank you to Deputy Manuel. We are expanding our monitor

well program to expand out, but, you know, regarding seepage

2.4

-- and the branch lead, Dean, maybe comment on that to really assess aquifer health as a -- in a more holistic manner.

DEPUTY MANUEL: I'll -- I'll jump in real quick, and then if Ayron comes back, he can jump in. So I think you hit it on the head. Our groundwater guys are good at what they do, right, evaluating water levels, chlorides, the -- the profile, right, of our aquifer, and oftentimes the changes in -- in groundwater take years, if not decades to see, right, over time. So it's kind of just monitoring that. It's not a -- you know, a rain event that all of a sudden our aquifer increases exponentially. But with that said, we do know there's interaction, and there's additional data sets and data gaps that we potentially need to fill. Kind of we're -- you know, (inaudible) of what Chair Chang had mentioned, we -- the more data we have, the better and more informed decisions we can make holistically as it relates to aquifer health. So there -- there are studies here. These are some gaining streams, so there is a groundwater-surface water connection per my initial conversations with Dr. Strauch. And if that's him, he can also add in.

(Laughter.)

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

DEPUTY MANUEL: Perfect timing. But there are spring sources, as we're aware of, along the coast which also indicate kind of this interaction or something -- geology, right, creating that space for ground and surface water

interaction. So we do look at it holistically. A lot of it's just taking the components of groundwater's research, the components of surface water's research, data from Department of Health and UH, and kind of putting that together and then looking at, okay, well, what is the management recommendations that we want to propose?

1.3

Our primary tool in this region is water use permits, right, and the conditions of how -- you know, the withdrawal of water and the impact that it has on both ground and surface water resources as well as public trust uses. So it's all connected. I just want to -- I think we can add more to this. This is just one component, and we wanted to respond to the question from -- I think (inaudible) question about, Can we -- Can we have a conversation about the data that we're collecting? We hear a lot of DOH data, we hear a lot about Navy data, but what is the data that we're collecting? That's the purpose of today's presentation, to share that with you, get feedback on if you want us to focus or if there's things that you're seeing are missing, let us know, and we can look at what resources we have to try to -- try to fill those gaps.

COMMISSIONER [SETO] KAGAWA-VIVIANI: Okay. So the -- so the short

answer is data streams, we don't have -- we haven't put together the multiple streams of data, but according to deep monitor wells, it looks pretty good.

DEPUTY MANUEL: The groundwater aquifer health --

COMMISSIONER [SETO] KAGAWA-VIVIANI: Yeah, yeah. 1 2 DEPUTY MANUEL: -- at this point. And he'll keep 3 going through the rest of the system. 4 COMMISSIONER [SETO] KAGAWA-VIVIANI: Yeah. I don't want to hold that 5 up. 6 DEPUTY MANUEL: No, no, no. That's -- yeah, that's 7 the general summary. I think you'll be hearing that as well. 8 MR. IMATA: Okay. So I -- I believe this is where I 9 left off, I think. We were looking at particularly Waimalu deep monitor well and how that thick -- lens thickening is --10 11 is maybe suggesting a hydraulic buffer. 12 So as you can see as a time series, we have -- the 13 water table actually rose. It rose about maybe 18 and a half 14 feet from May to April, May -- from 2005 till 2023. We do see 15 again a thickening of the transition zone here. And this is, 16 again, Ghyben-Herzberg. So this is telling us that where it 17 should be, and maybe it's -- maybe it's arriving at a steady 18 state condition, I don't know, but that this is -- this is the 19 data that we're collecting from the Waimalu deep monitoring 20 well. 21 So the last well that we're going to look at is the 22 Waipio mauka deep monitor well. And again -- shucks, you know 23 what? We'll -- I'll give you a little bit better information on this as we go through the Navy system wells. But again, 24

this is the Waipio mauka deep monitor well that's located

25

right off of the road going up towards the -- towards that 1 2 Mililani Cemetery. So we see in this well the freshwater lens 3 continues to slowly thin about may -- well, about 100 feet. 4 don't know if you can say that's slow, but -- but it's been 37 5 years since we've seen that. The elevation of the midpoint of 6 the transition zone shows a gentle rise, but again, the current elevation is still below the calculated Ghyben-8 Herzberg elevation, which indicates to us that the current 9 thickness is greater than expected. 10 So going to the next slide, you can see again, this is -- this is Ghyben-Herzberg, that's the midpoint of -- this 11 12 is the midpoint of the transition zone. So this is the top of 1.3 the transition zone. So we are quite significantly below the 14 calculated Ghyben-Herzberg midpoint of the transition zone. 15 And again, this well is located kind of close to the Navy's 16 Waiawa Shaft, which they are -- they've placed a hundred 17 percent reliance on to supply water for existing. 18 So that's a good seque into the next portion of my 19 presentation, which is talking about Navy system pumping centers. So --20 21 COMMISSIONER BUCK: Ryan, Ryan, excuse me. Before 22 you go on to the next subject. 23 MR. IMATA: Sure. 2.4 COMMISSIONER BUCK: I'm curious. The thickening has occurred

since 2005. Could -- might the Waiāhole water

25

decision and/or the diminished use of water for sugar have contributed to less withdrawal and more retainment?

1.3

2.4

MR. IMATA: So -- so it appears that Waipio mauka has actually -- the water level is rising, but we're also seeing a rise of the midpoint -- at the top of the transition zone and the midpoint of the transition zone, so, you know, that would suggest some -- some kind of -- I don't know. I mean, at this point, could that suggest some kind of depletion? I'm not really sure. Yeah, that's a great question.

I mean, we -- with respect to Waiāhole, we see development tunnels are quite -- still actively in use, and I believe that though the development tunnels are on the windward side, they do extend -- it appears that they may extend hydrologically possibly into the Waipahu-Waiawa Aquifer system. So whether the development tunnels are depleting recharge of Waipahu-Waiawa, that's a -- that's a great question. Although, you know, I think that -- you know, I'm trying to think of the timeline now. I'm trying to think of Waiāhole Ditch with respect to, you know, the pineapple fields on the Kunia side, and when things started actually transitioning over from -- the transition from sugar to pineapple and then pineapple to what's being seen in Kunia is -- you know, what we're seeing is diversified crops and some seed corn. I think seed corn is kind of diminishing.

I've really gotta take -- take a look at the data 1 2 for what's -- you know, for the Waiāhole withdrawals. Waiāhole 3 is interesting, right, because they -- what they do is there's 4 a valve at the -- at the north portal that -- I think it's the 5 north portal that they turn on and off depending on how much 6 rainfall they get on the leeward side. There's also a development tunnel, Waiawa development tunnel, that actually 8 develops water on the leeward side that --that's never really 9 sort of shut off. Right? So I -- it's hard for me to -- all 10 that to say that I think it's hard for me to attribute any 11 kind of changes in the aquifer, you know, mauka or even within 12 Waipio mauka as being attributed to sugar -- the reduction of 1.3 sugar production or the change in agricultural use. So the --14 I quess the short answer is I don't know. 15 (Laughter.) 16 MR. IMATA: I know I can be wordy, but it takes up --17 sometimes I'm processing my thoughts as I'm speaking. 18 19 (Laughter.) 20 CHAIR CHANG: I can tell. 21 (Laughter.) 22 COMMISSIONER KAGAWA-VIVIANI: If I can interject, Chair, I 23 wanted to suggest -- Scott Izuka from USGS, they released a 24 really interesting groundwater availability scenarios report 25 in April, and so maybe that can be --

DEPUTY MANUEL: They're coming next month. 1 2 (Laughter.) 3 COMMISSIONER KAGAWA-VIVIANI: Okay. They're already on it, yeah. 4 DEPUTY MANUEL: Sorry, we try to get you the 5 cutting-edge data. 6 COMMISSIONER KAGAWA-VIVIANI: Yeah. Well, WRRC 7 hosted him, so the -- the recording might -- there might be a 8 previous recording online, and then we'll hear next month. 9 I think that'll help us because it was really helpful to see his maps and -- and have that dialogue, so -- okay. 10 MR. IMATA: Shall I continue? 11 12 COMMISSIONER KAGAWA-VIVIANI: Yep. 1.3 CHAIR CHANG: Yes, go ahead. 14 MR. IMATA: Okay, okay. So again, talking about --15 now we're segueing into the Navy pumping centers. 16 gonna show you on the next map the three shaft sources that 17 the Navy has for the system. Aiea Halawa Shaft is the 18 smallest source. This has an allocation of 0.697 mgd. Red 19 Hill Shaft is sort of a -- I want to say a medium-sized 20 source. It's definitely a lot smaller than the Board of Water 21 Supply's Halawa Shaft, but it does have an allocation of 4.659 million gallons per day. Waiawa Shaft is the most productive 22 23 shaft in the Waipahu-Waiawa Aquifer system, and it has an allocation of 14.977 mgd. And I will note that these are --2.4 25 all are under a public water system.

1.3

2.4

So here's a map that shows you basically the extent of the Navy system. You can see how far -- I mean, it extends all the way out into Ford Island, and then obviously out into the West Loch portion, airport point. Again, the Waiawa Shaft is the farthest sort of -- it's not -- farthest north, I guess, on the system, and I was mentioning that the -- our Waipio mauka monitor well is like around here somewhere. This is -- this is the Navy's Aiea-Halawa Shaft, which this is a small allocation, like 0.497, and this is Red Hill Shaft, which is located right next to the field tank farm, so -- and this one has the allocation of about 4 point -- I don't know, under 5 mgd.

So again, here's -- here's a better map showing the location of the shafts. Here is -- here's Waiawa Shaft, here's Aiea-Halawa, here's Red Hill Shaft.

So let's look at the pumpage prior to the fuel release and the resulting change in pumpage as a response. So in November of 2021 -- oh, this doesn't look good. Right? Like in -- they were pumping 0.272; they were within their allocation for Aiea-Halawa Shaft. Again, that's a small source. Waiawa Shaft, they were over-pumping at a very -- very small on a 12-month moving average, but they were over-pumping it. And Red Hill Shaft was over-pumping by about a half a million gallons per day. So this doesn't look good. Combined 12-month moving average monthly pumpage of 20.363

mgd.

2.1

So the following three slides are just an indication -- and this is kind of -- it's a little bit -- I don't want to be misleading about it because it's hard to tell by the scale. Right? If we're looking at the scale of this, this is really just 0.8 million gallons per day. So we're seeing -- we saw a decrease in -- in time series of the 12-month moving average from about -- so we -- so the graphs I'm providing you are from 2020 to the present, and you see a reduction of Aiea -- they basically took Aiea-Halawa Shaft offline. I think they were pumping it for some testing purposes or whatever.

Red Hill Shaft -- let's see. So I think since -- I can't remember the date, but they started pumping Red Hill Shaft in order to induce like a plume -- plume containment situation.

Is that right, Commissioner Seto?

And -- and so they exceeded their allocation. Of course, you know, the allocation that the commission issued was -- was for consumptive purposes, but they converted Red Hill Shaft over to pumping it for plume containment. So you'll -- again, I don't want -- I don't want this to be sort of -- well, you can see. I mean, it's a -- it was about -- above their allocation. Maybe they -- they peaked by about 0.2 mgd at one point and then started stepping down their pumpage of Red Hill Shaft.

1.3

2.4

And then the last graph, again, I think this is —
this one's a little bit confusing because you'll see my time
series goes from 12.5 to 17. So if I had — if it went all
the way down to zero, I think you'd have a better idea of how
much they were over-pumping Waiawa Shaft. And I'm not making
excuses for the Navy, by any means, but Waiawa Shaft was — is
the only source that's online to supply their entire water
system. So you can see how much in excess they did pump. We
did — we are keeping tabs on their — both their pumpage and
the chlorides of Waiawa Shaft on a more — a finer scale.

So let's talk about the change in pumpage as -- in response to the release. Red Hill Shaft stopped in December 2021 and resumed on January 29, 2022, for plume containment, and they've been pumping an average of about 4.2 mgd.

Pumpage ceased at Aiea-Halawa Shaft at the same time. Pump started up again in September of 2022, and I think they just run the pumps periodically just for a couple of days a month, and they only pump about a hundred thousand gallons a month.

And then -- oh, I'm sorry. And then Waiawa Shaft has always -- again, that's the one that they exceeded their allocation for, and we've discovered -- or they've discovered leaks in the system that can be -- can speak to why they were over pumping. And at a certain point, they pumped 16.993 million gallons per day, but they -- again, they're reducing

pumping Waiawa Shaft, I think partly due to some efficiency measures, and also, they had fixed -- there was a big leak in the Pearl Harbor Peninsula that they fixed. And so you see that their 12-month moving average as of May 2023 is 14.9 mgd, which is below their allocation.

1.3

2.4

DEPUTY MANUEL: And again, just a leak in the water system just for verification because that was -- we did this presentation prior, and there was concern that it was in the actual fuel system. No, it's the water system that Ryan's talking about.

MR. IMATA: Thank you. Yeah, that -- I should have been a little clearer about that. I think it was -- it was those kinds of water distribution leaks that you see in all big water systems, right, Board of Water Supply. And so they discovered one. And I think this is -- I think maybe that's part of the silver lining in this whole situation is it -- it's caused us to put a lot more scrutiny on the Navy's data with respect to both the pumpage, aquifer health, and -- and particularly salinity.

So this slide shows the current pumpage, and then you'll see that, okay, Aiea-Halawa Shaft is basically offline. Waiawa Shaft, they were brought -- you know, they brought their pumpage down below their allocation. Red Hill Shaft, again below their allocation, although this is for plume containment. This is not feeding into the system. And you'll

see that the combined 12-month moving average is 18.972 from 20.363 as of November of 2021.

1.3

2.4

So can they sustain running the system with one source? Yes. Is that a good idea? Probably not, because if Waiawa Shaft pulls down, they don't have water for their system.

The one thing that we -- we wanted to make sure that we looked at was chlorides and -- because chlorides give us an indication of aquifer health too. And so this is a plot of chlorides. So you'll see this scale is pumpage in million gallons per day. This scale is parts -- in terms of parts per million. So you see some variability. The orange dots are the chlorides, and you see some variability, but it's relatively -- pretty stable and pretty good at about maybe 130, 130 parts per million.

Waiawa Shaft is the one that I think we're really -that we're a lot more interested in because as they increase
pumpage from Waiawa Shaft to support the system, what does
that tell us about the chlorides? Well, the chlorides -- I
mean, this is -- it's relatively fresh water, right? Like
between 35 and maybe a high of 44 parts per million. So we
see -- we see some variability with respect to pumpage, but
not too much.

That takes me through the Navy's water sources. Did you guys have any questions on that section before we move on?

1	CHAIR CHANG: Ryan, Aurora has a question.
2	MR. IMATA: Sure.
3	COMMISSIONER KAGAWA-VIVIANI: So Waiawa pumping is
4	declining, but we're heading into summer, and do you have any
5	in general, that's, you know, high water demand time is
6	I mean, the implication there is that it's probably not going
7	to continue going down over the summer and they will be
8	exceeding that specific likely be exceeding that specific
9	allocation for that. So what measures or have there been any
10	dialogues around that?
11	DEPUTY MANUEL: I mean, I can start, Ryan, real
12	quick.
13	The graph here shows summer month usage. So if you
14	look at it on the 12 MAV, they still fall within their
15	allocation.
16	COMMISSIONER KAGAWA-VIVIANI: Okay, all right.
17	DEPUTY MANUEL: So, in the bottom frames, right?
18	COMMISSIONER KAGAWA-VIVIANI: Right.
19	DEPUTY MANUEL: You know, basically July through
20	August or that period, those are summer months where you would
21	see higher use. So, I mean, in general, we are we're
22	what's been great is they've been reporting daily pumpage
23	(inaudible).
24	COMMISSIONER KAGAWA-VIVIANI: Okay.
25	DEPUTY MANUEL: Which we we don't ask of anybody

1	else in the state.
2	COMMISSIONER KAGAWA-VIVIANI: Right, yeah.
3	DEPUTY MANUEL: So the Navy's been really, really,
4	really good at getting us this data; that's the only reason
5	why we're able to track it at this scale
6	COMMISSIONER KAGAWA-VIVIANI: Yeah.
7	DEPUTY MANUEL: over time. And then we it is
8	on a 12 MAV, right
9	COMMISSIONER KAGAWA-VIVIANI: Yeah.
10	DEPUTY MANUEL: with the idea that during summer
11	periods, there might be increased pumping to meet demands and
12	needs, but we also ramp up our conservation efforts working
13	with our planning office and our conservation work. So those
14	are some of the strategies, at least right now, we're working
15	with the Navy even anybody throughout the state on is
16	conservation strategies and drought preparedness.
17	COMMISSIONER KAGAWA-VIVIANI: Right, yeah. 'Cause
18	it's not looking you know, the prospects are not looking
19	great.
20	DEPUTY MANUEL: It is gonna be a prolonged drought
21	per per models, right, and predictions.
22	So, Ryan, sorry. Sorry to jump in, but go ahead.
23	MR. IMATA: No, no. No, that's a that's a great
24	thing to add.
25	So we also as Kaleo mentioned, we are looking at

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

both pumpage and chloride data on a finer scale. And normally, what we would require of any well owner or shaft owner or whatever is monthly water use and monthly chloride data to be submitted. We -- because of this -- because of the concern that we brought up not just for the summer months, but just in general as they increase the pumpage, we were -- we were looking at daily pumpage and weekly chloride data to be submitted so that we can kind of start to get a handle, are we seeing -- are we seeing chloride starting to increase as their pumping higher? Again, if this is -- if the past, you know, two years of data is any indication, I don't think we're going to see chloride increases if -- you know, as they approach the summer months. But we'll continue to keep a handle on the data and -- and present anything to you if we see that anything is -- you know, if there's any adverse impacts on the aquifer.

COMMISSIONER KAGAWA-VIVIANI: Okay, thanks.

MR. IMATA: Okay, thanks.

So I'll -- I'll move on to the next -- the final section. I wanted to give you guys a briefing on the Navy monitor well permit. So it's -- this is -- this is an interesting -- and I should preface this by saying that typically the commission approves well permits for -- I mean, I would say 90 percent of our permitting is for production-type wells, right, where people drill wells to produce water.

We also permit deep monitor wells and permanent deep monitor wells, but a lot of environmental wells that are being done to assess, you know, aquifer water quality are done through -- you know, via the underground storage tank program at DOH or other environmental programs. So typically, we hadn't been -- been permitting these types of environmental monitor wells.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

Well, back in around, I think, 2015, and maybe prior to that, we started permitting the monitor wells for the Navy. And I think it's a good -- it's a good thing for the commission to be involved because, as we know, there's contamination in the area. For the Navy to be constructing the wells in accordance with our well standards will help us to ensure that if there's contamination in the vadose or the unsaturated zone above the aquifer, you know, adhering to our well standards will help prevent a contaminant from entering the aquifer from above. And not to say that DOH wouldn't be able to do that, but I think our well standards are -- are sufficiently designed to protect both that from happening and also from maybe perched water from entering an ungrouted annular space and entering the basal nodes. So -- so all that to say that we have been permitting Navy monitor wells. are 23 existing Navy monitor wells right now in all -- all of these various locations. There are eight new proposed Navy monitor wells that we have applications in for that we're under -- that are under review. This shows the location of

the Navy monitor wells with respect to the fuel tank farm. 1 So 2 this is the fuel tank farm right here. 3 And then water quality data from the monitor well -so we don't have the expertise within groundwater to analyze 4 5 water quality data, but thank you to Commissioner Seto for 6 sending me this yesterday. Here are some websites that anybody can go to, the commissioners and general public can go 8 to to get water quality data from the monitor wells. So 9 there's the -- DOH's Red Hill information website. There's 10 the EPA's groundwater results application which was just released, I think, last month or two months ago. And then 11 12 there's the Navy's Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Red Hill 1.3 environmental website. And that's basically all I -- oh-oh. 14 15 recording again? 16 DEPUTY MANUEL: Yeah, you can just press start 17 recording, Kathy. 18 MS. YODA: It's connecting. Like it's not sensing 19 or something. 20 CHAIR CHANG: So can we confirm --21 DEPUTY MANUEL: Is it -- is it on --2.2 MS. YODA: It's a hard connection. 23 DEPUTY MANUEL: Okay, there we go. 2.4 DEPUTY MANUEL: It came back. 25 MR. IMATA: Okay, there we go.

So that concludes my presentation. I'm happy to answer any questions that you guys have or -- I think I see Commissioner Seto smiling, so I'll deflect some questions to her too, but -- okay, thank you.

CHAIR CHANG: So, Mike.

1.3

2.4

know the monitoring wells are critical, especially the ones in the west, to get a much better idea of what's in the aquifer and the plume flow. And I know we've got some issues with liability and trying to put the appropriate monitoring wells in, but let's say we put them in there — and again, the — the commission's kuleana is really gonna be long-term aquifer remediation and recovery. What kind of time frame — assuming we get the wells in — did you project before we could start making some determinations of kind of the plume? And I know theoretical, we don't know, but this is an issue that is gonna be with the commission for quite a while. Do you have any — any projections of time frames once the monitoring wells are in for us to begin to draw some — some kind of rational, you know, observations?

MR. IMATA: Yeah, and I don't want to misspeak, and Joanna's certainly here to correct me if I say anything wrong or -- or even expand on what I might say. But I know that initially -- was it at an FTAC, a Fuel Tank Advisory Committee meeting, Joanna, that I think that either EPA or DOH presented

on some sort of -- some sort of spatial analysis on plume locations? But I don't know that there's been a time series to represent any sort of changes with respect to how plume containment was -- and maybe -- and so I'll let Commissioner Seto sort of expand on that if she can.

1.3

2.4

COMMISSIONER BUCK: Just real quick, Ryan, most of the monitoring wells are just around the -- the Red Hill facility. We really have not collected data -- the wells aren't even in yet, so (inaudible) --

MR. IMATA: Yeah, thank you. So I will say that I think that there are -- like the majority, I'd say just about all of the wells are Navy wells. I know that the Board of Water Supply has, I believe, one monitor well in, and I believe they're applying or are looking to apply for one or two more. So I think that the -- you know, I kind of see where you're going with this because I know we had talked about this before, but I'm trying to establish sentinel wells between the fuel tank facility and -- and Halawa Shaft. But I don't -- I don't have a timeline for the -- for that. I think that's a -- that's going to be a Board of Water Supply question.

COMMISSIONER BUCK: But with an assumption, basically we're talking years having to put the wells in, and hopefully we'll get that done, and then actually getting the data over a certain amount of time frames until there's a

comfort level that Board of Water Supply could open up their shafts again. That's really more like years rather than months.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

MR. IMATA: That -- you know, that's kind of hard to I mean, the -- we, staff has been sort of -- staff has been addressing the deep -- the monitor well applications as fast as we can in order to aid in the -- in assessing what's happening. And, you know, they've been coming in for maybe --I want to say maybe 15 wells a year or so, and they've been getting them online relatively quickly, maybe -- maybe within about a year. Again, I'm not -- I can't speak on behalf of the Navy, but they've expanded out their -- their drilling sort of roster into maybe three or four drillers at this point, whereas they only had one driller prior. And I think they're just trying to accelerate drilling monitor wells all over the place. So it's hard for me to say, but based on the plan, it would appear that maybe within a year or two as far as what has been planned so far, I think all of the wells should be in place and online. I -- that's my best estimate.

DEPUTY MANUEL: And, Commission Buck, maybe real quick, we did make a request -- because they are collecting data now in whatever wells have been completed -- to the Navy in their next quarterly update, which is next month, unfortunately, to provide kind of like -- if possible, a summary of what they're seeing.

COMMISSIONER BUCK: Yeah. 1 2 DEPUTY MANUEL: You know, we have some wells 3 completed. What is the data showing us now, and can that help 4 to inform some of our management decisions? So we put in the 5 requests and hoping to get some report back from the Navy next 6 month. COMMISSIONER BUCK: I mean, I've been to the 8 meetings. The Navy is -- we're ready, they're ready to go. 9 The major issue is a lot of them are on private land --10 DEPUTY MANUEL: Right. 11 COMMISSIONER BUCK: -- and the private land owner is 12 not comfortable. They want some liability protection in case 1.3 they find something, and so that's -- and I know DOH has been 14 working with -- I mean, that's something, but -- yeah, until 15 we get those west monitoring wells in, we're still -- really have -- don't have much of an idea --16 17 DEPUTY MANUEL: Yeah. COMMISSIONER BUCK: -- of what's going on. 18 19 DEPUTY MANUEL: It's definitely isolated around the 20 fuel facility. 21 COMMISSIONER BUCK: All right. 22 CHAIR CHANG: Yeah. Ryan, do you have a -- an 23 opportunity to sort of -- I don't know if synthesize is the 2.4 right word, but take in, like, EPA, Board of Water Supply, and 25 -- and put them all together so that we have a -- a larger

visual of all of the different wells? And are they all -- are they all in sync, or are they different? Or what impacts do those additional well information have for you?

MR. IMATA: Yeah, let me think about this. So I

1.3

2.4

think that at a certain point, we did a -- we did a collaborative effort with USGS. Shoot, I can't -- I wish Patrick were here. Patrick is our geologist that can -- and Bob, I wish they were here talking about how they calibrated the elevation surveys of all of the wells in the area.

But in terms of syncing data, I mean, I think that the websites that I had mentioned have results of all of the monitor wells in the area. I'm not sure that they have permission receipt -- I don't think they have Board of Water Supply data in the area, but there's only one Board of Water Supply monitor well, so -- yeah, I think that that would be the best opportunity to see data results from, you know, a more comprehensive scale.

DEPUTY MANUEL: And maybe just -- you know, a lot of -- we trust in our link, right?

CHAIR CHANG: Yeah.

DEPUTY MANUEL: So we're really focusing on a lot of times the aquifer health from a quantity and chloride perspective, which is kind of the sweet spot we fit in in relation to Department of Health, EPA, who is -- is managing the water quality data sets from these well fields. Putting

```
them together is definitely something that we need --
 1
 2
                CHAIR CHANG: Yeah.
                DEPUTY MANUEL: -- to try to do more of and be
 3
 4
      better at, but a lot of the focus has been quality metrics
 5
      that have been presented. So we can talk about it and see if
 6
      there's a way for us to use some of maybe the existing data
      sharing sites that DOH or EPA or the Navy has set up, and then
      plug in some of our, you know, quantitative data --
 9
                CHAIR CHANG: Yeah.
                DEPUTY MANUEL: -- into that.
10
11
                CHAIR CHANG: Okay. And maybe that's a -- that's a
12
      -- that's a task for UH.
1.3
                COMMISSIONER KAGAWA-VIVIANI: Yeah, I was gonna
14
      suggest -- I mean, you know, the USGS is --
15
                CHAIR CHANG: Yeah, yeah.
16
                COMMISSIONER KAGAWA-VIVIANI: -- very well -- you
17
      know, they have a really stronger group of geologists,
18
      hydrologists, and then UH as well. So I think kind of helping
19
      the different organizations find their role in -- in the --
20
      sort of the network would be good. And I think oftentimes
21
      from the researcher's side, you know, people want to help, but
22
      they don't know what the right questions are --
23
                CHAIR CHANG: Yeah, yes, yes.
2.4
                COMMISSIONER KAGAWA-VIVIANI: -- and they don't know
25
      where the data is. And once the data is available, they --
```

```
you just point them, and that's --
 1
 2
                CHAIR CHANG: Right.
 3
                COMMISSIONER KAGAWA-VIVIANI: People get very
 4
      excited when there's (inaudible).
 5
                CHAIR CHANG: Yeah.
 6
                COMMISSIONER KAGAWA-VIVIANI: Yeah.
                CHAIR CHANG: Okay. So --
 8
                COMMISSIONER KAGAWA-VIVIANI: I'll pass that word
 9
      back.
                CHAIR CHANG: Yes.
10
11
                Thank you, Ryan.
12
                Any -- has any board members -- commission have any
1.3
      questions for Ryan or staff?
14
                COMMISSIONER KAGAWA-VIVIANI: I -- sorry, I have one
15
      other.
16
                CHAIR CHANG: Go ahead.
17
                COMMISSIONER KAGAWA-VIVIANI: So this is going back
      to the chlorides being stable at Red Hill Shaft, and I was
18
19
      wondering because Halawa's shut off, you know, I mean -- and
20
      Halawa used to be a big draw, is -- do you think that plays
21
      into the chloride story there or it's just the aquifer can
22
      handle and, you know?
23
                MR. IMATA: You know, that's a -- that is a good
2.4
      question. I would have to look at the data for -- the water
25
      use reported data from Red Hill Shaft and compare that to, you
```

```
1
      know, prior to Halawa and then -- and then post-shutdown of
 2
      Halawa Shaft.
 3
                COMMISSIONER KAGAWA-VIVIANI: Okay.
 4
                MR. IMATA: Again, if our theory or if our
 5
      geologist's theory holds true, that large influx of water from
 6
      the Ko'olaus would -- would maybe -- could possibly suggest
      that the shutdown of Halawa Shaft wouldn't impact Red Hill
 8
      Shaft in a significant way.
 9
                CHAIR CHANG: Any other questions or comments? Do
10
      we have -- Jonathan, you've been with us the whole meeting.
11
      Did you wanna -- were you here to participate on a particular
12
      item?
1.3
                MR. SCHEUER: Not at this time, mahalo. Other than
14
      I was going to, when it comes to it, thank Commissioner Buck
15
      for his years of service.
16
                CHAIR CHANG: Oh, okay. Thank you very much. I
17
      thought so.
18
                Okay. Anybody else?
19
                COMMISSIONER HANNAHS: So my takeaway is generally
20
      good news, nothing disturbing in your -- in the data you
21
      presented, Ryan?
22
                MR. IMATA: Well, not from a water quality
23
      standpoint, right, because again, we can't really --
2.4
                COMMISSIONER HANNAHS: Right.
25
                MR. IMATA: We can't really comment on -- on the
```

perspective of the presence of contaminants in the aquifer.

As far as aquifer health and depletion, that's really where -again, as Kaleo mentioned, that's our sweet spot, right? So
based on our increased monitoring of what's happening with
respect to Waiawa Shaft and looking at our deep monitor well
data, we are relatively confident that any changes in system
pumpage isn't affecting the aquifers in a negative way.

1.3

2.4

COMMISSIONER HANNAHS: Okay, thank you.

And second to Kaleo, the last -- I don't know if it was last month or the month before, the Navy made a presentation which really created an opportunity to kind of create a dashboard of various important task completions or objectives and milestones that we could track. Have we kind of done anything with that? Will we be seeing that on some routine basis, guarterly perhaps, or some --

DEPUTY MANUEL: I'm hoping to try to figure out whether it's some kind of informational briefing submittal that we have that we can kind of evaluate what we're seeing related to what they've presented or just have the Navy present on those three things every quarter. So they've agreed -- I've consistently reached out, and they agreed to be back in July to update us on those kind of three focal points of the work that they're doing. I'm hopeful that until the fuel is removed or the facility is closed, that they're committed -- at least we've gotten commitments from leadership

```
right now that they'll be here. So it is -- those three
 1
 2
      threads and those focuses are where we want to have them
 3
      provide those updates.
 4
                COMMISSIONER HANNAHS: But I like the idea of kind
 5
      of keeping the destination targets --
                DEPUTY MANUEL: Yeah, yeah.
 6
                COMMISSIONER HANNAHS: -- solid, and then measuring
 8
      milestone and progress --
 9
                DEPUTY MANUEL: Yeah, I think --
10
                COMMISSIONER HANNAHS: -- of those milestones along
11
      the way.
12
                DEPUTY MANUEL: I think one of the -- in my opinion,
1.3
      kind of seeing the big picture of things, that the biggest
      issue is the remediation.
14
15
                COMMISSIONER HANNAHS: (Inaudible.)
16
                DEPUTY MANUEL: And we haven't got there yet.
17
      Right? The focus right now has been on defueling safely the
18
      facility. But, you know, I think we've been really consistent
19
      at the Fuel Tank Advisory Commission -- Committee meetings and
20
      others, at our subject matter expert meetings, that we've
21
      really got to start thinking about what does remediation look
      like for this -- these aquifers.
2.2
23
                COMMISSIONER HANNAHS: Yes.
2.4
                DEPUTY MANUEL: -- and start that conversation now
25
      and not afterwards when you're done reviewing. But we need to
```

```
have those conversations now --
 1
 2
                COMMISSIONER HANNAHS: Right.
 3
                DEPUTY MANUEL: -- and set those goals. We can
 4
      change --
 5
                COMMISSIONER HANNAHS: Yeah.
 6
                DEPUTY MANUEL: -- as we get more data, but we
 7
      really need to, yeah, know where it is we're going.
 8
                COMMISSIONER HANNAHS:
                                      Okay.
 9
                CHAIR CHANG: Wayne.
10
                COMMISSIONER KATAYAMA: Hi, Ryan. Has the Navy
11
      formed and stood up an organization to meet your expectations
12
      moving forward to provide you timely data? And how does
1.3
      that --
14
                MR. IMATA: Yes.
15
                COMMISSIONER KATAYAMA: -- organization look as to
      what they've had historically there?
16
17
                MR. IMATA: I mean, what we're -- I guess it depends
      on what you mean by what we're looking at. From staff's
18
19
      perspective, we are primarily looking at getting like a
20
      finer-tuned reporting of their water use, which that -- that
21
      came from NAVFAC directly. So in that sense, no.
22
                As Kaleo mentioned, we are -- the commission is part
23
      of the -- both the Fuel Tank Advisory Committee as well as
2.4
      various subject matter expert groups, maybe the most
25
      significant being the Remediation Roundtable. So as far as
```

1.3

2.4

particular commission objectives, yeah, there's -- there's really -- there's really nothing that we look at in terms of a larger group. Although, you know, informally, we do consult with several geologists throughout the state about geologic issues as they pertain to monitor wells. Otherwise, commission staff is advisory to the Field Tank -- well, we're a part of the Fuel Tank Advisory Committee as well as subject matter experts.

opportunity -- one of the, to me, issues is that your groundwater staff is sort of limited. Could we avail the Navy's conscience and hopefully, you know, some of their accountability to help improve getting groundwater data to you to -- you know, what would normally be your function in doing it, but take advantage of that if they're putting in, you know, 35 sentinel wells around the area? Can we --

MR. IMATA: No, that's --

COMMISSIONER KATAYAMA: -- task them to do more?

MR. IMATA: That's a great question and -- and actually, timely for me to let you know that the legislature approved four positions under groundwater regulation for that very purpose. So, you know, my thing has always been I would prefer for us to be collecting the data rather than the Navy to be collecting the data because, you know, validation -- data validation is an issue. And for us to do that stuff

in-house, it gives me much more confidence that we can make better assessments on aquifer health. So we did get four new positions. I'm in the process of trying to figure out how to fill those positions and how to write the position description, so -- but whether the Navy can contribute to that, yeah, I would love that, you know.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

COMMISSIONER KATAYAMA: Well, I think they're obligated to do something.

CHAIR CHANG: Now, if I can add to that, so, you know, the -- well, the State of Hawai'i, the state and the counties created this unified statement. Part of the -- the goal of this unified statement or this coalition is to bring all of the different agencies together, including the county, to hold the -- the Navy accountable for more than just remediation. I mean, so we sit on that and, you know, my concern is it's -- it's not just water quality and water quantity, but the health of our ecosystem. Like what impact does this have to the nearshore waters, up on the streams, up mauka? So we are trying to leverage the Navy through this opportunity to require them to do more data, you know, have them responsible because there's a whole question as to, as you say, Ryan, the validation. I mean, we're only getting information from what the Navy's providing us. We are not having the opportunity to necessarily ground truth that. And that's why to me, having collaboration with other -- you know,

1.3

2.2

2.4

other monitoring wells, whether the Board of Water Supply -but I think it -- right now is the opportunity for us to hold
the Navy accountable. Because if our -- our goal is not just,
you know, clean water with infiltration. I mean, far from
that. I mean, we want to be able to have clean water for
future generations that doesn't have to all have to go through
filtration. We also want to have clean water so our resources
are taken care of. So the -- part of the mission of this
unified statement, this coalition, is to draft federal
legislation and to get money to finance this. And it
shouldn't be funded by the State of Hawai'i; it should be
financed by the United States.

So we are, as we're speaking, going through that process to try to be very comprehensive and inclusive and bring the right people to the table to begin to identify what's -- you know, what's our long-term goal, and then working backwards, how do we -- how do we get sufficient information, data, resources to get us to that point. So we are being very --

COMMISSIONER KATAYAMA: Good.

CHAIR CHANG: -- cognizant of that.

COMMISSIONER KATAYAMA: Good.

CHAIR CHANG: Yeah. Any other questions or comments to staff, Ryan or anybody else, on this update? And Kaleo's right, I think, you did confirm with the Navy they'll be here,

```
1
      so --
 2
                DEPUTY MANUEL: Yeah, they'll be here next -- in
 3
      July.
 4
                CHAIR CHANG: Yeah. So they are keeping to their
      commitment to do quarterly updates to us following up on that
 5
 6
      first meeting. So with that, being this was just an
 7
      informational briefing, right?
 8
                DEPUTY MANUEL: Just informational.
 9
                CHAIR CHANG: So, having no other comments or
10
      questions, thank you very much, Ryan, for a very comprehensive
      overview.
11
12
                COMMISSIONER BUCK: And think of all our
13
      (inaudible).
14
                (Laughter.)
15
                CHAIR CHANG: Yeah, yeah, you're right.
                                                          I'm
16
      trying --
17
                COMMISSIONER BUCK: And throwing ones at the wall.
18
                CHAIR CHANG: Yeah, there you go.
19
                COMMISSIONER BUCK: I'm sure we've got plenty more.
20
                CHAIR CHANG: I want to be cautiously optimistic
2.1
      about the -- the data that you gave us and the health, but,
22
      you know, preliminary, we've still got a lot more.
23
                So with that being said, this item is closed and --
24
                DEPUTY MANUEL: One more item.
25
                CHAIR CHANG: One more item.
```

Item D-1 is just a chance for 1 DEPUTY MANUEL: Yes. 2 a farewell address from Commissioner Buck and just to --3 CHAIR CHANG: Yes, yes. COMMISSIONER BUCK: Super. And --4 5 DEPUTY MANUEL: -- (inaudible). 6 COMMISSIONER BUCK: You know, informal. You guys 7 got some formal written comments over there for the record, 8 but I do have some other comments. It's the last time you'll 9 hear me talk, at least on this side of the table. 10 I know many of you were here when Mr. Beamer gave his goodbye comments. I think he identified 41 different 11 12 streams that we set in-stream flow standards during his 1.3 tenure, which somewhat overlap, and so it had me thinking 14 about, you know, why -- what's happened over the past eight 15 years that we've been so productive? You know, a lot of our 16 decisions were called historic and -- and surprising, and I 17 think we've been really blessed 'cause the time was really ripe to have those decisions. Plantation agriculture was 18 19 totally gone. We had lengthy contested cases that were ready 20 to be resolved. We had a really diverse range of 21 commissioners as well. 22 And so, I want to reflect a little bit on what did 23 we learn over the past eight years and how might the 2.4 commission improve how it works? So I came up -- the commission is more effective when we have time to work 25

together, when we have adequate and timely data from the staff, when we have an understanding of stakeholder issues, and we have ability to address those issues over larger geographical areas. I think those -- let me drill down a little bit.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

You know, as we know, it's all frustrating that the commissioners cannot talk to one another and -- only in public. And I think some of our best work has been in some of the protracted contested case issues when we really can sit down together, and we come up with value-added products from our different perspectives and -- and so I think it's important to try to increase that. We did the permitted interaction group, which I think is really useful, and I think that's an underutilized thing, a way to have a certain number of commissioners -- and I understand the evolution of the legal issues, we're not doing backroom, smoke-filled things, we're not, but -- and I think it's important for the public to actually see us interact. I don't think they realize after four or five hours of public testimony we don't know what we're going to say to each other yet. You know, the show hasn't really even started yet. So I think the interaction between the commissioners is really important.

And that -- the issue of the contested case issue and where that is. I understand why it's there. I'm not suggesting -- but broken, it's kind of a broken system. It

1.3

2.4

does allow us -- you guys were on Kaua'i when we did the Wai'ale'ale Stream, four or five hours of pretty heated public testimony. We had just started deliberations, someone called for a contested case; everything stopped. No more discussion. And it turned out that entity did not even have, you know, the proper standing. So I think there's -- we should really think about how we reform the contested case because I think if the commission and staff have time for a couple months to try to work out a compromise and work with stakeholders and then come back and maybe make a decision, I think we can resolve a lot of that stuff.

You know, if people want a contested case, that's fine. There are advantages. We get to sit together and deal with it. It takes too long, it's too expensive, legal issues, and we might not even agree with the hearings officer's report and end up having to go back. And I think we found in numerous situations where we go back and ask people, Can you rescind your contested case so we can actually sit down and talk? So maybe legally there's a two or three months timeout, we're not making a decision, but we're going to work on the issue, come back in a public forum, try again, and maybe there's a way that we can actually work. So I'm not suggesting we get rid of the contested cases, but it's time to have a -- kind of a serious discussion how to re-reform that with stakeholders. So that's one.

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

Obviously, adequate and timely data from staff is critical. And we're sitting with some of our best staff right here that does it. I think it's time -- I know it's hard. You know, when I was at DOFA, we reorganized to have decentralized so we could have someone on each island who had the authority and the responsibility to make decisions. And we have so many in-stream flow standards; we can't manage this from -- as effectively from Honolulu anymore. And we only have one Ayron. And so eventually setting up some sort of organization where you have someone on each island, especially on Maui where we have really active community groups. And I know, Claire, you're well aware of that, but it's time to kind of move toward that. We've gotten bigger now; we have enforcement and regulatory structures, you know. in-stream flow standards all over the island. And so I think it's time to -- however you can manage that, to start doing that.

The third one is, you know, the more we know about our stakeholders, the better. You know, COVID has changed our public hearings forever. I don't think we're ever gonna go back to in-person. I think it's been an improvement. We're getting testimony from all sorts of people. It's hard for the chair to manage sometimes as a three-minute warning and, you know, after four or five hours of public testimony, the commission has a pretty good idea where people are, and our

people the same thing.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

So I don't have any suggestions, but I think it has changed the way we'll be doing hearings forever now, and maybe there's ways to make it more efficient. Somehow having the testifiers know what other people are testifying so they can consolidate. Maybe pre-recording public testimony so people have a chance -- I haven't really thought that through, but we know these hybrid meetings are a way of the future, and we have to deal with that.

And then finally, wherever we can, if we can do larger geographical areas, you know, and look at the difference between the East Maui decision -- and I go back to Kaua'i, Wai'ale'ale, where we were stuck with one stream because of a time limit on an application to the Board of Land and Natural Resources. There's more water in that drainage than any other drainage in the whole state, and if we would have an ability -- I think we're trying -- to really look at a larger geographical area, we can deal with the ecosystem issues, we can deal with the balancing that we need to do between our public trust priorities. And so wherever we can -- sometimes we're stuck with having to deal with a stream, but any way we can combine that within the larger area. And I think East Maui was a classic example where really we had a clean pallet for almost the first time to really implement the Water Code because we had 27 streams, we had really enough

1.3

2.4

water, we had -- we really could make the balancing. Nā Wai 'Ehā was a lot harder and -- well, apologized to staff because we know implementation of that was going to be horrible because we had private delivery systems, we had contested already with the water use, and so -- and so I know as you start dealing with Lanai, I'm so glad we didn't, Oh, let's just take this aquifer. You know, take as large a geographical piece as you can because that allows you to make the appropriate decisions.

It'd be remiss not to talk about Red Hill. We talked about it a lot and -- and I'll just say shortly, I'm -- I'm okay where we are right now. We have the Navy's attention, DOH is all in, and that's good; EPA is all in, and that's good, although you can never trust a federal agency to stick up for what the state's interests are. But I still would urge in this all-in concept that the State of Hawai'i needs a comprehensive legal regulatory and enforcement strategy because we're gonna have to put constant pressure. And it is all about our kuleana aquifer remediation and recovery. And knock on wood, once the fuel is out, you know, people -- the energy is gonna let down, and we are still stuck with some of the issues that we've been talking about.

And so, this commission unanimously recommended modifying their water permit. Take a look at their water permit. There is none; it's grandfathered in. We're giving

20 million gallons a day to the Navy with no conditions whatsoever. And, you know, you ask in the public meetings, people ask EPA, Well, what happens if they don't -- you know, if they don't follow the plan? Oh, we'll fine them. You know, that's just taxpayer money. You know, DOH can fine them, but that's just money. But connecting their responsibility to clean up the aquifer with their use of the water. If we need to cut back, they need to cut back.

1.3

2.4

So I still would urge the Water Commission, when the time is right and when we know more about the monitoring data so we have a better feel of what is involved in aquifer recovery remediation, we start the public process -- because it'll be commission-oriented -- where we go out to the public and say, We want a plan for aquifer recovery remediation.

What does it look like? And I think that's the time for the commission to step up in its regulatory role.

Like I said, I'm happy where we are right now.

We've got people's attention; DOH is all in, and, you know,

I've been to every one of the FTAC and all of the different

meetings. And so we have their attention, but once they

safely defuel, we're still left with those issues which are

gonna probably transcend the time frame of most everyone here

at the table, so it's important that we do that.

And my last one, and this one is I'm not giving up yet. You know, in '78, they made water -- there is no private

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

ownership of water, the Water Code in '81. Sustainability, you know, is a three-legged table: Biological, social, and economic. There is no economic underpinnings for the Water Commission and the Water Code. We don't have -- we're not connected at all -- outside of potential fines and administrative fees, we don't charge anything for water. Water is not free, the public trust responsibilities that we're supposed to manage are not free, and we haven't yet made that connection. And even now, the Board of Land and Natural Resources is struggling to try to figure out -- well, at least in our designated area in the lease, how much do we charge people for water? But basically, to be sustainable, the Water Code has to have an economic underpinning, which means there needs to be some way to connect the value of the water with the management of the water resource. And so that's still an outstanding issue. I've talked to Kaleo about it a lot, I've talked to Neil about it a lot, you know.

You know, when we did the watershed partnerships, we came up with the conveyance tax and, I mean, we've come up with ways to do that, but it's important that this commission — and maybe you can hold some workshops or bring some people in, just a way to kind of have people understand. 'Cause when you talk about money and water, people — people freak out. You know, the counties don't want to deal with it, they don't want to raise their rates, but we need to find a way that we

could fund the public trust 'cause that's our responsibility.

That's kind of some suggestions I might have, observations of how we've been very productive. I want to thank you all. I'm not going away. I'm actually chair of the Malama Honua Public Charter School Foundation. You know, we're raising money to build our school; it's based on the values of ocean navigation. The kids -- actually, we have a sublease from DLNR. The kids are unbelievable. I mean, that is the next generation of leadership, and so I'm really dedicated to try to build that school. And it happens to be in Waimānalo, so I might be asking you guys for donations at some time.

(Laughter.)

1.3

2.4

COMMISSIONER BUCK: But it's been a pleasure. You know, when I was with DOFAW, you know, and this was maybe when we were starting the East Maui partnership, and that was when Waiāhole was just going, and I was going, God, these commissioners, they're fighting over this drop in the bucket when we're dealing with all the source water stuff. I said, One of these days, I'm gonna be on that commission. And we have so many converts now in watershed protection, I feel very comfortable, especially with Commissioner Hannahs. I don't need to -- like I don't need to spout off anytime. But it's been great, thank you very much. Keep up the great work. You're doing important -- and the Water Code is probably one

1.3

2.4

of the most innovative and aspirational water legislations in the world. It really is. It's not -- it's a challenge to implement, but, you know, I've worked all over the US and internationally, and when I asked the Maui chair comparing California and Hawai'i, he obviously doesn't know much about Hawai'i yet because we are so far ahead of what they're doing in California about regulatory structures and indigenous rights. So it's been a pleasure, and thank you all for your work. Stay happy and healthy.

CHAIR CHANG: Thank you. Before -- I know that Jonathan and Lucienne are also on the Zoom and probably want to say something, so go ahead, Jonathan.

MR. SCHEUER: Aloha mai kākou, Commissioners. My name, for the record, is Jonathan Lakeke Scheuer. And while I often appear in front of you as a testifier on behalf of DHHL or other entities, this is just my personal testimony. Just wanting to thank Commissioner Buck for his years of service and say from the perspective of somebody who's been observing this commission for almost three decades now, that I just want to highlight three things which came out in -- in his very thoughtful closing remarks that I think really mark something very special and at times completely unique that Commissioner Buck has brought to this commission.

The first is really the matter he last talked about. He's always approached the commission with an understanding of

how innovative and how unusual and how profound the Water Code is. And he's really sort of come with that understanding that it means a huge deal to walk into a role of having to try and implement and uphold that.

1.3

2.4

That relates to my second thing that I wanted to highlight about his tremendous service is that I certainly have not always agreed with some of the decisions that he's made, but unlike some other people I've observed over three decades, there was never a question in my mind that, first and foremost, he understood the duties of a trustee which first is duties to be faithful to the trust corpus itself. He -- I might have disagreed with the decision he reached, but it was always in trying to further what was best for the resource and best for the implementation of the code, and that really increased the amount of trust that this body has had over the time of his service.

And finally, and this is also something he remarked on, his continual drumbeat about us needing to connect how we manage our forested watersheds and how we manage the water derived from them is an incredibly important message, and I think that as we slowly make progress on that over the next years and decades, his voice in the wilderness will be one that will continue to guide us and be seen as a guiding light in that process.

So I'm just personally very, very grateful for your

service and for your closing remarks. Thank you for the opportunity to offer these few comments. Aloha.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

CHAIR CHANG: Thank you, Jonathan. That was very well said. Thank you so much.

Lucienne, I see you on the call as well.

MS. DE NAIE: Indeed. Mahalo and thank you all. Thank you all for a long day. Thank you all for the service that each of the members puts into this very important board. But, you know, I've known Mike since back in the days of DOFAR and, you know, we've had discussions about forestry issues and this and that 'cause I've been here watching these meetings for about three decades too. And those of us who represent, you know, groups that are trying to be part of the -- kind of watchdog for the public trust always appreciate when there's a person who's willing to listen. And like Jonathan says, you don't always come to the same agreement. In the end, that is not the whole point. The point is, is that there is a respectful and engaged dialogue. And Mike just really has gone the extra mile in every facet of his service on the commission.

And I have to say, you -- your closing words, Mike,
I agree a hundred percent with every thoughtful suggestion you
brought up. They are things that are on the minds of all of
us who have been watching our water policy evolve from, you
know, the 1980s when it first kind of took form, and all of

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

these are important things. I join with Jonathan. Connecting our watersheds and caring for the whole watershed, and involving the communities in that caring is one of the most important things that we can do if we really don't want to be fighting over less and less water in the future. We need to envision a future when we -- where we -- as we grow water, and that means cooperating with nature.

I also very, very much appreciate your remarks about working with stakeholders to try to avoid contested cases being the only option. Now, obviously, you know, I've been party to many contested cases. Sometimes they are the best option because the story is just too full to tell through even, you know, meeting a few times. But even if you look at Nā Wai 'Ehā and working towards some of these brokered settlement agreements, it saved everybody time. It is not perfect; we do need more enforcement of what's on paper so it doesn't become just a good-looking decision on paper that on the ground, where's the water? But the idea of bringing people together when possible to find common ground over a shared resource, I think, should be very, very high on the purview of the commission like this, and I applaud your efforts. I -- you know, you've made many suggestions to that that -- that type of resolution. And Director Chang is really heading in that way as well; your staff is heading in that way.

```
So just from the bottom of our hearts in our
 1
 2
      communities, you know, most people are not like me, they're --
 3
      they're not, like, kind of retired and, you know, just
 4
      dedicated to sign up to wait in line to testify for hours, but
 5
      they do care and the -- this attitude is being appreciated.
 6
      So I hope everything that's ahead for you, Mike, allows you to
      see some of these dreams come true and do many other wonderful
 8
      things for our community. So God bless you, and thank you for
 9
      your service.
                CHAIR CHANG: Thank you, Lucienne. You are indeed a
10
11
      great representative of the community. Mahalo for signing up
12
      and being there.
1.3
                I'm gonna -- I'm gonna let Kaleo say the final
14
      words, but I'm going to go around, either staff or commission,
15
      if you want to say something to Mike as well.
                DEPUTY MANUEL: Sure.
16
17
                CHAIR CHANG: Aurora.
                COMMISSIONER KAGAWA-VIVIANI: I didn't draft
18
19
      anything.
20
                CHAIR CHANG: Oh, that's okay.
21
                COMMISSIONER KAGAWA-VIVIANI: I should've.
2.2
                CHAIR CHANG: From the heart, from the heart.
23
                COMMISSIONER KAGAWA-VIVIANI: I'm pretty bad at
2.4
      impromptu speaking. But I do appreciate the opportunity I had
25
      to get to know you on the permitted interaction group. And
```

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

```
also, you know, as sort of the -- the junior member on the
commission, really watching you kind of be the tip of the
spear and the first person to make a motion and -- and to know
-- because I think I first interacted with you through -- when
I was working at conservation. So I knew your name, I knew
your work in forestry, and to understand how -- like the role
you played in the watershed partnerships and kind of this
stitching together for me of forest and water. And then to be
able to work with you on the permitted interaction group and,
oh, my gosh, like the phone calls, the text messages, the Zoom
calls, the meetings. I mean, the energy with which you
attended every single -- I don't know how many hours long
meetings and read -- actually, like read through the very long
reports. You know, I think I -- I was skimming and word
searching, but you, you read through and followed everything
with such a commitment. And I think for me, I don't know,
it's really great to see that as a model of this is what
public service is because I don't think the public really
understands. Not everybody does it, but I think you set, I
think, a high bar, at least for me personally, on how much to
research and do investigating and to learn more about -- you
said you came from a family of lawyers --
          COMMISSIONER BUCK: And that's why I became a
forester.
          (Laughter.)
```

COMMISSIONER KAGAWA-VIVIANI: And I studied 1 forestry, and I'm thinking like, Well, I need to understand 2 3 more, you know, about law. But I really appreciate what I've 4 been able to learn certainly (inaudible) especially working 5 more closely (inaudible). 6 Your comments about interactions, some of those 7 exchangers were really where we could not be so reactive in a 8 meeting, but really think hard and think creatively and think around some really complex issues and, yeah, mahalo for those 9 -- those points. I haven't been in a contested case really 10 11 yet, so I'll be thinking about that. 12 COMMISSIONER BUCK: Don't worry, you'll get a 1.3 chance. 14 COMMISSIONER KAGAWA-VIVIANI: (Inaudible.) Yeah, so 15 -- so, yeah, mahalo for that. And we'll see you around --16 COMMISSIONER BUCK: Oh, yeah. 17 COMMISSIONER KAGAWA-VIVIANI: -- in educational 18 spheres. 19 CHAIR CHANG: There you go. 20 COMMISSIONER BUCK: Yeah. Hey, for our legal 21 assistant, you know, we do have a mediation process that's in 22 our rules, but the commissioners are not allowed to 23 participate. It's an outside person, and we still are not 2.4 connected to that, so maybe there's something you can look at. 25 CHAIR CHANG: Yeah, we are looking.

Joanna, do you want to --

1.3

2.4

COMMISSIONER SETO: Just a short one.

Thank you for all the hard work that you've put in on the commission, eight years and plus. We appreciate everything that you've done for the water and the big picture of water, not just one focus of quantity. So, yes, there is the overlap between quantity and quality, and we do need to work together. So thank you for also being on the PIG -- sorry, the permitted interaction group -- and providing the input that we needed for the Red Hill situation.

COMMISSIONER BUCK: And thank you for what you do. You've been in the spotlight the last couple of years. I know it hasn't been easy.

CHAIR CHANG: Wayne, did you want to say anything to Mike?

think one of the signature characteristics of an effective organization is the composition of its members in that each member provides a very distinct and unique skill set and a point of view. As you look at the composition of our members today, I think we have that, Mike, and your perspective has filled a very important segment of how we approach issues and how we resolve that. So, you know, again, thank you, Mike. And unfortunately, our first interaction was I replaced you on your seat, so I apologize for that.

(Laughter.)

1.3

2.4

COMMISSIONER BUCK: You know, when I looked at your -- your resume because obviously I wasn't reappointed, I did have like a three-month gap, and I said, No, no, he's okay.

(Laughter.)

COMMISSIONER KATAYAMA: Anyway, Mike, thank you very much for being you and thank you very much for, I guess, helping me see a far broader perspective of what needs to be encompassed in managing and ensuring that we have a sustainable water supply that provides for a healthy community in terms of growth. So again, Mike, thank you very much.

CHAIR CHANG: Neil.

COMMISSIONER HANNAHS: Yeah. Mike, our paths have crossed many times prior to being on the Water Commission, and during these last, I guess, seven years of overlap, and I have no doubt that they'll cross again in the future. And there are four things I've really come to appreciate in this term of service is that you really love Hawai'i, and your aloha, you know, factor metric is really up there, and I really appreciate that, and you're courageous about it. You put it on the line, and you fight for it, so that's awesome. You show up, you know, you have a -- you bring a lot to the table when you do. You are prepared, and you engage, and you take the time to take -- if you're gonna take a seat on this table, you know, be there, be present, and be ready and do your job.

So you've done it really well and set a model and an example for all of us.

1.3

2.4

As you come here, you don't know a lot, but yet you're very respectful of everybody else, a good team member. And as Wayne has said, you recognize that these decisions have to balance a lot of interests. You have -- you have some, others have other perspectives, and I've always felt this great sense of respect for your peers and for the testifiers and the diverse constituencies out there that need to be served. I appreciate that.

And finally, you made a special effort to be transparent, and your -- you kept those humongous decisions, you know, East Maui and Nā Wai 'Ehā and so forth, you know, you were the one who fought for executive summaries. So the public really needs to not get mired in all the details or just the one line item that affects them and so forth; they need to see the big picture, and I think it really helps people. It creates the common ground, the higher -- the higher sense of vision and value that helps bring people together. So it's -- it's considerate of them to -- they should -- they need to know, but it's also unifying for those that can share this, and I think that's helped us a lot.

So I hope part of your future is not just building a wonderful school, but also maybe playing a little music.

COMMISSIONER BUCK: Oh, yeah, yeah.

COMMISSIONER HANNAHS: Aloha to you.

COMMISSIONER BUCK: Thank you so much.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

CHAIR CHANG: I'm gonna let Kaleo have the last words as you both have come to know each other well. All I can say is from -- I've always -- I think it's -- what I appreciate is sort of this full circle, being part of -- you never leave DLNR. I mean, I say that because I quess I can state that firsthand. And it's -- it is a very different perspective to sit on this side of the table versus that side of the table because we do have this awesome kuleana that the decisions we make have broad implications far beyond us and our generation, but generations to come. And I have just appreciated watching you afar sitting on here, but as well as when you were with DLNR. Water and land are inseparable, and sitting here, we have the ability to always ensure that we are taking into consideration all of that and how intertwined and interconnected and that we as decision-makers cannot separate that but ensure that we are considering all of those. And I always talk to the staff about staying in our lane, but I think as a decision maker, we have to take the much broader view. And I've appreciated the lens upon which you have brought to the Water Commission just that -- the broader kuleana of recognizing, again, that our decisions have broad implications, but that it is -- it is a very heavy responsibility, and you have worn that well and have accepted

that with such honor and privilege. And so it -- likewise, it has been a privilege for me to share this time we see together, as short as it is. But we're going to probably see you on that side of the table.

(Laughter.)

1.3

2.4

CHAIR CHANG: Yeah, who knows, maybe as a hearing officer or as a -- I mean, you can help to -- you can help to correct this broken contested case hearing process. But, like Neil, our paths will cross again, so thank you very much.

Kaleo.

DEPUTY MANUEL: Yeah, I mean, I'm -- on behalf of the staff, you've always been really respectful of the team and super supportive, and it's been really great to work with you for four and a half years on your tenure. I really just -- you know, I mean, everybody's kind of touched on your great, you know, attributes and the work that you've done and the space that you've held, and you've held it really well, but I really just appreciated like your storytelling in space and kind of connecting people through this scene versus kind of using the seat from a place of power. You've really found a way to make this a people's -- you know, the community a space in and have been a staunch advocate for the public trust, but also holding ourselves as -- as trustees accountable and to look and innovate and continue to push, push the envelope. So I've appreciated that, and I've learned

a lot from you. And yeah, just the beginning of another story, so good luck, and we will miss you. We will miss you on this, this body.

COMMISSIONER BUCK: I wish you would replace me with someone who has a little bit of knowledge.

(Laughter.)

1.3

2.4

DEPUTY MANUEL: You know, I, unfortunately, have zero clout in that process, and so that -- you know, we -- we look forward to, you know, Dr. Miike joining the commission again and his expertise --

CHAIR CHANG: Oh, yes.

DEPUTY MANUEL: -- in this space. But again, like Commissioner Katayama said, I mean, what I've really loved is the diversity of perspectives and world views that each and every one of you bring to this space. And it really helps build the capacity of our staff and our agency, and I think we do a lot with so little and -- and build that trust over time, yeah, with community.

COMMISSIONER BUCK: Yeah, I think it'd be really -he'll be really interesting, just the history of the Water

Code, you know, what happened between '78 and '81, and how was
this established, all the different compromises and things to
make it. Because, you know, people are gonna go after the

Water Code, I think eventually because let's say in Lahaina, I
mean, we made some pretty big decisions that pissed some

```
people off, they were not ready, and yet I don't think people
 1
      realized what the Water Code was. And I think over the last
 2
 3
      eight years; we're really implementing it. We've had an
 4
      opportunity that other commissioners haven't to really
 5
      implement it for the first time over large areas. And so I
 6
      think people are now just like thinking about it and what it
      means and -- yeah. So I think he'll bring an incredibly
 8
      useful perspective because he was there, you know, during that
             I wasn't -- you know, between '78 and '81, I was here,
 9
10
      but I wasn't part of any of that process, but -- and I don't
      know if anyone's really kind of documented that, you know, all
11
12
      of the push-pull and the Homeland issues and -- Homeland, how
1.3
      did they actually come up with that because I think eventually
14
      someone needs to tell that story because it is a unique story.
15
                COMMISSIONER HANNAHS: Well, you wrote a book?
                COMMISSIONER BUCK: Yeah, but have you read the
16
17
      book?
             It's a tough read.
18
                (Laughter.)
19
                COMMISSIONER HANNAHS:
                                       It needs an executive
                summary.
20
                (Laughter.)
21
                CHAIR CHANG:
                             He will definitely add a different
22
      dynamic to this commission.
23
                COMMISSIONER BUCK:
                                    Yeah.
24
                CHAIR CHANG: We're gonna have to put a special
```

```
COMMISSIONER BUCK: Yeah.
 1
                CHAIR CHANG: -- way in the back.
 2
 3
                (Laughter.)
 4
                CHAIR CHANG: No, I -- undoubtedly, big shoes to
 5
      fill. You bring a very different perspective than he does,
 6
      but, you know, I think that is -- yeah, as you say, Wayne,
      that is the wonderful value. I mean, we were all here when we
 8
      had man boards and water commissions that were very different
 9
      composition that didn't necessarily reflect this kind of
10
      wealth of expertise and communities. So, yeah, we've come a
11
      long way.
12
                COMMISSIONER BUCK: Yeah. One other suggestion I
1.3
      forgot that because of Zoom, there should be at least -- like
14
      once every quarter that the commissioners could come together
15
      so you actually could be in the same room. Because it's so
16
      much easier to go on Zoom, we all know that, and we prefer
17
      that mostly, but especially (inaudible), it's really important
18
      for people to sit face to face.
19
                CHAIR CHANG: I think more people have been trying
20
      to make an effort, so yeah. But thank you for bringing --
21
      creating the opportunity for everybody to be here today.
2.2
                COMMISSIONER BUCK: Yeah.
23
                (Laughter.)
2.4
                CHAIR CHANG: Don't do it again.
25
                (Laughter.)
```

1	CHAIR CHANG: All right. With that being said
2	(gavel), the commission meeting is closed.
3	(The proceedings were adjourned at 12:19 p.m.)
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

	d
1	<u>CERTIFICATE</u>
2	STATE OF HAWAI'I)
3) SS. COUNTY OF MAUI)
4	
5	I, Sandra J. Gran, Certified Shorthand Reporter for
6	the State of Hawai'i, hereby certify that on June 20, 2023, at
7	9:03 a.m., the proceeding was taken down by me in machine
8	shorthand and was thereafter reduced to typewritten form under
9	my supervision; that the foregoing represents, to the best of
10	my ability, a true and correct transcript of the proceedings
11	had in the foregoing matter.
12	
13	I further certify that I am not an attorney for any
14	of the parties hereto, nor in any way concerned with the
15	cause.
16	
17	DATED this 18th day of July, 2023, in Maui, Hawai'i.
18	
19	
20	
21	Sandra l. Coro Submitted by:
22	Sandra J. Gran, RPR Kathy Goda
23	Hawai 'i CSR 424 Kathy Yoda, Secretary Pro Tem
24	M. KALEO MANUEL, Deputy Director
!	IVI. IVALLO IVIANOLL, DEPULY DIRECTO