

1 RED HILL TASK FORCE SUBGROUP MEETING # 2

2 Wednesday, November 26, 2014

3 10:02 a.m. to 12:05 p.m.

4 919 Ala Moana Boulevard, Fifth Floor

5 Honolulu, Hawaii 96814

6 * * * * *

7 MR. GILL: Good morning. It's a couple
8 minutes after 10:00 o'clock. This is Gary Gill,
9 deputy director for Department of Health, convening
10 the second subgroup meeting of the task force.
11 We'll begin with introductions around the table and
12 in the audience, and then our agenda is very
13 simple. We're going to review the draft combined
14 document with an eye towards preparing a draft for
15 final approval of the full Red Hill Task Force on
16 the 11th of December.

17 So starting on my left from the Board of
18 Water Supply, can you speak loudly so everybody can
19 hear who you are?

20 MR. LAU: Go ahead. You can start.

21 MR. KAWATA: I'm Erwin Kawata, Board of
22 Water Supply.

23 MR. LAU: Ernest Lau, Board of Water
24 Supply.

25 MR. GILL: And to my right from the Navy?

1 MR. POENTIS: Aaron Poentis from Navy
2 Region Environmental.

3 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: Mike Williamson,
4 Navy Region Hawaii.

5 MR. GILL: And EPA on the phone, who do
6 we have with us?

7 MR. LINDER: Steve Linder.

8 MR. GILL: Just you, Steve?

9 MR. LINDER: I think Rebecca Reynolds may
10 be dialing in separately a little bit later.

11 MR. GILL: Okay. Welcome.

12 Behind me in the audience, please speak
13 loudly.

14 MR. PURCELL: Dan Purcell, member of the
15 public.

16 MR. GILL: Thank you.

17 MR. WOOD: Bob Whittier, Department of
18 Health.

19 MR. CHENET: Bob Chenet, Commission on
20 Water Resource Management.

21 MR. YOSHIOKA: Wayne Yoshioka of Hawaii
22 Public Radio.

23 MS. SHIMABUKU: June Shimabuku, NAVFAC
24 Hawaii.

25 MR. CLEMENTS: Tom Clements, Navy Region

1 Hawaii.

2 LT. COMMANDER LOVGREN: Lt. Commander
3 Lovgren, FLC Pearl Harbor.

4 MR. GILL: Okay. And from my staff,
5 Solid and Hazardous Waste Branch?

6 MR. CHANG: Steve Chang, Department of
7 Health.

8 MS. PERRY: Thu Perry, Underground
9 Storage Tanks.

10 MS. KWAN: Roxanne Kwan, Underground
11 Storage Tanks.

12 MR. GILL: Okay. And that is the
13 complete list of folks we have with us in addition
14 to the court reporter helping us with the notes.

15 So just by way of introduction, I think
16 we had a real productive meeting the last time this
17 subgroup got together trying to find a way to
18 practically put together a report from the full
19 task force. The two main issues that I think we
20 resolved was that, first, we wouldn't try to
21 circulate the report for signature from all the
22 members of the task force because the particulars
23 were concerns of the timing and legal ability for
24 federal agencies to sign on with such a report
25 advising the state legislature. So we agreed that

1 we would try and combine a report and then it would
2 be submitted just under the signature of the
3 Department of Health.

4 Then, secondly, regarding the format of
5 the report, rather than trying to couple together a
6 consensus on everything in the report, we decided
7 to list the various recommendations or findings by
8 agency and identify which agency was making those
9 recommendations and not try to assert that we had
10 any kind of unanimous or consensus support on all
11 the different recommendations that were coming from
12 the different members of the task force.

13 So with that in mind, what we did is,
14 working offline over the internet, we submitted a
15 draft report trying to combine all the issues and
16 the words that were submitted by various task force
17 members into a single document. We went through a
18 couple of variations of that, and we have the
19 latest subgroup combined report dated today before
20 us.

21 We did receive a significant number of
22 suggestions from the Navy and some new language
23 from the Department of Land and Natural Resources
24 as well, additional language from the Board of
25 Water Supply. So what the Department of Health

1 staff attempted to do was to merge all of these
2 things into a single document for our review today.

3 It would be my hope that we can get close
4 to a common understanding amongst the people of
5 this subgroup and, probably with a little bit more
6 polish and refinement, be ready to have a document
7 for final review and approval by the full task
8 force in just, what is what, 10 days from now or
9 so. Just under two weeks.

10 So what I'd like to suggest we do is to
11 take the combined document. I think we're ready to
12 project it up so everyone in the audience as well
13 can see it, and try and take it not word by word,
14 but perhaps page by page and hear if there's any
15 substantive concerns. If people have simple edits
16 or technical fixes or things for clarity, rather
17 than discussing those in detail, we would like to
18 get them just submitted so we can tune up the
19 document accordingly. But if there are any
20 substantive issues, I'd like to discuss them in
21 this forum and, hopefully, decide whether to
22 include or exclude any given text or add any
23 additional clarity to this document before it is
24 refined and submitted to the full task force.

25 It looks like we're having a little --

1 MR. LAU: Technical difficulties.

2 MR. GILL: It never happens that we have
3 computer difficulties here.

4 While we're trying to get the document up
5 and projected, let me just pause and ask members of
6 the task force if you have any other suggestions on
7 how this meeting ought to go today or any
8 particular thoughts to share?

9 MR. LAU: I think what you suggested,
10 Gary, works for us.

11 MR. GILL: Okay.

12 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: Sounds good. A
13 tremendous amount of work went into this. So I
14 appreciate everybody turning and burning and
15 putting the documents together. So I think -- I'm
16 sort of reading the final draft right now, the
17 final final for the first time, but I have marked
18 up the previous version. So I see a lot of
19 improvements have been made. So I appreciate the
20 effort that's gone into this.

21 MS. KWAN: We're going to get another
22 copy. It looks like it's jumbled. I don't know
23 what happened.

24 MR. GILL: It looks we have kind of a
25 Word coding issue there, but I'm in favor of all

1 those X's on the page there. Maybe if you clicked
2 on, you know, the final document instead of all the
3 markup, but it looks like --

4 MS. KWAN: I didn't even go there.

5 MR. GILL: Okay. It looks like we have
6 an incompatibility between Word versions. So maybe
7 we can struggle through this manually.

8 Thu, could I maybe ask you to, as the
9 reviser of the document, perhaps lead us through
10 this?

11 MS. PERRY: I could give it a shot. I
12 wasn't here Monday. So Roxanne did a lot of the
13 combining and agreed to work on the different
14 sections.

15 Generally, the first page is we removed
16 the introduction of the SCR up to the front. So
17 that's how it starts, but meanwhile, the content is
18 pretty much the same. So this is just ordered.

19 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: We have no comments
20 or concerns with page 1.

21 MR. LAU: Actually, I'll give this to
22 Gary, but we can give a copy to you, Mike. But on
23 the bottom of page 1, we noted our comments in red.
24 It's just a suggestion there. Assuming that the
25 reader of the report is going to be somebody that

1 knows very little or nothing about the facility,
2 we're adding just a paragraph talking about the
3 history, a little bit of the history. The facility
4 was built between 1940 and 1943 and has a history
5 of fuel releases dating back to 1949 and
6 documenting quantities up to 1.2 million gallons at
7 the facility, including an oily waste disposal
8 site.

9 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: So I disagree with
10 that comment because if you tell part of the
11 history, you need to tell all the history;
12 otherwise, you're misinforming the readers. So I
13 think these points can be brought out Findings of
14 Fact further in the document rather than providing
15 bits and pieces of fact up-front that might mislead
16 the readers in the front end.

17 MR. LAU: No. Mike, I have a problem. I
18 think it would be good someplace to capture the
19 whole history of the facility for the reader that
20 knows nothing about it where if they were to pick
21 up the report, they would have a complete picture
22 to look at.

23 So if you can find a better place to put
24 it, Gary, then we're open to that.

25 MR. GILL: Okay. So the Board of Water

1 Supply has submitted a red-line version of the
2 subgroup combined report with a suggested inclusion
3 of just one sentence in the introduction. Why
4 don't we just accept that as a recommendation and
5 ask staff to --

6 MR. LAU: Take a look at it.

7 MR. GILL: -- take a look at it, but let
8 me make sure that -- I'm not sure that the Navy
9 would agree to the wording.

10 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: We -- I mean, right
11 up front, we took the 1940 to '43 out of that
12 section, and that was your staff put that together
13 based on our recommendation. Now the
14 recommendation is to put it back in. So I think we
15 need to have a business rule that says it was in,
16 it was out, and now it's back in again and then
17 does it go out again. I mean, what's your business
18 rule for getting resolution? Because your staff is
19 going to say, "Oh, great, I'll put it back in
20 again." So what's the business rule?

21 MR. GILL: Well, I think what I heard was
22 a suggestion that this kind of information would be
23 appropriate in a finding of fact somewhere in the
24 document, but I wasn't sure if you agreed that it
25 was an accurate finding of fact. So if the Navy's

1 okay with including this background information as
2 a finding of fact somewhere out -- somewhere other
3 than the introduction, then we can do that. If you
4 don't like the wording, then --

5 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: My issue is I want
6 to make sure it is put in context.

7 MR. LAU: Actually, there is an Appendix
8 B in the report that's entitled -- yeah, it's
9 interesting. It has a title of "DOH and BWS
10 History of Red Hill." I'm not sure why it says,
11 "DOH and BWS History."

12 MR. GILL: What page is that again?

13 MR. LAU: Page 15, Appendix B. Maybe
14 it's appropriate to expand that a little bit and
15 capture, I think, the history of the facility, when
16 it was constructed, the history of leaks, the
17 efforts in the Navy over time to improve the
18 facility. It might be a good place to kind of
19 capture in an appendix and then, in the beginning,
20 you can just make a referral back to the appendix
21 for some background on the facility. That would be
22 cleaner, I think.

23 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: I'm okay with that.

24 Where is the 1.2 million gallons coming
25 from?

1 MR. LAU: Erwin?

2 MR. KAWATA: That's been reported in the
3 past.

4 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: Where is it coming
5 from, the reference?

6 MR. KAWATA: It was reported in the past
7 in that senate hearing.

8 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: Well, I think that
9 came from --

10 MR. LAU: Department of Health.

11 MR. GILL: And as we've discussed over
12 time over the past months, you know, that number
13 came out of a Navy report with an interpreted
14 number that might be -- you know, it's hard to
15 verify. So although that number was in our
16 original slide show in the senate hearing many
17 months ago, we no longer rely on that number as
18 fact because it may have been a reporting error --

19 MR. CHANG: It's anecdotal. The
20 information was in a report regarding, I think, the
21 oily waste disposal facility, and it was a
22 statement made by -- collected from an employee and
23 there was no references, but it made reference --
24 so it's not -- there's no cooperation on that.

25 MR. LAU: So we're okay with leaving the

1 discretion of that number up to the Department of
2 Health.

3 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: Well, the number
4 should be fact; right? We should put the facts in
5 the report.

6 MR. LAU: And I guess that number came
7 out of our Navy report.

8 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: No. It came from an
9 interview.

10 MR. LAU: That is in the Navy report.

11 MR. GILL: The fact is we don't have any
12 verifiable, factual data about the total amount of
13 gallons spilled in Red Hill over the past 70 years.
14 We have lots of anecdotal information and reports
15 from the Navy gathered together with assertions or
16 estimates, and so there is really no way of tagging
17 this number accurately and verifying it.

18 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: Today, unless
19 there's some document of document study.

20 MR. LAU: Mike, I'm okay with Gary, if he
21 feels that he can't confirm that number and he
22 doesn't feel comfortable putting it in the report
23 to remove.

24 MR. GILL: Okay. Thank you. We'll say
25 lots of stuff. No, we can't say that.

1 MR. LAU: It's your discretion, Gary,
2 before you leave as deputy director.

3 MR. GILL: Okay. So thanks for page 1.
4 So I think what we'll do is, by acclimation here,
5 take this sentence that Board of Water Supply is
6 suggesting to be added, edit to remove the 1.2
7 million gallons as a number that we can't verify,
8 but take that sentence and move it back to Appendix
9 B which probably needs to be retitled just as
10 background information with the broad history of
11 the tank.

12 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: So can I ask -- can
13 I ask that that be -- if we're going to do a
14 history of Red Hill, can I ask that that be a
15 coordinated history with Lieutenant Commander
16 Lovgren involved in that as well?

17 MR. GILL: Sure.

18 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: That would be my
19 suggestion.

20 MR. LAU: That would be a good idea.

21 MR. GILL: So with that suggestion, in
22 terms of providing a final edited version for the
23 full task force, ask my staff to coordinate with
24 Navy staff and the Board of Water Supply to look
25 down this Appendix B history. I don't think it's

1 appropriately labeled to be like one department's
2 or agency's history. I think that's a carryover
3 from a previous draft. So we'll need to relabel
4 that and happily work with the Navy to put that
5 appendix together in a mutually agreeable format
6 for the final document.

7 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: Sounds good.

8 MR. GILL: Okay. So it looks like we
9 have the document up now in all of its red-lined
10 and blue-underlined version.

11 So, Roxanne or Thu, do you want to take
12 us to page 2?

13 MS. PERRY: I'm not sure this version is
14 going to be that helpful, but it's just to show
15 that we did try to incorporate verbatim as much as
16 we could.

17 MR. CHANG: So it attempts to show the
18 different contributors and their additions. So
19 different colors represent the different parties
20 that had suggestions to making changes, and then
21 you can see like I believe the blue is Navy
22 comments, and where they have made deletions of the
23 original text will show up as a blue deletion. I
24 believe the red ones are -- I'm not sure. We have
25 to check.

1 MS. PERRY: The Navy.

2 MR. CHANG: Does that say who the
3 original of that comment?

4 MS. PERRY: It doesn't show.

5 MR. CHANG: So it might be Department of
6 Health and the green comments are --

7 MS. KWAN: They're just formatting
8 changes.

9 MR. CHANG: All right. So there are
10 different colorations. So you can probably
11 identify -- if you made those suggested comments,
12 you probably can identify what color represents
13 your revisions in the document.

14 MS. PERRY: So go to the second page,
15 Roxanne. I took some liberties in adding this one
16 paragraph because it was kind of unclear -- in
17 terms of when we're talking about straight into
18 results from monitoring wells, it was very unclear.
19 So you guys can look it over. Basically, it's just
20 describing that there is a distinction between the
21 drinking water wells, Board of Water Supply, plus
22 the Red Hill Shaft in comparison to strictly
23 groundwater samples taken from monitor wells 1
24 through 5 and also the oily --

25 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: I think that's

1 helpful.

2 MR. LAU: I think the only thing I added
3 there was, Mike, I believe you folks are also
4 monitoring the seawater deep monitor well located
5 on the Halawa Correctional Facility? That data
6 gets reported?

7 MR. POENTIS: We do occasionally.

8 MR. LAU: So I wanted to add that so it's
9 clear all the monitoring points within the Navy
10 property and outside the Navy property was
11 captured.

12 MR. GILL: Okay. So Board of Water
13 Supply has suggested including language in this
14 paragraph to identify that DLNR well, which is also
15 being used as a monitoring well and is located on
16 the attached map at the end; right?

17 MR. LAU: Yes.

18 MR. GILL: So just as a background
19 factual matter, it doesn't sound like we have any
20 disagreement with that.

21 MR. LAU: Yeah.

22 MR. GILL: Okay. Thu, any other issues
23 you want to go over on page 2?

24 MS. PERRY: The rest of the page 2 is, I
25 think, mostly from Navy.

1 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: I think we're fine
2 with -- I mean, I think we're fine with what we see
3 here. Tough to piece it all together, but it's
4 okay. We're good. We're good.

5 MS. PERRY: Just email me.

6 MR. GILL: So page 3.

7 MS. PERRY: Page 3. Just a summary of
8 the task force activities, and then there's a note
9 about how Navy and EPA will not submit
10 recommendations because they're federal agencies.

11 Okay. So the nitty-gritty is just the
12 short-term effects. How did we do this? Because
13 Board of Water Supply -- wait. Wait. In the
14 findings of facts --

15 MR. LAU: Bottom of page 3.

16 MS. PERRY: -- we talk about both the
17 vapor and the groundwater monitoring results, and
18 we reference both our appendices as well as the
19 appendices that the Navy has submitted explaining
20 EALs and the Site Specific Risk Based Levels. I
21 don't know if you had time to go over that.

22 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: Can we go back up
23 one? I have a thought on that, but can we go back
24 up to page 3, third paragraph up from the bottom?
25 It says that -- sort of the middle of the paragraph

1 there, it says, "Test results of the BWS wells were
2 nondetectful of petroleum constituents." With the
3 Navy drinking water wells, there's only one well.
4 Just sort of keeping it consistent.

5 MR. POENTIS: It's actually a shaft.

6 MR. LAU: Maybe drinking water source
7 which is Red Hill Shaft.

8 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: Yeah. So I want to
9 get specific to Red Hill Shaft because I don't want
10 to mislead folks.

11 MR. LAU: It's not a well. I agree.

12 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: Okay. So Red Hill
13 Shaft. And it says, "showed detections, but all
14 under DOH environmental action levels."

15 My understanding is our shaft did not
16 test positive for petroleum constituents. It
17 tested positive for lead at a very low level, and
18 we think we understand what the reason for that is,
19 but that's not -- what I don't want to do is
20 mislead the public that we had petroleum
21 constituents in the Red Hill Shaft. That's the
22 point I'd like to make.

23 MS. PERRY: There was TPH.

24 MR. GILL: What is naphthalene? Is that
25 not a petroleum constituent?

1 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: It didn't test as a
2 result of -- there have been samples of naphthalene
3 at the edge of detection in the past, but my
4 understanding is we didn't find naphthalene in the
5 drinking water samples at the same time these
6 samples were drawn.

7 MR. CHANG: So at the tap when you do
8 your drinking water monitoring, you do not detect
9 any --

10 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: Correct. I just
11 want to make sure we're not misleading folks.

12 MS. PERRY: You're saying historically
13 versus after the release?

14 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: Correct.

15 MR. POENTIS: After the release.

16 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: If you were to say
17 historically, intermittently historically at the
18 edge of detection, I'm fine with that, but I just
19 want to make sure we don't mislead folks.

20 MR. LAU: Probably historically would be
21 more appropriate.

22 MR. GILL: Then the naphthalene hit I saw
23 was in an October report, the October prior to the
24 January release. So I don't know about all the
25 other -- I haven't looked at all the other reports,

1 but we should be clear that at least that hit of
2 naphthalene at very low levels is a historic number
3 not related directly to the January release.

4 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: That would be fair.

5 MR. LAU: Yes. I would agree
6 historically because even methylnaphthalene is
7 there in 2008 in the drinking water source.

8 MR. GILL: Okay. So staff can make those
9 clarifications. Thank you. Is that --

10 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: That satisfies my
11 concern with that one.

12 MR. GILL: -- it for page 3?

13 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: Can I ask about the
14 next paragraph down? It says we've completed the
15 groundwater sampling -- the Groundwater Protection
16 Plan for 2014. Have we completed that, an update,
17 or is that in process?

18 MR. LINDER: I'm having a hard time
19 hearing because something is, it sounds like,
20 rubbing against the phone.

21 MR. GILL: Not on our side. We hear the
22 static, Steve, but there's nothing moving or
23 rubbing here.

24 MR. CHANG: It sounds like it's coming
25 from your side.

1 MS. REYNOLDS: Sorry. I think that was
2 me. It's Rebecca.

3 MR. GILL: Oh, Rebecca, put yourself on
4 mute.

5 MS. REYNOLDS: I thought it was on mute.
6 So I apologize for that.

7 MR. GILL: Okay. So where are we on
8 this?

9 MS. PERRY: I was just saying there has
10 been a 2014 update August that we received to the
11 2008 Environmental Protection Plan. So it has been
12 updated.

13 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: So it's signed off
14 and completed, no comments? I don't know. I'm
15 asking.

16 MS. PERRY: Interim update.

17 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: There we go. So I
18 don't know if there are comments coming back from
19 that. Again, I just want to make sure it's
20 accurate.

21 MR. LAU: And, also, that 2014 report, we
22 haven't actually even seen it.

23 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: That's what I'm
24 after.

25 MR. LAU: So maybe the task force has not

1 seen --

2 MS. PERRY: So 2009.

3 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: So 2009, I think
4 you've got the interim report. Again, accuracy,
5 the interim report is available from 2014, but I
6 don't know what stage, who has to comment on it or
7 not.

8 MR. POENTIS: It has been submitted and
9 we haven't had a response.

10 MR. LAU: Just for the record, BWS hasn't
11 received a copy of that report yet from --

12 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: That would come from
13 DOH.

14 MR. LAU: -- DOH. Okay.

15 MR. GILL: Okay. So is it fair to say
16 for the document, that we should reference it as
17 we've received an interim report that's under
18 review or something?

19 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: Correct. That would
20 be more accurate.

21 MR. GILL: All right. Is that it for
22 page 3?

23 MR. LAU: Actually, top of page 3 just
24 after that sentence about the interim report from
25 2014, in 2009, in an update of this plan, there was

1 a finding of potential northwesterly flow. I'm
2 glad Bob Whittier is here because I think the memos
3 that I saw, which Bob completed while working for
4 TEC, was dated 2010, that brought up the issue of
5 the 20 -- the northwesterly flow gradient after
6 correcting the errors in the elevation.

7 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: So can I -- 'cause
8 I -- I thank you for that because I highlighted on
9 the earlier version here. My only concern with
10 that is what is the -- is that his -- and please
11 don't take this the wrong way. Is that his
12 opinion? Is that a hypothesis. Is that based on
13 hard data? I'm just looking for -- because it
14 says, "a finding of potential." So it's either a
15 finding or it's -- finding is -- in our vernacular
16 here, finding is a fact.

17 MR. LAU: Maybe then you shouldn't say
18 potential. Maybe we can just say northwesterly
19 flow gradient after there was --

20 And this is work done for you folks for
21 the Navy --

22 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: Understand.

23 MR. LAU: -- under a report that was
24 submitted to the Department of Health. But
25 correcting the elevation errors, elevation data

1 errors on the various monitor wells at different
2 locations as used to calibrate the model, it was
3 done in 2008. So after that effort, using GPS
4 technology and running levels, elevation survey in
5 the lower access tunnel, they found significant
6 errors in the elevation data which, after
7 corrected, showed that there is actually a
8 northwesterly flow gradient that could point toward
9 Halawa Shaft, which is where we became concerned.

10 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: Understand.

11 Understand. But can I ask that we go back to that
12 source document because I haven't read that source
13 document?

14 MR. LAU: Maybe Aaron is familiar with
15 it.

16 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: Whatever is in that
17 source document in terms of fact or hypothesis or
18 corrections were made to the datum which suggest,
19 again, again, I want to be factual about it.

20 MR. LAU: Since Department of Health's
21 hydrologist/geologist is here, Gary, could I pose a
22 question to Bob?

23 MR. GILL: Sure. But I get what Captain
24 Williamson is saying, though. If we're going to
25 put it in this report, we should be clear what the

1 findings are or whether it is a hypothesis.

2 So for that clarification, Bob, why don't
3 you come up so EPA can hear you as well, and maybe
4 you can just characterize what -- since you did a
5 bunch of that work, how you think it would be
6 appropriately recorded in this document or
7 described in this document.

8 MR. WHITTIER: Okay. In reference to
9 Captain Williamson's concerns, what the best GPS
10 data today shows is groundwater elevations
11 decreasing. Going from the midpoint between
12 Moanalua and Kalihi Valleys going toward Red Hill,
13 the groundwater elevations decreased. The aquifer
14 tests done in 2006 actually showed good
15 connectivity from the Red Hill Shaft all the way
16 over to that point between the Moanalua Valley and
17 Kalihi Valley. This is here in Mauna Iki
18 observation well.

19 MR. LAU: Which is located closer to our
20 Moanalua wells, actually.

21 MR. WHITTIER: Now, what is not concrete
22 is actually getting the groundwater flow direction
23 gradient because you do not have good triangulation
24 of wells, but if you have connectivity and
25 decreasing water level, that is a strong inference

1 of groundwater flow moving from southeast to
2 northwest.

3 The other thing that's not clear is there
4 is a drop, significant drop in water level between
5 the Red Hill facility and the Board of Water
6 Supply's Halawa Shaft, and we don't know that
7 degree of connectivity and that has not been tested
8 yet.

9 MR. LAU: Thus, the need for more wells
10 in the area to better define that --

11 MR. GILL: Okay. So, Bob, if you were
12 to --

13 MR. LINDER: This is Steve Linder. It
14 seems like for the purposes of this document, it
15 maybe can meet everybody's needs if it really just
16 said -- basically, essentially quotes that report,
17 identified that particular 2009 report, indicated a
18 potential northerly flow 'cause I think we all
19 realize more work needs to be done to really better
20 characterize flow directions and potential
21 magnitude of flow from the Red Hill facility
22 towards the Halawa Shaft.

23 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: And, Steve, to your
24 point, that's where I was going to go. I just --
25 my recommendation is we can reference -- you can

1 say and I think I liked your term. There's a --
2 there's a, you know, confluence of indicators that
3 suggest there may be a flow in that direction. We
4 have a report that we can reference, and further
5 work needs to be done to figure out the actual
6 flows. I think those are all accurate statements
7 that I can certainly live with.

8 MR. LAU: And, Mike, that's why the word
9 "potential" is there. It still needs to be
10 confirmed with more information.

11 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: So I would recommend
12 that we put a reference to -- maybe we have a
13 reference to that document here, and I'm fine with
14 that, but then the finding, you know, in the
15 context of this document, I just -- and I don't
16 want to get tweaked over words, but a finding is a
17 finding. So there's a -- there's a -- you know,
18 there's reason to believe.

19 MR. LAU: Actually, that section -- that
20 statement there is actually not under the findings
21 and recommendations.

22 MR. GILL: All right. Let's not get hung
23 up on the word "findings." I think we know what
24 we're talking about. The report indicates a
25 potential northwesterly flow that needs to be

1 confirmed.

2 MR. LAU: That's fine.

3 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: I'm fine with that.

4 MR. GILL: So with that suggestion, maybe
5 staff has enough to go on on the reworking of that
6 paragraph, and we can all check it before the next
7 meeting to make sure it's accurate.

8 Thanks, Bob.

9 MR. LAU: Thank you, Bob. Sorry to put
10 you on the spot.

11 MR. GILL: Okay. So does this take us
12 to -- everybody's looking at different marked-up
13 versions. So I don't know if we can go page by
14 page.

15 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: No, no. I think we
16 can keep going.

17 MR. LAU: We'll follow.

18 MR. GILL: Aaron, did I sense that you
19 had something to add in?

20 MR. POENTIS: No, no. That's fine.

21 MR. GILL: So, Thu, lead us to the next
22 page.

23 MS. PERRY: The first section is findings
24 of facts for the short-term effects of the release
25 in January. It's kind of summarizing the spike in

1 groundwater monitoring as well as the soil vapor.
2 Again, we have some tables from Navy reports, and
3 then Navy also added an appendices that summarizes
4 the same type of information.

5 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: So can I back up
6 just a one step? Again, it's just for
7 clarification. If you go to page 4, the very
8 bottom of page 4, you have Findings and
9 Recommendations. I think based on how the report
10 has been put together, maybe it makes sense to have
11 findings, opinions and recommendations. So I think
12 that that offers -- you know, gives that leeway
13 between -- between recommendations and facts. If
14 you have an opinion, I think that's important for
15 folks to understand that.

16 MR. GILL: Captain, where are you
17 suggesting that that be added?

18 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: That's just sort of
19 the header right there. You see on the bottom of
20 page 4? Because now you're going to go into the
21 findings of fact, and then you have DOH and Board
22 of Water Supply recommendations, and you have Navy
23 recommendations, and you have DLNR recommendations,
24 and then you have, I presume, recommendations from
25 the task force is the flow that we've come up with.

1 But within that, the recommendations, there are
2 recommendations -- it wasn't real clear to me if
3 they're recommendations to the legislature or the
4 opinion of the stakeholder involved, and I think it
5 reads cleaner if they're opinions, and then at the
6 end of the day, they are recommendations that come
7 out of the task force to the legislature.

8 MR. LAU: If you look on page -- maybe to
9 your point, Mike, on page 8, it does say in the
10 header there for Navy recommendations and opinions
11 combined together.

12 MR. GILL: Okay. All right. So we're
13 talking about a formatting issue for clarity.

14 MS. PERRY: I don't think so. I think
15 what he's saying is that -- Captain is saying that
16 the recommendations that we have currently should
17 be opinions, should be labeled opinions?

18 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: Some of them are
19 opinions.

20 MS. PERRY: Because they're not
21 legislative?

22 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: Correct. Some of
23 them are opinions. Some of them are
24 recommendations. For the clarity of presentation,
25 I think that, you know, there's more than just

1 findings and recommendations. There are findings
2 that are opinions and there are recommendations.

3 MR. GILL: I don't object to that as a
4 format if it adds clarity. I'm not sure what we
5 would parse out of the document and label it as an
6 opinion, but I don't mind that as a concept if we
7 find things that are neither recommendations nor
8 findings.

9 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: So if I can take an
10 example -- example, one of the -- it's currently a
11 recommendation for the Navy -- in earlier versions,
12 I don't know if it still says Navy, but to graph
13 the data, and then you provide a rationale for
14 that. And I -- so is that a recommendation to the
15 legislature --

16 MR. GILL: No.

17 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: -- or is that an
18 opinion that you're presenting that, you know --

19 MR. LAU: Actually, that's a
20 recommendation. For ease of understanding analysis
21 of the data, then it should be graphed out and not
22 just be provided in tabular format and tables.

23 MR. GILL: But I think Mike makes a good
24 point and I agree. As I read through this, not all
25 of the recommendations in here are recommendations

1 to the legislature. In the earlier draft, we had a
2 bunch of recommendations, and the last section was
3 recommendations to the legislature. So, you know,
4 I'm happy with making that -- making it clear in
5 each case where there's a recommendation that who's
6 making the recommendation and to whom the
7 recommendation is directed should be clear; right?

8 MR. LAU: Maybe we can --

9 MR. GILL: If it's the Board of Water
10 Supply's recommendation that the Navy do something,
11 that doesn't necessarily fall under a
12 recommendation to the legislature and it should be
13 called out separately. I don't know if I would
14 call that an opinion, though, because that's an
15 action item, a recommended action.

16 MR. LAU: Yeah. I think as we go through
17 this, maybe with the opinions versus
18 recommendations, we can note down which one might
19 be an opinion as opposed to recommendation.

20 MR. GILL: I might want to call it
21 comments instead of opinions.

22 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: I'm fine with that.
23 I think it's not -- it's in-between.

24 MR. LAU: Yeah.

25 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: So when we hand the

1 document over to the legislature, what are they
2 going to act upon?

3 MR. GILL: Right. So we could have --
4 for example, if we're going to follow that
5 structure of the document, we could have a finding
6 of a fact, and the Board of Water Supply might have
7 a comment on it and the Navy might have a different
8 comment on it, and we should collect all those
9 comments and say -- you know, show that there's
10 different comments on this finding or different
11 recommendations.

12 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: And then at the end
13 of that comes the recommendations.

14 MR. GILL: Okay.

15 MR. LAU: I guess I can live with the
16 word "comment."

17 MR. GILL: Okay. Yet another task for
18 our wordsmiths in DOH to try to piece this thing
19 together, but I think that's a valid concern. We
20 can attempt to do that. Thu doesn't look happy.

21 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: I mean, you almost
22 have it in that format already.

23 MR. GILL: It's just headings and
24 subheadings, basically.

25 MS. PERRY: So in the section previous to

1 that, though, in the summary of short-term and
2 long-term results -- effects.

3 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: I don't think that
4 applies. I think it applies under 1, 2, 3 and 4 is
5 where, I think, that construct applies.

6 MR. CHANG: We went through all this
7 process. Should we call it opinions? Shall we
8 call it comments? We had the same issues you've
9 had because there are so many different things
10 going on in the document. So we can finally agree
11 here that we can go back and fix it up.

12 MR. GILL: Okay. So we'll try that. In
13 the next draft, we'll have --

14 MR. LAU: We'll leave it up to you.

15 MR. GILL: In the next section, there
16 will be findings, comments and recommendations. In
17 each of those recommendations, we should make sure
18 it's clear as to who's making the recommendation
19 and to whom the recommendation is directed because
20 they're not all going to be --

21 MR. LAU: Navy, Department of Health,
22 legislature, EPA, whoever.

23 MR. CHANG: So would it be easier to say
24 that we would have recommendations to the Navy, and
25 under that, we would have Board of Water Supply,

1 Department of Health, Department of Natural
2 Resources, then recommendations -- I think --

3 MR. GILL: You're going to have to play
4 with it and see what makes sense.

5 MR. LAU: Yeah.

6 MR. CHANG: But if you can like that, who
7 you want to address the recommendations to, that
8 would help us.

9 MR. GILL: All right. What page are we
10 on?

11 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: Page 5.

12 MR. GILL: Page 5?

13 MS. PERRY: So everybody is okay with
14 that short-term, long-term fix?

15 MR. LAU: Yeah. Actually, we had some
16 suggestions on maybe about three of the bullets
17 there.

18 MS. PERRY: Oh, the comments?

19 MR. LAU: Comments, recommendations,
20 findings. "DOH and BWS Recommendations." Bottom
21 of page 5, first one says, "Strengthen Hawaii's
22 groundwater protection program," et cetera, and I
23 just wanted to actually add there as kind of a
24 background reason of why do you want to strengthen
25 the protection program? At this time there are 46

1 such facilities statewide with Red Hill being the
2 largest in the state and the United States.

3 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: Where is that?

4 MR. LAU: It's the third bullet from the
5 bottom of page 5. Third bullet from the bottom of
6 page 5.

7 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: You're working on
8 this or you're working on --

9 MR. LAU: I'm sorry. So look at this
10 version without my markups. I had given my
11 red-lined version too, Mike. So third bullet,
12 yeah, sort of around the middle of page 5 for the
13 public.

14 MR. KAWATA: Fourth bullet.

15 MR. LAU: I'm sorry. The fourth bullet,
16 it begins with, "Strengthen Hawaii's groundwater
17 protection program," and my suggestion there was
18 just to add that last sentence just to put it in
19 context.

20 Then the next bullet, Navy -- begins
21 with, "Navy and Department of Health, Safe Drinking
22 Water Branch. "It's sampling and this is maybe
23 redundant. I think it's covered elsewhere. It's
24 just a sampling, testing, quality assurance and
25 quality control should be developed and adhered to.

1 This is sampling testing from the various
2 monitoring wells that are used to test for
3 petroleum constituents or other contaminants. In
4 particular, this relates to maintaining as an
5 example, limits of detection, maintaining
6 consistent limits of detection that doesn't vary
7 over time as we've seen with some of the data. So
8 going forward, we're suggesting that this program
9 be held to ensure that all data is good and can be
10 useful to the task force.

11 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: So can I make two
12 comments on this?

13 MR. LAU: Yeah.

14 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: One is at this time,
15 there are 46 such facilities statewide. I sort
16 of -- I saw the 46 and I've seen where the 46 is
17 referenced through the document. I'd like to make
18 a recommendation that you add an appendix that
19 lists the 46 and puts the current status of the 46,
20 and then identifies if those 46 are in the vicinity
21 of a drinking water source or aquifer. By throwing
22 46 out there, my concern is it's alarmist and
23 they're not -- and some of these tanks are not in
24 use. So I think that cataloguing that and then
25 referencing that in an appendix, I think, will be

1 helpful.

2 MR. GILL: I think that's a great idea.
3 Do we have that data?

4 MS. PERRY: Yes.

5 MR. GILL: We can name them and locate
6 them? We're not going to run into some top-secret
7 military operation?

8 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: No, no, no.

9 MR. POENTIS: I think we provided that
10 information with a map to DOH.

11 MR. GILL: So that suggestion is to
12 incorporate another appendix to identify the
13 location and status of the 46 field-constructed
14 underground storage tanks?

15 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: Yeah, and then you
16 can say, you know, we recommend you study that list
17 and strengthen the program accordingly.

18 MR. LAU: I think from there is more of a
19 broader study for source water protection --

20 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: Sure.

21 MR. LAU: -- and protection of the
22 environment. So I'm okay with that change.

23 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: Okay. The second
24 one, the sampling and quality assurance and quality
25 control, it seems to me and it makes sense to you

1 putting this in here because you haven't seen the
2 Groundwater Protection Plan, but it seems to me
3 that that would be spelled out in the Groundwater
4 Protection Plan.

5 MR. LAU: Actually, Mike, we're looking
6 at actual quarterly data that's being provided to
7 the Department of Health that we've gotten copies,
8 and we noticed that the limits of detection is,
9 basically, what the laboratory is -- the lowest
10 level that the lab can detect --

11 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: Is capable.

12 MR. LAU: -- in an item or constituent or
13 chemical, and it seems that that lowest level of
14 detection varies at different -- for different
15 locations.

16 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: Laboratories'
17 capabilities.

18 MR. LAU: We don't know why, but we think
19 at least for BWS, when we test for contaminants,
20 that we maintain the same level of limits of
21 detection or lowest level that we can detect in a
22 chemical lab, and we keep it consistent until the
23 industry gets -- the instrumentation gets more
24 sensitive, and over time that level goes down and
25 down, but we try to create a consistency across all

1 our wells. So the recommendation here is that for
2 your wells, your monitoring points, that you also
3 do that. We can't do anything about the past data.
4 Past data is past data, but going forward, because
5 this is going to be a long-term effort among
6 ourselves, that the data be very consistent.

7 MR. POENTIS: The method that we use is
8 unchanged. Those are just qualifiers that are
9 basically the limitations of the laboratory
10 technician at the time of the analysis.

11 MR. LAU: Yeah. The only thing is for us
12 from the drinking water side perspective, not the
13 UST perspective, a detection is a detection. We
14 want to know if we're going to detect naphthalene
15 at a very low level, even just above the level of
16 detection for the instruments that the lab uses.

17 Maybe I can let Erwin explain a little
18 bit better where I'm coming from with this. He's
19 our water quality guy.

20 MR. KAWATA: Well, all our test methods
21 have specific limits of detection that you have to
22 be able to achieve regardless of who it is. It's
23 specified in the method. So if you have specific
24 method and you're using it, that laboratory should
25 be able to perform to the method specification. So

1 if you have and using a specific method, you
2 shouldn't see variation in your limits of
3 detection, but the data shows differences. It will
4 go up and down. It will change with the same test
5 method. So, again, what happened in the past
6 happened in the past. It's just that if you're
7 using a specific method, that method specifies what
8 your performance and sensitivities should be. The
9 laboratory should be able to, essentially, perform
10 at that level, at a specified method, and should be
11 able to report it continuously going forward.

12 MR. POENTIS: Are you speaking of the
13 drinking water sampling results or the groundwater
14 sampling results?

15 MR. KAWATA: Both. Both.

16 MR. POENTIS: Because we use the EPA
17 methods that are specified by the --

18 MR. KAWATA: I'm just reporting to you
19 what we saw in the data.

20 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: Okay. But you've
21 got to give him a chance to explain; right?
22 Because we want to understand.

23 MR. POENTIS: So we used a certified lab,
24 an EPA certified laboratory that's done by
25 contract, and the data of that report is that is

1 what is received by the laboratory. Sometimes the
2 detection limits for that particular test, on that
3 particular sample, they have qualifiers.

4 MR. KAWATA: I'm just reporting to you
5 what I saw.

6 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: Can I ask Steve
7 Linder, are you following this conversation? Can I
8 ask your thought on this from an EPA perspective?

9 MR. LINDER: I'm sort of following it.
10 So the question is, essentially, what gets reported
11 in terms of method detection limits?

12 MR. GILL: I think the overall question,
13 Steve, is what is the appropriate quality
14 assurance/quality control procedure that ought to
15 be followed for sampling both the drinking water
16 well and the groundwater monitoring wells?

17 MR. LINDER: Right. Well, a lot of times
18 what I see happen is the detection limits can be
19 significantly different for monitoring wells
20 compared to drinking water wells because if a lab
21 believes that they're going to have significant
22 contamination in a sample, they will dilute that
23 sample in order to essentially not have to go
24 through a process of recalibrating their equipment.
25 So sometimes that dilution will give a higher

1 detection limit on a monitoring well than a
2 drinking water well.

3 What I historically typically like to
4 see, especially for drinking water wells where
5 you're interested in the lowest possible detection
6 technically available, is basically shoot for that
7 and the same for any kind of wells that are being
8 used as kind of early detection of movement of
9 contamination. So wells that are typically clean,
10 you want to, basically, not dilute the samples and,
11 basically, use best available technology to get the
12 lowest possible detection limit.

13 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: Steve, can I --
14 Steve, does it make sense then to have that sort of
15 spelled out in our Groundwater Protection Plan that
16 we're revising right now that says interim
17 revision? Should that be spelled out in that plan
18 that says here's the testing protocol that we
19 expect from you for your groundwater monitoring
20 wells? So we have consistency and so at Board of
21 Water Supply, we're not dancing all over. The same
22 sample methodology is used, and whatever the
23 dilution and the technical aspects of that are,
24 and then we -- and then for our drinking water
25 well, we do exactly as you just stated. Test for

1 the absolute lowest level of detection because
2 that's where -- you know, we expect that to be
3 clean and we want to make sure that's clean for
4 human consumption.

5 MR. LINDER: Right. And any kind of, you
6 know, trace amounts, to a certain degree, if you're
7 producing water, you want that kind of early
8 warning that something may be coming.

9 MR. LAU: And, Steve, this is Ernie from
10 BWS. Because we're talking about a drinking water
11 aquifer resource here, we believe that we should
12 standardize on the sampling and testing protocol,
13 and the limits of detection is just one example.
14 Even, for example, how do you draw the sample from
15 a well, monitor well, do you purge some? Do you
16 pump some? Do you bail some of those wells? I
17 just want to make sure that there's a rational plan
18 that creates consistency of process that allows the
19 data to be compared on an apples-to-apples basis.

20 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: Do you do that
21 across the state on all the monitoring wells?

22 MR. LAU: We don't do it. We only have
23 jurisdiction on our wells. I'm not sure what the
24 health department requires on other wells across
25 the state. But it's basically -- and I think the

1 Groundwater Protection Plan is probably a good
2 place to actually explicitly state the process to
3 follow and the QA/QC controls to be there to make
4 sure that the data is of high integrity. So that's
5 basically our point.

6 MR. GILL: Okay. So --

7 MR. LINDER: And, Mike, just to kind of
8 clarify a little bit what you repeated what I was
9 trying to say, the monitoring well, the ones where
10 you anticipate there being contamination, you may
11 not be able to get the same detection limits
12 because the labs, typically, if they feel like
13 they're going to have a significant contamination
14 in a sample, they'll want to dilute those samples,
15 but for the drinking water sources and any sentinel
16 well, in those situations, I think you should be
17 able to achieve that technology in terms of
18 detection limits.

19 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: Understood. It's
20 sort of -- understood.

21 MR. LINDER: Yeah. So there shouldn't be
22 diluted samples in those cases.

23 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: Sort of like
24 measuring a mile with a yard stick versus measuring
25 a mile with a micrometer. You can probably get by

1 with a yard stick with measure a mile.

2 MR. LAU: So like monitor well No. 2
3 where it's always going to be pretty high levels,
4 so no sense setting a detection level pretty low on
5 that. But if you're in an area where --

6 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: Clean.

7 MR. LAU: -- there should be no
8 contaminants there --

9 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: You want to go to
10 the highest level of detection. Understood.

11 MR. LAU: As an early warning system.

12 MR. GILL: So the point of this bullet
13 here is, however, to make sure everybody's clear on
14 the QA/QC on the methodology because we had some
15 issues early on. I think it was at the Tripler
16 well, whether it was hand-bailed or pumped and
17 things like that.

18 MR. POENTIS: And we followed the
19 guidance document provided by the Department of
20 Health.

21 MR. GILL: So whatever that is, we just
22 need to make sure it's consistent. I can't speak
23 to whatever the guidance document was that you have
24 was. But since we're looking at a pretty high
25 level of public interest in all of these samples

1 that we're taking from this point forward, I want
2 to make sure everybody's on the same page as to how
3 the samples are taken and what the methodology is
4 and the time it takes the lab and the quality
5 control. It's a big deal for the Department of
6 Health and I know for EPA because they force us to
7 do that, and we push those requirements on down to
8 the purveyors of drinking water.

9 MR. LINDER: One other thing to mention,
10 I think, also is just the whole lab selection
11 process because different commercial labs are
12 capable of different detection limits for
13 essentially the same method given their procedures
14 and equipment they have. So I think that's also
15 something that should also be covered in the plan
16 in terms of essentially what is -- you know, is
17 there going to be any process involved in selecting
18 a lab based on their capability.

19 MR. GILL: So, Steve, from the EPA's
20 perspective, do you want to add that as a note to
21 this bullet that the sampling and testing quality
22 assurance program should include lab selection?

23 MR. LINDER: I think that would be -- I
24 think that would be good because then it's pretty
25 clear what the criteria is and how it's being done.

1 I guess the Navy, is that something that, you know,
2 you could add to this into your plan?

3 MR. POENTIS: My understanding is, and
4 correct me if I'm wrong, that the laboratory,
5 especially for drinking water, has to be an EPA
6 certified laboratory. So all of our contracted
7 laboratories meet this criteria. Otherwise, they
8 wouldn't meet the requirement of the solicitation.
9 Using an EPA --

10 MR. LINDER: Well, you know, I've been
11 involved in past situations involving all certified
12 labs, all labs that didn't have any kind of
13 problems per se, but when we went out and did a lab
14 survey to figure out kind of who was capable of
15 what detection limits, certain labs were better
16 than others in terms of their technology they have,
17 equipment they have and their ability. So I think
18 that should be something everybody should at least
19 be aware of and something, at least in my past
20 experience, has been a concern on water purveyors
21 trying to make sure that, you know, the highest
22 quality labs were chosen even though they all met
23 essentially certifications.

24 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: So, Steve, Mike
25 Williamson here. Obviously, we've got to comply

1 with the Federal Acquisition Regulation, the FAR.

2 MR. LINDER: Correct.

3 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: And the FAR says we
4 need to put criteria on the street and draw
5 competition. So if we are putting in our RFPs, the
6 criteria is an EPA-certified lab, and the idea is
7 there are multiple labs that are certified, that
8 that's not good enough? We need to -- because, I
9 mean, within our regulations, that could pose a
10 problem; right? We need to drive competition?

11 MR. LINDER: Right. You could add to
12 your criteria in the future that, basically, part
13 of it is also providing that particular lab's
14 method detection limits, what they expect to
15 achieve in any kind of demonstration they're able
16 to achieve that. I've been involved in situations
17 where some labs have abilities that go down much
18 lower than others in terms of detection limits.

19 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: Got it. Okay.

20 MR. LINDER: And I've been involved in
21 situations where responsible parties have wanted to
22 negotiate high detection limits in order to be able
23 to say things are nondetected --

24 MR. LAU: I don't think the Navy wants to
25 do that.

1 MR. LINDER: The goal is to see,
2 essentially, clean samples, but it's typically in a
3 water purveyor's best interest to even find trace
4 amounts of contamination because it gives them
5 indication of potential future movement of
6 contaminants.

7 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: Okay. So if we
8 spell this out in the -- my recommendation again,
9 if we spell this out in the Groundwater Protection
10 Plan and then we could use the requirements out of
11 the Groundwater Protection Plan as a basis for our
12 solicitation, I think that we can achieve this
13 objective and satisfy all concerned.

14 MR. GILL: Erwin?

15 MR. KAWATA: Mike, if I may, to Steve's
16 point, we have also found the same experience where
17 labs have been certified, but we find different
18 levels of performance. So, yes, we use the same
19 criteria Aaron does that we say the lab must be
20 certified for drinking water, but I have also an
21 additional set of performance criteria that I put
22 in my specifications that we actually put out for
23 the bidding process.

24 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: Sure. That makes
25 sense.

1 MR. KAWATA: I just wanted to add that.
2 So I do have some myself and we put it out there.

3 MR. GILL: So that was discussion on the
4 red-lined edition in the Board of Water Supply's
5 version to add some clarification or additional
6 detail on the sampling and testing, quality
7 assurance/quality control plan that needs to be
8 developed. We had a good discussion on that. I
9 think maybe staff has enough to go with the Navy's
10 recommendation that these things be incorporated
11 into the --

12 MS. PERRY: Groundwater Protection.

13 MR. GILL: -- Groundwater --
14 What's the name of it?

15 MS. PERRY: Protection Plan.

16 MR. GILL: Protection Plan. Okay.

17 MR. CHANG: I might suggest that maybe
18 true chemists get involved in this and what can be
19 done because --

20 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: Sure.

21 MR. CHANG: -- we're at that higher level
22 and getting into the weeds of actual chemistry, I'm
23 not saying Erwin is very expert at this, but we
24 don't necessarily have the chemists from the Navy
25 side or maybe from the other agencies. So that

1 might be some ongoing discussions as we go back and
2 look at the Groundwater Protection Plan and
3 sampling.

4 MR. GILL: So suffice it to say for the
5 benefit of the audience and those of us who are
6 nonchemists and technicians in the room, when we're
7 dealing with such minute traces of chemicals, it's
8 really important to have a consistent quality
9 assurance/quality control methodology to assure
10 that when we're finding a few parts per million or
11 billion or trillion, that it's -- you know, that
12 the data is usable, and that there's a lot of
13 science and methodology that must be adhered to in
14 order to get usable data at these trace levels.

15 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: Can I -- because
16 I've lost track of where we were in the document,
17 can we go back just for a quick second? "Findings
18 of Fact, short-term Effects." You went past it.
19 Go down a little bit. Keep going down a little
20 bit.

21 MS. KWAN: This is the long-term effects?

22 MR. POENTIS: Short-term.

23 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: I'm sorry.
24 Short-term. I saw "term." Go back up to
25 "short-term effects." Sorry. There you go.

1 Just trying to understand. A little
2 confusing there, that first -- it looks like the
3 top part of that first paragraph, it says,
4 "Groundwater monitoring in well 2, located near
5 tank 5, showed an increase in total petroleum
6 hydrocarbons TPH(d) of up to 5,000 parts per
7 billion, 500 parts billion higher than the site
8 specific risk based EAL approved by DOH and -- and
9 upwards of 50 times DOH EAL 500 --"

10 So I'm confused over that terminology
11 there. So my suggestion is it's a finding of fact
12 that 500 parts per billion was found there, and
13 it's 500 over the site specific EAL. That's a
14 fact. I don't know about that second part. I
15 would recommend striking that.

16 MR. GILL: Okay. Let's just take that
17 comment. I think it was staff's attempt to say
18 something.

19 MR. CHANG: There were two different
20 things in there, and we tried to combine it and we
21 gave up and said we'll throw it out there and see
22 if anybody figures it out. So, yeah, there's a
23 site specific 500 PPB action level, and if it
24 exceeds that, then there is an action plan by Navy
25 to increase monitoring. And what we found is in

1 January when it hit 5,000, they went to weekly
2 monitoring, and the next week, it dropped down to
3 3,000. So it's a blip on the screen there, but it
4 showed there was a possible response from the
5 release.

6 MR. GILL: But it looks like that
7 sentence needs to be broken into two bits.

8 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: I'm fine with
9 leaving 5,000 up there. I'd recommend striking the
10 50 times because that's redundant. That's my view.
11 I think that's actually a drinking water EAL;
12 right?

13 MR. CHANG: It's a contamination --

14 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: It's not a site
15 specific EAL?

16 MR. CHANG: That's correct. It's not a
17 site specific.

18 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: And we're working
19 under the premise of site specific for these
20 watering wells. We've agreed to under our
21 groundwater monitoring plan.

22 MR. LAU: Steve, there's also a reference
23 in Appendix C to the SSB -- SSRBL. So you might
24 want to look there to see if you want to make some
25 clarification there and make a reference pointing

1 back to it.

2 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: I think spelling out
3 the site specific in the appendix --

4 MR. LAU: Explaining what that is. It's
5 a little confusing right now.

6 MR. GILL: So we'll take that general
7 comment that that section needs to be clarified.
8 We'll take another crack at it and refer to, if
9 necessary, to attachments and charts because it is
10 hard to follow will from a lay perspective. So
11 we're on to page 6? Is that where we are?

12 MS. PERRY: Yes.

13 MR. GILL: Thu or Roxanne, do you want
14 to --

15 MS. PERRY: So last meeting, Board of
16 Water Supply submitted some additional
17 recommendations that we took verbatim cut and paste
18 to this section which we will rename "Further
19 Comments by BWS."

20 MR. LAU: "BWS Comments."

21 MS. PERRY: Any objections to part of
22 that?

23 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: My only comment is I
24 think it would be helpful if it's in a consistent
25 format. So we've got -- I mean, you've got

1 additional layers in here. I understand.

2 MR. LAU: She just cut and paste. So
3 we're okay, Thu, if you want to reformat to be more
4 consistent with the rest of the document, but
5 please try to keep the content similar, but do your
6 best.

7 MS. PERRY: Navy comments were from --

8 MR. GILL: Are you on the section where
9 it now says, "Navy Recommendations and Opinions?"

10 MS. PERRY: Yes. I've already striked
11 that.

12 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: How about Navy
13 Comments? Navy Comments? And so we don't have
14 anything at the end of one in terms of task force
15 recommendations coming on this. Should there be
16 task force recommendations that come out of --

17 MR. GILL: So by that, you mean
18 recommendations for -- that are agreed upon by all
19 members of the task force?

20 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: (Nodding head.)

21 MR. GILL: I don't know that we have
22 recommendations that are specific that are agreed
23 to.

24 MS. PERRY: I think we all agree there
25 should be additional groundwater wells.

1 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: We agree, I think,
2 that additional -- that additional groundwater
3 monitoring wells should be installed based on the
4 further assessment of datums and all the work we're
5 doing. So we're not saying we don't need to put
6 more in, but I think we can find some common ground
7 that additional groundwater monitoring wells be
8 considered based on the science -- based on
9 science. I mean, you can change the wording around
10 on that a little bit.

11 MR. LAU: I think we're fine with that.
12 There may be some references in other parts of the
13 report about additional wells. I thought there was
14 another section and that might be under the
15 long-term.

16 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: But that second --
17 you got long-term. So to wrap up No. 1, I'm just
18 thinking of a cleaner document and say right there,
19 here's where the task force agrees and everything
20 else can be left to, you know, we either don't
21 agree or we somewhat agree, but here's no kidding
22 what the legislature can act on because we agree on
23 this.

24 MR. LAU: It could be simply stated "task
25 force recommendations."

1 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: It could be, but the
2 concept with the underlying premise would be we all
3 agree on that.

4 MR. LAU: Task force recommendations
5 where we agree.

6 MR. GILL: So let's -- for staff's
7 purposes, let's go ahead and format the document in
8 that way so that under each of the sections that
9 the legislature has asked us to respond to, we
10 would have, in effect, consensus recommendations.
11 They may be more generally stated than the details
12 of any individual agency recommendation, but if we
13 can all agree we've got to do more monitoring
14 wells, let's just lay that out in simple form.

15 MR. LAU: And if we don't have agreement,
16 that can be captured under DOH recommendations --

17 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: Exactly.

18 MR. LAU: -- or comments.

19 MR. GILL: I think that's a good
20 suggestion. So staff will do that.

21 Does that get us on to the next page?
22 I'm getting my exercise switching glasses.

23 MR. LAU: Just go to bifocals.

24 MS. PERRY: No 2, response strategies to
25 mitigate the effects of future releases at Red

1 Hill.

2 MR. GILL: Okay. So this is point 2 of
3 the legislative mandate that we have, and we
4 have -- on the circulated draft, we're pretty much
5 on page 7; right?

6 MS. PERRY: Yes.

7 MR. GILL: Findings of fact regarding the
8 response strategies to mitigate effects of future
9 leaks.

10 MR. POENTIS: Gary, can we go back a
11 little bit? I'm really sorry.

12 MR. GILL: How far back do you want to
13 go?

14 MR. POENTIS: It talks about the
15 long-term effects, the Department of Health and
16 Board of Water Supply recommendations. It's the
17 second-to-the-last bullet.

18 MR. GILL: Okay. "Navy should mitigate
19 existing contamination," that bullet?

20 MR. POENTIS: Right. And I want to have
21 a discussion to make the argument that, you know,
22 should mitigate where it's appropriate. I mean, if
23 the existing monitoring system, whatever that comes
24 out to be in the future, doesn't show impacts to
25 drinking water sources, you know, we wouldn't

1 advocate, as in the past, mitigate contamination
2 where it's not necessary.

3 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: So if it's going to
4 attenuate or it's not -- I mean, it's not -- if it
5 will naturally degrade or attenuate over time and
6 not impact the groundwater source, should we spend
7 millions of taxpayer dollars going and trying to
8 remediate?

9 MR. GILL: Okay. I get your point. A
10 natural attenuation is an approved mitigation
11 strategy. If you want to reference that, you know,
12 that would be appropriate to me. I mean --

13 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: Well, you all put
14 that comment in. So is your intent that we could
15 actively pursue mitigation or --

16 I mean, just again making it clear
17 because a layman won't know that. The layperson
18 won't know that.

19 MR. LAU: I guess we could call this a
20 comment for us then.

21 MR. CHANG: So in the first bullet, we do
22 make the general reference to the maximum extent
23 practical, which applies to the situations that we
24 will have to evaluate the ability or, in most of
25 these recommendations, it really comes down to the

1 fact that is it practical to pursue? So would it
2 be sufficient that we already have captured it in
3 the first bullet?

4 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: Maybe we just ask is
5 that redundant? Again, does that confuse the
6 reader?

7 MR. LAU: Well, I think we -- if we use
8 the word "comments," then we separate things that
9 are comments; that this is our opinion or comment
10 on this. I'm a little nervous about saying where
11 appropriate that we're already starting to qualify
12 things without actually knowing what the extent and
13 nature of the contamination is. It seems like
14 that's why the -- and I consistently pushed
15 characterization determining what's there, and then
16 we can figure out what to do.

17 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: And I think we
18 agree. We agree completely on that front. Maybe
19 said in another way to address Aaron's concern and
20 our concern --

21 MR. LAU: Think about how to rephrase it.

22 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: How to rephrase it
23 to achieve that objective.

24 MR. LAU: I guess it comes back to the
25 principle of you have a pristine groundwater

1 resource. Do you allow the resource to stay
2 contaminated because it's not going to migrate or
3 the data or the models don't show migration toward
4 a drinking water source, but the resources are
5 compromised in that location? It's sort of in
6 principle, what do you do here? You know, Mike, I
7 think from our point of view is prevention is
8 always better than reaction. If you have a
9 pristine resource, don't let it get contaminated to
10 begin with.

11 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: So along those lines
12 and my understanding is that Groundwater Protection
13 Plan is put in place. So we put monitoring wells
14 so we see if something is moving in the direction
15 of our pristine drinking -- our pristine sources,
16 and that there are action levels that if we -- if
17 we see detection -- if we detect at levels, we then
18 take action, and that action would be to pump or
19 treat; it would be to bioremediate; it would be
20 to --

21 MR. LAU: Vapor extraction.

22 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: Exactly. Whatever
23 it is, but I think that that's sort of the intent
24 of the groundwater monitoring plan as a layer of
25 defense for our drinking water sources and other

1 pristine areas of the aquifer.

2 MR. LAU: You know, we're probably going
3 to have to come out with a protection plan or
4 remediation plan at some point once we know the
5 extent of the contamination and movement. The
6 drinking water wells being one component,
7 definitely from our perspective as a stakeholder,
8 representing our community for drinking water.
9 Effects of our drinking water wells is primary.
10 But do you allow the contamination to exist there
11 and possibly make it at some point into the
12 environment with the groundwater flow? So I don't
13 know.

14 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: Should we ask Steve?

15 MR. LAU: I think we should -- I'm okay
16 with letting the Department of Health take this and
17 see how they can wordsmith it to address it --
18 they've heard your concerns; they've heard my
19 concerns -- and come out with a revised version.

20 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: Fair enough.

21 MR. GILL: I think that one thing that
22 Steve Chang suggested is you can just take the
23 maximum extent practicable language and insert it
24 in there. I don't think anybody in the Board of
25 Water Supply wants to spend millions of dollars

1 going after one part per trillion if it's going to
2 decay in six months and not go anywhere and hurt
3 anything.

4 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: They understand
5 that. We understand that, but the readers might
6 not understand that. So if we can put something
7 like that in, that would be -- I'm fine with that.

8 MR. LAU: I think what you're asking from
9 Mike is a little bit of a qualifier there in that
10 recommendation. So we're open to DOH coming up
11 with something.

12 MR. GILL: Okay. Let's move on to where
13 we were which is, I think, page 6 or 7 on the
14 circulated draft. Roxanne? I think it's page 7,
15 Regular Maintenance, Finding of Facts, Regular
16 Maintenance. It looks like Board of Water Supply
17 had some suggestions in their red-lined version
18 here.

19 Ernie, do you want to go over those?

20 MR. LAU: Yeah, just real quickly. After
21 that first introductory paragraph, it starts, "Red
22 Hill facility consists of field constructed USTs."
23 It mentions something about currently deferred from
24 other federal or state regs. I know in our
25 presentations, we use a list, I think, of 10

1 different items for clarity for the reader here.
2 Maybe a list of that 10 items and indicate which
3 ones are deferred for field constructed --

4 MR. GILL: That's one of our standard
5 PowerPoint slides. So you're just suggesting to
6 incorporate that?

7 MR. LAU: Just for clarity so the reader
8 can understand, well, what was deferred.

9 MR. POENTIS: And I'm glad you said that
10 because that is an important distinction. I don't
11 think we're deferred from the rules. We still have
12 to comply, but there are certain aspects of the
13 rule that are not applicable.

14 MR. LAU: Not all 10.

15 MR. POENTIS: Correct.

16 MR. KAWATA: If we put it in the
17 appendix, it summarizes the regulations covering --

18 MR. GILL: The PowerPoint slide and the
19 appendix to reference it. That's fine. Okay.

20 Ernie, you had more?

21 MR. LAU: Okay. Going down and skip the
22 second paragraph, the third paragraph, "Recent
23 maintenance cycles of --"

24 I think this was put in by the health
25 department. API procedure developed by the Navy is

1 our suggestion there. Then after the sentence,
2 "According to the Navy, the goal of the tank
3 maintenance is to have at least .1 inches of steel
4 plate remaining at the end of the 20-year
5 operational cycle," our suggestion there is the
6 original steel plate installed in 1940 to '43 were
7 .5 inches and .25 inches thick for the tank bottom
8 and walls, including the top perspective. Just
9 to say, okay, it's .1 inches, but what was it when
10 it was originally installed, and I think it was
11 either a half an inch or a quarter inch.

12 Then the last sentence of that paragraph,
13 "The required thickness was restored through
14 additional weld plates -- weld patch plating within
15 tank 5," thinning of the steel plate over time was
16 due to corrosion. Just a simple statement.

17 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: Okay. Couple
18 concerns with this. "According to the Navy, the
19 goal of tank maintenance is to have at least .1
20 inches of steel plate remaining at the end of the
21 20-year operational cycle." So that's not to say
22 it was .1 inches today. It's to say that based on
23 the corrosion, degradation occurs, and the
24 corrosion rate, that it will thin to that point
25 over the course of the next 20 years. I think that

1 the original plate thickness is .25 inches. Fine.

2 MR. LAU: That's on the walls and the
3 dome at the top?

4 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: Yes.

5 MR. LAU: But the bottom is .5?

6 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: I don't know.

7 LT. COMMANDER LOVGREN: .25 all the way
8 around.

9 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: It's .25 all the way
10 around.

11 MR. LAU: Oh, all the way around? Even
12 the bottom is .25?

13 MR. KAWATA: I thought the bottom is
14 thicker.

15 LT. COMMANDER LOVGREN: Yes. We got
16 historical documents that do relate that, but,
17 again, what we're saying is the .5 that you see is
18 there's a reference to another document, and I want
19 to find the original document before I can approve
20 that. Does that make sense?

21 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: We just drilled some
22 holes in the tank --

23 LT. COMMANDER LOVGREN: We can even have
24 further proof that --

25 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: -- that you're going

1 to go out and take a look at.

2 LT. COMMANDER LOVGREN: It's at least the
3 a minimum of a .25.

4 MR. LAU: To be factual, minimum .25?

5 LT. COMMANDER LOVGREN: Correct.

6 MR. GILL: So we can't confirm -- just
7 point of the record here, the Navy is not able to
8 confirm right now that the bottom of the tanks
9 originally installed were half-inch steel.

10 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: I don't know. I
11 know the walls and -- the walls are quarter inch
12 steel. I know that for a fact.

13 MR. GILL: If you want this
14 clarification, Ernie, can we just say --

15 MR. LAU: .25.

16 MR. GILL: -- at least a quarter inch was
17 the original construction or do you just want to
18 say --

19 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: So from a -- as an
20 engineer, my concern would be the reader would say,
21 "Hey, this thing has thinned out to .1 inches over
22 70 years and it started at half an inch." It's a
23 very different scenario than starting at a quarter
24 inch and thinning down over the course of the next
25 20 years down to .1 inches. So there's a very --

1 there's a very different understanding for the
2 reader if you read this together.

3 Maybe this is better put together in the
4 history piece; right? Because you're going back to
5 the '40 to '43. You're talking about the height of
6 the tank. You're talking about the -- because --
7 and there's more to the story here because it's
8 quarter inch steel that is encased in two to four
9 feet of concrete, which we don't refer to in this
10 document. And I think that somewhere in this
11 document, we speak to the point where our
12 methodologies are all reactionary, and we only know
13 when something has gotten into the environment,
14 which isn't necessarily the case. It can be the
15 case, but is it always the case? It could be
16 caught inside that concrete encasement.

17 So I think that maybe this is best as we
18 characterize the tanks in the history piece would
19 be my recommendation. Because, again, my whole
20 goal here is to make sure we don't confuse readers
21 and somebody goes on, "I'm a mechanical engineer.
22 I'm a member of the public. If it's thinning at,
23 you know, from half inch to .1 inches over the
24 course of the first 60 years, then we have a
25 problem -- we have a serious problem in the rest of

1 our tanks." That's my concern. I just don't want
2 to convey --

3 MR. LAU: Mike, for my benefit for
4 clarification, it seems like your API 653 is really
5 focused on the steel shell in the tank and --

6 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: It is.

7 MR. LAU: -- it appears that it's looks
8 at trying to maintain a minimum wall thickness at
9 anytime of .1 inches, depending on the rate of
10 corrosion. So your tank extension is adding
11 additional steel plate for material thickness that
12 in time will also corrode because there's
13 corrosion that's going on.

14 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: May.

15 MR. LAU: By the time it reaches .1
16 inches, which will trigger another maintenance
17 requirement at that location, it will be .1 inches
18 thick as opposed to the original .25. So it's
19 really your maintenance seems to be focused on the
20 steel as opposed to maintaining the concrete behind
21 it.

22 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: Correct.

23 MR. LAU: So I guess moving into the
24 appendix sort of takes away some main points of
25 what kind of maintenance actively that you're doing

1 right now that's in the main document as opposed to
2 being buried in the appendix. So I think -- I
3 wanted to put in perspective where the original
4 tank was quarter-inch-thick steel plate, your
5 maintenance is looking at trying to maintain a
6 minimum wall thickness by .1 inches by patching in
7 time to extend the life at that location given an
8 estimator or calculated rate of corrosion on the
9 tank.

10 MR. LINDER: This is Steve Linder. You
11 know, I've got kind of one observation on this. I
12 think the thing is the corrosion rate per se, I
13 mean, it's not tremendously predictable. It's not
14 like the walls of the tanks are uniformly
15 corroding. At least that's not, at least, what I'm
16 hearing in terms of conceptually here. It's more
17 there's probably pitting and other corrosion, and
18 there are places or areas where corrosion was
19 severe enough that the wall thickness was less than
20 a 10th of an inch, which triggered the need for
21 adding these additional plates to, essentially,
22 extend the life of the tank.

23 So I don't want to -- we shouldn't leave
24 people with the impression that we can kind of
25 predict the overall rate of corrosion because I'm

1 not sure if we can.

2 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: No. You're right.
3 Again, the calculation is purely a straight line
4 calculation based on what we started with, where we
5 are today over the number of years. So it's a very
6 basic -- and that corrosion could have taken place
7 as accelerated corrosion over a period of 15 years
8 and it sort of stalled out from there. It can move
9 in that direction. So I just think that, you know,
10 getting too detailed in this area here could be
11 misleading, and it clearly is an area that we need
12 to -- that we're going to be looking at as part of
13 our ongoing coordinated effort with you and DOH in
14 December.

15 So, you know, if we want to say, hey, you
16 know, the original tanks were .25 inches. You
17 know, the API 653 process looks to provide -- to
18 address areas that might --

19 So maybe rewording this a little bit
20 more --

21 MR. LAU: Maybe even the ordering of --
22 maybe the paragraph can begin with, "The original
23 tanks were installed this. The Navy has
24 implemented and modified an API 653 process and
25 this is what the process is."

1 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: Bingo. I'm good
2 with that.

3 MR. GILL: So I think that's been a good
4 discussion. I hope staff has enough to go on. We
5 will accept the intent of the Board of Water
6 Supply's additions here and we'll rework the
7 paragraph for clarity, and we can flag that one.

8 MR. LINDER: This is Steve Linder. I've
9 got one other point related to this I'd like to
10 make.

11 MR. GILL: Okay. Steve Linder, go ahead.

12 MR. LINDER: Some of the historic
13 documents the Navy provided refer to these tanks as
14 concrete tanks with steel liners, and in other
15 places, they're steel tanks surrounded by concrete.
16 I think what we have realistically here is a
17 composite tank which is a combination of concrete
18 rebar with a steel inner shell. So I don't know
19 how the report plans to characterize it, what we
20 want to put in there as the facts in terms of
21 construction here, calling this a composite tank or
22 calling it a steel tank or a concrete tank.

23 MR. GILL: Is there a reference
24 specifically in the document, Steve, that you're
25 looking too?

1 MR. LINDER: Well, I don't have them all
2 open in front of me. Bob Pallerino has been
3 reviewing the document extensively, and that is one
4 thing he pointed out to me was some inconsistencies
5 in some of the historic documents in terms of the
6 description of the tank.

7 MR. GILL: But for the point of this task
8 force report, and I'm not sure I'm reading through
9 here how we describe the tank, but if you'd like to
10 have consistency, can I suggest concrete-lined
11 steel tank or concrete-reinforced steel tank is how
12 we should refer to it or does it matter? I mean,
13 it's a steel tank with a concrete -- three feet of
14 concrete between the steel and the bedrock.

15 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: No. I think Steve
16 brings up a good point because, again, you want
17 to --

18 MR. LINDER: What we're dealing with here
19 is a composite tank made up of concrete rebar with
20 a steel shell internal lining. But, you know,
21 again, I'm interested to hear what the Navy -- how
22 they think it's best to characterize it.

23 MR. GILL: Reinforced concrete tank with
24 steel lining.

25 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: Let me get the

1 experts to pull the same documents that
2 Mr. Pallerino is looking at and let's -- let's put
3 our eyes on and look at some of the source
4 documents and see if we can come up with a thought.
5 I think it's important and, sort of to Ernie's
6 point at the front end of this, let's describe to
7 the public the tank, the size, the orientation, you
8 know, what was originally -- the original intent of
9 the construction, how it was originally intended to
10 construct and hold fuel and describe those
11 different layers, and I think that will help down
12 through the document as well. Why don't we take a
13 stab at putting together a draft of that and
14 sending it to DOH --

15 MR. GILL: Okay. Fair enough. So we'll
16 ask the Navy to submit as soon as they can the
17 appropriate description as to how they would like
18 the construction of these tanks to be --

19 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: Well, the guys that
20 built the tanks, what was their concept, their
21 engineering concept in putting these together?

22 MR. LAU: Mike, the other aspect is I
23 know there's a lot of focus on the tanks, but you
24 folks have done quite a bit of work also on the
25 pipelines --

1 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: We have.

2 MR. LAU: -- which is a critical
3 component of this facility. You're looking for
4 doing the electromagnetics and trying to look at
5 corrosion of the pipelines.

6 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: Corrosion control,
7 yes.

8 MR. LAU: Protecting the pipeline from
9 water coming out of the tank walls and corroding
10 the pipe from the outside.

11 MR. GILL: Okay. I'm going to have to
12 exercise chair's discretion here. We've got about
13 a half hour left, and we're on page 7 of a 17-,
14 18-page document. So I want to see if we can't
15 move quickly through here.

16 Board of Water Supply has only a couple
17 more pages, I think, of significant red line
18 additions to be proposed. Let me just pause and
19 make sure I'm being fair in allocation of time.
20 Did the Navy come today with any other significant
21 suggestions for changes?

22 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: I've got lots of
23 markups. My biggest concern with the document is
24 sort of the No. 4 areas. I'd like to see if we can
25 preserve some time to talk through No. 4. I think

1 there's some wording that can be done to make that
2 more clean, a little cleaner, but right now as it's
3 written, I've got some serious concerns there. So
4 if we can dedicate some time, 10 minutes or so, to
5 talk through 4, I'd appreciate that.

6 MR. GILL: Okay. Let's see if we can get
7 there quickly. So assuming you don't have anything
8 really pending between now and section 4 of the
9 report --

10 MS. PERRY: Captain, you said you had a
11 problem with the next paragraph?

12 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: No. My issues
13 are --

14 MS. PERRY: In terms of the alarm
15 entering the environment? No alarm until
16 contamination enters the environment?

17 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: I think the
18 description of the tank helps address that. When
19 reading this, you have the impression that you have
20 a steel liner, then you have the environment, and
21 we have more than that. So I think as we --

22 MR. CHANG: As we craft that.

23 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: As we craft that, it
24 addresses that.

25 MR. GILL: Okay. So can we then go to

1 page -- are we on 8? Board of Water Supply has
2 additional recommendations on the site assessment
3 and containment plans?

4 MR. POENTIS: Contingency.

5 MR. GILL: That's the bottom of page 7 on
6 the circulated version, page 8 of the Board of
7 Water Supply.

8 MR. LAU: Actually, it's on page 8 of
9 both documents.

10 MR. GILL: Starting on page 7.

11 MR. LAU: It starts on page 7, but page 8
12 has -- it's a section entitled "DOH and BWS
13 Recommendations." First bullet begins with the
14 statement, "BWS and the public to support proposed
15 EPA regulatory changes." This is the changes to 40
16 CFR Parts 280 and 281, and I just added some
17 clarification there. The change will regulate
18 field-constructed USTs and require compliance with
19 existing release detection spill and overflow
20 control and cathodic corrosion protection
21 requirements.

22 And then the second bullet was this is --
23 I put this under DOH and BWS recommendations, but
24 it's really maybe BWS recommending to the
25 legislature to issue a resolution encouraging the

1 President to pass these proposed changes out of the
2 Office of Management Budget as originally
3 published, which was originally published back in
4 2011.

5 MR. GILL: Okay. So we can accept that
6 bullet as a BWS recommendation, and maybe we need
7 to break down that heading so it's clear what's BWS
8 and what's Department of Health.

9 MR. LAU: Of course. Unless the
10 Department of Health agrees with us.

11 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: That and a box of
12 cookies and a cup of coffee.

13 MR. CHANG: The issue is that it is at
14 OMB for review, and EPA is already noted that it
15 may change. It may pass with the removal of
16 deferrals. It's still unclear as this point in
17 time. So we have to be aware that something could
18 happen to it.

19 MR. GILL: But at least for the next
20 draft, we can incorporate that as an additional
21 suggestion from the Board of Water Supply and just
22 reflect it accordingly.

23 MR. LAU: And prior to that, under site
24 assessment and contingency plan just above there,
25 we just made the reference again to Halawa deep

1 monitor well that's being monitored. And also
2 suggest that a TAMC monitor -- the Tripler's -- the
3 Army's TAMC monitor well No. 2 might serve as a
4 sentinel well, monitoring well for any movement
5 toward our Moanalua wells. And I think those are
6 the major --

7 MR. GILL: Okay. For clarification,
8 we'll accept that for staff and work on the final
9 draft. So let me just jump ahead. If people don't
10 have -- just in interest of time, if there's no
11 substantive suggestions to our circulated draft on
12 pages 9, 10 and 11, which I don't see the Board of
13 Water Supply has any --

14 MR. LAU: Only on page 12.

15 MR. GILL: Page 12. Does the Navy have
16 anything in the next couple of pages that you
17 wanted to flag for us?

18 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: So, again, we don't
19 have consolidated recommendations coming out of 3.
20 So I don't know if we have any or not, but, again,
21 capture that under formatting piece.

22 MR. GILL: Okay. So, staff, be aware
23 that in our new formatting scheme, if we have
24 recommendations within here that everybody can
25 agree to, let's put them under the subhead of Task

1 Force Recommendations or Unanimously Agreed to
2 Recommendations or something like that. So we'll
3 take that as a formatting suggestion.

4 And then, Ernie, I think we're on your
5 page 12. You have a couple more red-lined items to
6 suggest, and then we'll take the Navy's suggestions
7 on point No. 4, Implications of Closing Red Hill.

8 MR. LAU: Okay. Looking at page 12, this
9 is actually just above the Navy recommendations and
10 opinions. BWS recommendations, one suggestion is
11 provide additional resources to DOH to adequately
12 monitor, study and regulate this facility. And the
13 second bullet actually is more probably a comment.
14 Given the age and condition of the facility with
15 its historic history of leaks dating back to at
16 least 1947 to the present, we would like the Navy
17 to disclose all studies or reports connected,
18 including possible catastrophic release scenarios
19 looked at, for example, seismic related or
20 accidents within the lower access tunnel,
21 et cetera.

22 The first bullet was to really point out
23 later on, I think, the DOH -- the legislative
24 recommendations to BWS and DOH includes the change
25 to the emergency response revolving fund that

1 receives funding from a tax of 5 percent. You want
2 to have that changed to 15 percent. That's
3 something that we didn't actually -- we're not a
4 party to that recommendation to increase the tax,
5 but we do support the concept that you need more
6 resources to help do your job here, and this Red
7 Hill situation is a very complicated issue that's
8 going to exist for probably a number of years that
9 you need more resources. How the legislature
10 provides those resources is their call, but we're
11 advocating that, yes, we agree with you that you
12 need the resources. We're not necessarily
13 advocating that it's through the tax. So I would
14 like to make that very clear.

15 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: I had as a taxpayer,
16 not as a guy wearing a uniform, but as an expender
17 of taxpayer resources, as a steward of the taxpayer
18 resources, yeah, I was thinking the same thing
19 because we make that recommendation at the tail
20 end. Well, the task force makes that
21 recommendation at the tail end, but there's no
22 reference to the requirement in the document. So I
23 think that, you know, from where I sit, my
24 recommendation would be, you know, the DOH should
25 say, hey, we know that by implementing these

1 recommendations, that additional resources in terms
2 of man years, in terms of additional staffing, you
3 know, is required and that staffing is X number of
4 work years or whatever, and 'cause I have no idea
5 if five cents on the barrel far exceeds your
6 requirement or barely covers your requirement
7 because you're just all over the map on me on that
8 one. So that's just from citizen --

9 MR. LAU: And the legislature can decide
10 to use general funds as opposed to tax --

11 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: Sure.

12 MR. GILL: I take it your point is just
13 to opine that adequate resources ought to be
14 provided to the Department of Health to continue
15 this work; right? And then we can just leave it
16 like that.

17 MR. LAU: I think you need to be a little
18 bit more explicit, Mike. Additional positions,
19 funds for consultant studies, analysis, laboratory
20 analysis costs. You need to at least kind of bound
21 it somehow.

22 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: Define the
23 requirement.

24 MR. LAU: Define it. Mike and I, we're
25 on the same page there for a change.

1 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: We're on the same
2 page on a lot of stuff, Ernie.

3 MR. GILL: So, Ernie, you have a few more
4 red-lined versions. Then I'm going to ask the Navy
5 to make their objections.

6 MR. LAU: Then under recommendations from
7 BWS and DOH, we just added some things on the first
8 bullet, field constructed tanks, construction and
9 operational history, past leaks, et cetera.

10 Then I made the second bullet on the tax
11 issue that is, clearly, DOH recommendation only.

12 MR. GILL: Yes.

13 MR. LAU: Then I added another bullet.
14 "Legislature issue a resolution continuing the work
15 of the task force until DOH is satisfied --
16 satisfied with progress and outcome on issues
17 related to the facility and will recommend
18 suspension of task force."

19 I know at one time we talked about asking
20 the legislature to extend the task force, but I
21 didn't see a recommendation in this report.

22 MR. GILL: Okay.

23 MR. LAU: I think that's it for me.

24 MR. GILL: Thank you for reading through
25 carefully and making additional recommendations.

1 Staff will try and incorporate those as we've
2 discussed, including the additional and changing
3 and formatting for clarity.

4 So, Captain Mike, you have some
5 suggestions on the same pages here?

6 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: So No. 4, findings
7 of fact, Roger, first paragraph, no comments.
8 Roger, second paragraph, no comments. Third
9 paragraph, I think those are opinions. I don't see
10 those as facts. So Department of Health does not
11 have information regarding implication. So, you
12 know, that's fine.

13 MR. GILL: That's an artifact of an early
14 draft. So let's take a look at that.

15 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: Going down and so I
16 mean, we've got that Navy views preceding sentence.
17 So that's -- you know, our defense mechanism was
18 going up, and so however you want to couch that,
19 you know, if it's an opinion, it's an opinion. We
20 can agree or disagree with that.

21 MR. GILL: It clearly needs to be
22 reworked.

23 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: The DOH and BWS
24 recommendation earlier in the document speaks to a
25 recommendation of legislature to seek secondary

1 protection to the extent practicable. I mean,
2 there's that language earlier in the document. I
3 don't know if this first recommendation here should
4 only exist on the condition that the aging facility
5 be upgraded with secondary containment. So I
6 thought that --

7 There is reference earlier in the
8 document where the language isn't that strong to
9 the legislature. So I don't know if that -- we
10 need to take a look at that. It's not consistent
11 with what's in the document. But, again, if it's
12 your opinion, then, you know, that's fine, but just
13 looking at that for consistency purposes.

14 Then, Gary, the second bullet, again,
15 your opinion, "Navy should have facility-wide
16 secondary containment by December 31st, 2024." I
17 know the purpose of that is to help us get the
18 funds. I know that's not physically possible under
19 the current construct. We just can't move fuel
20 around fast enough to do that and get in the tanks
21 and do what needs to be done. And there was a
22 broader discussion among the task force that we
23 should put something in there that is practicable.
24 I believe and I thought the task force agreed that
25 that's not practicable to have the work done in 10

1 years.

2 So might I suggest that we replace this
3 with adopt a two-step process aggressively pursuing
4 technological solutions that allow us to improve
5 the containment of the facility, and then once upon
6 the defecation of that, the technology and a
7 feasible and practicable solution, then take that
8 second step, a trigger that causes us to come back
9 together and set the time line, set the expectation
10 for when that is implemented, I think, would be a
11 more productive way of --

12 MR. GILL: Okay. But you don't have that
13 two-phase language structured or --

14 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: Well, these are your
15 recommendations. So no.

16 MR. GILL: But if the Navy chooses -- I'd
17 love to see the Navy's recommendation in response
18 to the DOH's recommendation, and maybe we could
19 actually, through discussion, include that as a
20 consensus recommendation, but I can't do that
21 without seeing what the Navy is suggesting.

22 So the health department threw in a time
23 certain. If the Navy feels that time certain is
24 not practicable and would like to have Navy
25 recommendations on how to move forward, maybe

1 that's something we can agree to, but I think we
2 need to see how you would like to craft that
3 language for review.

4 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: Okay. We can --
5 we'll certainly take a stab at it with this sort of
6 two-step model. Let's focus on that first piece of
7 finding a solution, and then once we found a
8 solution, then let's have a reason for us to get
9 back together to settle on the expectation and the
10 implementation of that solution. I think that that
11 will be an approach that --

12 Again, Steve, you're on the phone. I
13 think that's part of the major discussion sitting
14 down when you get here in Hawaii in two weeks. So
15 maybe that's something we can flush out in sort of
16 the tail end of the document, something we can
17 flush out with our experts sitting in the room
18 between now and then and slap the table.

19 MR. GILL: Just for clarity because we
20 are on a time line with this document to the
21 legislature and as we've discussed before, there's
22 obvious intersection with the ongoing negotiations
23 between EPA, DOH and the Navy on a consent order.
24 And just because that consent order negotiations
25 may go on beyond the time line under which we have

1 to submit this document to the legislature, I'd
2 just like to throw out that we do the best we can
3 at the time we submit this document, but we should
4 maybe even reference in this document that at the
5 time when the consent agreement is finalized, that
6 that would append this document or it would -- it
7 could amend the recommendations. It could add to
8 it.

9 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: I think you could
10 weave that into this section. That would be
11 appropriate to weave into this section. And one of
12 our recommendations at the tail end is, no kidding,
13 let's get on with this AOC/SOW and legislature
14 support that and drive us to --

15 MR. LAU: Get the funding.

16 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: -- get that thing
17 put together and finalized.

18 MR. LINDER: That's a point I want to
19 make is that, really, I think one of the big
20 recommendations is, at least in our mind, that,
21 essentially, the Navy enter into an enforceable
22 agreement with DOH and EPA to carry out, I'd say,
23 the big picture, must-have issues that we're
24 looking for in terms of environmental protection at
25 Red Hill.

1 MR. GILL: Okay. So what I'm hearing is
2 maybe we need to add a reference into this section
3 that, you know, details -- specific details of this
4 entire Red Hill situation are still being worked
5 out in the consent agreement, and just this
6 document as its submitted is a representative of a
7 point in time, but that work is continuing beyond
8 the scope of this report.

9 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: And that may be a
10 great way to address that issue which will -- which
11 will develop over time based on the enforcement
12 order that we're putting in place.

13 MR. GILL: Okay. I think staff can do
14 that. I see heads nodding and look forward to the
15 language the Navy would like to submit under your
16 two-phase process of moving forward or however
17 you'd like to construct that. To the extent that
18 you'd like to have it incorporated in this
19 document, whether there's agreement on it or not,
20 it would be important to have it identified as a
21 Navy recommendation.

22 Okay. Does that bring us nearly to
23 conclusion here? We're actually on time? Are
24 there specific suggestions about any of the
25 appendices? We talked about adding a couple. The

1 10 items for field constructed and underground
2 storage tanks was one.

3 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: I think the EAL
4 action limits based on the wells, that would be
5 helpful to have.

6 MR. LAU: Site specific.

7 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: Site specific.
8 Excuse me. Thank you.

9 MR. GILL: The listing of the 46
10 underground storage tanks, field-constructed tanks
11 is an additional one.

12 Anything -- any other clarifications or
13 suggestions?

14 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: I think a reference
15 to the document that talked about -- well, that may
16 just be a reference that talked about the northerly
17 flow.

18 MR. LAU: Yeah, the April 15, 2010, memo.

19 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: Will we include that
20 memo or we'll just put a reference to that? I
21 don't know if it exists somewhere.

22 MR. POENTIS: We have it.

23 MR. LAU: I think it was submitted to the
24 Navy.

25 MR. POENTIS: It has been submitted to

1 the department.

2 MR. GILL: So let me be clear. You're
3 suggesting that memo, which I don't have in front
4 of me, be included in an appendices?

5 MR. LAU: Or basically summarizing what
6 was in that memo, which was correction of the
7 elevation datum errors which then revealed that
8 there is a gradient toward the northwest or
9 potential suspected gradient.

10 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: So I think, Gary,
11 what we're saying is if the document's posted and
12 people can get to it, then I don't think you need
13 it as an appendix as long as it's referenced, but
14 if people can't get to it and people are going to
15 look at the document, then you put some reference
16 to it in the appendix.

17 MR. GILL: Why don't we just put it in so
18 people have access to it?

19 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: Well, I don't know
20 if it's that thick or not.

21 MR. LAU: It's about 10 pages.

22 MR. POENTIS: I think you put the
23 original Groundwater Protection Plan on your
24 website. So I'm assuming that you can put the
25 appendix of this update, yeah, this update which is

1 a few pages, and then incorporate it by reference.

2 MR. LAU: So I believe the date was April
3 2010. There may have been two versions of it.

4 MR. GILL: Staff know what we're talking
5 about? Can we post that document on the website
6 and reference it in this report?

7 MS. PERRY: Roxanne, all the appendices
8 for the Groundwater Protection Plan 2008, there's a
9 whole bunch of them.

10 MR. POENTIS: But there's a 2010 update.

11 MS. PERRY: Just the update then?

12 MR. POENTIS: Yeah, because you have the
13 full document already posted on your website.

14 MS. KWAN: What was the date? April --

15 MR. LAU: April 2010.

16 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: So I recommend you
17 post it on your website and we reference it.

18 MR. LAU: Show the link.

19 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: Yeah, show the link.

20 MR. GILL: Let's make sure we can do
21 that. We'll take that as a recommendation.

22 So what I'm -- what I think we have is we
23 have some really good feedback. Obviously, the
24 draft that we discussed today needs a little bit
25 more work. We've suggested some additions and

1 clarifications and some reformatting and some
2 inclusion of additional appendices, had good
3 discussion on it. I think where we're going to go
4 now is Department of Health staff will take all
5 this discussion and recommendations and put out,
6 yet, another combined report. I think this one
7 will be draft final report for the task force, and
8 we'll try and get that out --

9 When can we get that out? How much time
10 can we give the public and the task force members
11 to read it? Can I say six days in advance of the
12 meeting so that it could be included in our notice
13 to the public? So when we post the meeting in the
14 lieutenant governor's office and on-line as we're
15 supposed to as a public meeting, the draft document
16 will be accessible to everyone at that point?

17 MS. PERRY: So we can post on the 5th.

18 MR. GILL: 5th of December?

19 MS. PERRY: Yes.

20 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: Can I make a couple
21 quick thoughts before we meet on the 11th? One is
22 before we meet on the 11th, I think it would be
23 helpful for us to sit down and review the final
24 draft. I think that would be helpful.

25 The second is could we -- if we have any

1 substantive changes that come out of this, could we
2 highlight that before we see that final draft just
3 'cause, I mean, I don't -- we've got a couple
4 things. We're doing the history. We're going to
5 tweak a couple areas. I think getting that out in
6 front so we can review that before -- before we get
7 in on the 11th and then we try and slap the table
8 and you get ready to sign, I think we have to get
9 together one more time.

10 MR. LAU: Thu can contact us.

11 MS. PERRY: I think it's okay. You said
12 you might need to post that, though. If that's the
13 case, we can post it today and the earliest would
14 be the 2nd of December we can meet.

15 MR. GILL: Okay. So the recommendation
16 is that the subgroup of the task force meet one
17 more time before the full task force meeting to go
18 over the latest draft? I don't know if that gives
19 us then time between a subgroup meeting and the
20 full task force meeting to post a final recommended
21 draft because if we meet one more time, and then
22 it's going to take a couple days or additional
23 refinements, and, you know, that might not give
24 task force members and the public a full six days
25 to review the final draft. So --

1 MR. CHANG: Last we can get it out by
2 sunshine law will be December 5th; right?

3 MS. PERRY: Correct.

4 MR. CHANG: The final draft.

5 MR. GILL: Well, we need to post notice
6 of the meeting. I don't know that, legally, we
7 need to post of the actual final document, but --

8 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: We have to get a
9 final draft so we can walk in here. I understand
10 we're moving fast. So subject to the rules.

11 MR. CHANG: I was hoping that everybody
12 would get their rewrites or the proposed language
13 or appendices changes to us by December 1st so we'd
14 have at least that day to massage it. So by
15 December 3rd, we could somehow -- I don't know how
16 we're going to meet and have any notice.

17 MR. GILL: Well, we'll have to post
18 notice today of another subgroup meeting.

19 MS. PERRY: We can post today.

20 MR. CHANG: We can post today for the
21 3rd?

22 MS. PERRY: Yes.

23 MR. GILL: All right. So I'm hearing a
24 proposal is subgroup can convene another meeting on
25 December 3rd. I haven't looked at anybody's

1 calendar. So that's Wednesday, 10:00 a.m.?

2 MS. KWAN: That's next week, Wednesday.

3 MR. GILL: A week from today. So we
4 would then have -- and then we would have to post
5 notice at latest --

6 MS. PERRY: I'm sorry. I've already
7 posted notice for the 11th. So that's already
8 done. It's just whether or not we have a document
9 to distribute.

10 MR. GILL: Okay. Then maybe a day or so
11 at the 3rd or 4th, we could circulate the final
12 final draft for the task force members for the
13 11th.

14 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: That would give us a
15 shot at signing this thing on the 11th.

16 MR. GILL: Yeah. Let's just have a
17 meeting with no discussion and I'll just say, "Here
18 it is. We'll sign it."

19 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: No. I think that
20 ought be our goal; right?

21 MR. LAU: I think we're getting close.

22 MR. GILL: And you bring the cupcakes and
23 the Board of Water Supply brings the sparkling
24 cider, and we'll have a Christmas party.

25 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: I'll bring some Red

1 Hill Shaft water.

2 MR. GILL: Excellent. Okay. So we're
3 going to recommend then we'll post the second task
4 force -- the final subgroup task force meeting for
5 December --

6 What was it?

7 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: 3rd.

8 MR. GILL: -- 3rd, Wednesday, this room
9 if we can reserve it. We'll get back to everybody.
10 The usual time. We will try and get out a new
11 draft based on today's information by Monday, so
12 people at least have a couple days to look at it
13 before the subgroup meeting.

14 MR. CHANG: Give us to Tuesday.

15 MS. PERRY: We're waiting on submittals
16 as well.

17 MR. CHANG: We're waiting on feedback.

18 MR. GILL: So one day in advance of the
19 meeting, we'll try to get out a consolidated draft.

20 MR. CHANG: So 9:00 o'clock, Monday
21 morning, get us your changes.

22 MR. POENTIS: So 9:00 o'clock, December
23 1st is when the comments are due?

24 MS. PERRY: Yes.

25 MR. GILL: We just love working, this

1 group.

2 Thank you, staff. Any -- let me just
3 post any comments from the public?

4 MR. PURCELL: Yes. Dan Purcell, member
5 of the public. I do have a comment. I think the
6 gentleman who left early mentioned that he couldn't
7 find some of the original construction docs that
8 talked about the thickness of the tank on the
9 bottom, which concerns me maybe other original
10 construction docs aren't available.

11 What comes to mind to me is Aloha Stadium
12 with some serious design flaws, dangerous design
13 flaws, and I'm concerned, you know, we've been
14 lucky so far the amount of time the tank's been
15 there. I'm wondering are we confident there are no
16 design flaws in the tank? We know what happens
17 with rebar over the years with concrete. It rusts.
18 It expands. To that point, does the Navy have the
19 ability to test for deformation of the tank and
20 also geospatial positioning and the different parts
21 of the tank? Because, you know, the islands are
22 spreading their liquid and they're slowly sinking.
23 On those points, I don't expect an answer. It's
24 something I'm concerned with, but I haven't really
25 heard addressed.

1 CAPTAIN WILLIAMSON: I think the inner
2 sleeve is designed to move and be somewhat
3 flexible, hence, the use of steel. So we have seen
4 some areas where the tanks have flexed interior.
5 There are -- means for the tanks to expand and
6 contract were designed into the tanks.

7 In terms of a fatal design flaw, I don't
8 know that we have one today, but I can tell you
9 that, you know, we've been in the tanks over the
10 years and we've removed some things, and one design
11 flaw was this telltale system that was installed in
12 the tank to help us identify if, in fact, we had
13 fuel got outside the tank in-between the steel
14 liner and the tank. That system was put in place,
15 and that system, because of the piping and the
16 water intrusion on the telltales themselves, was
17 causing accelerated corrosion. So we went in and
18 removed those because they were at risk of causing
19 the tanks to prematurely fail. So we've removed
20 that system.

21 We have installed additional valving at
22 the base of the tanks which weren't initially put
23 in the tanks to address a potential catastrophic
24 event that could occur inside that area, a seismic
25 event as an example, or something that would cause

1 the pipe at the base of the tank to shear. Now
2 we've installed valves in there, double valves, so
3 we can secure that so that we can isolate the tanks
4 individually.

5 There have been a number of improvements
6 that have been made over the years to address those
7 concerns of design flaws. So I don't think we have
8 any design flaws today that are readily apparent,
9 but, again, we're -- and that was one of the
10 reasons for taking and updating this API 653,
11 taking and adapting what we're learning on the
12 outside for above-ground tanks where the tanks are
13 meeting the ground. So taking and applying the
14 lessons we learned from the above-ground tanks to
15 the API system and then adapting what we could of
16 the API in with our tanks and then going through a
17 discipline process to upgrade those to extend them
18 out in a 20-year cycle.

19 So I think technology is keeping up with
20 us. So I think we're moving in the right
21 direction. Are we all the way there? I don't
22 think we're all the way there yet, and I think this
23 conversation we're going to have with EPA and with
24 DOH and this ongoing statement of work that we're
25 developing will get us closer to being able to say,

1 hey, we're 100 percent confident we've addressed
2 corrosion; we've addressed a policy process of
3 upgrade the tanks; we have in place the latest and
4 greatest leak detection system; we have employed
5 the latest and greatest inventory system, and we
6 all understand what that is and we're in agreement
7 or we're not in agreement and then we're addressing
8 the gaps. So I think we're making good process.

9 MR. GILL: Hold on. I'm going to have to
10 ask you to continue your discussion after the
11 meeting, but I appreciate the public comment and
12 the response and you guys can keep chatting if
13 you'd like.

14 Is there any other comment from the
15 audience at this point? Hearing none.

16 So I'd like to adjourn this meeting and
17 we will reconvene at the same time on December 3rd,
18 10:00 a.m., hopefully, in this venue. Thank you
19 all for coming and for your productive discussion
20 and looking forward to a final document on December
21 11th.

22 (Meeting adjourned at 12:05 p.m.)

23
24
25

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

C E R T I F I C A T E

STATE OF HAWAII)
) ss.
CITY AND COUNTY OF HONOLULU)

I, LAURA SAVO, a Certified Shorthand Reporter in and for the State of Hawaii, do hereby certify:

That the foregoing proceedings were taken down by me in machine shorthand at the time and place herein stated, and was thereafter reduced to typewriting under my supervision;

That the foregoing is a full, true and correct transcript of said proceedings;

I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for any of the parties to this case, nor in any way interested in the outcome hereof, and that I am not related to any of the parties hereto.

Dated this 7th day of December, 2014, in Honolulu, Hawaii.

LAURA SAVO, RPR, CSR NO. 347