

Ala Wai Watershed Project

Quarterly Stakeholder Meeting

DATE: May 1, 2009

ATTENDEES: See attached table

1. Introductions and Overview of Agenda

Cindy welcomed the group and asked each of the participants to introduce themselves. She provided an overview of the meeting agenda, explaining that in addition to an update of the project, the focus of the meeting was to discuss the stakeholder involvement strategy.

2. Project Overview

Cindy provided the group with a reminder of the project goals and objectives. She stated that the project goal is to improve the overall quality of the Ala Wai watershed, from the crest of the Ko'olau Mountains to the nearshore waters, while minimizing the risk of flood damages to the public. The project objectives are flood damage reduction, ecosystem restoration, water quality, water supply, recreation, infrastructure maintenance, and stakeholder involvement. She explained that a meeting was recently held to discuss coastal issues, and the group decided that it would be more appropriate to specifically address coastal issues as part of each of the other objectives, so it is no longer a stand-alone objective. She noted that the coastal issues objective had only recently been added to the project (the project study area had previously stopped at Kalakaua Avenue), and as such, was not reflected in the funding. As a result, there is not enough funding to develop measures specifically for the coastal area, but impacts to the coastal area will be considered as part of project development.

Cindy then explained to the group that to address the budget constraints for the project, the strategy is to focus the project on flood damage reduction, ecosystem restoration, and water quality, as these are the three objectives for which the project sponsors have the authority to address. Cindy explained that the USACE does have some limited authority relative to some of the other objectives, but given the funding limitations for this project, they will not be proposing any stand-alone measures specifically to address them. However, measures to address these other objectives will still be included as part of the plan if there are partner agencies and other stakeholders who can take a lead on developing and implementing those measures. By incorporating this information into the document, it will still allow for the watershed to be addressed in a more holistic manner, as well as increase the importance of those measures by putting them in the context of a larger watershed plan. In addition, Cindy explained that in some cases, supplemental features could be included with flood damage reduction, ecosystem restoration or water quality measures to address these objectives (e.g., a bike path along an ecosystem restoration project).

Lisa explained to the group that there are a lot of acronyms and terms that are specific to the project and the USACE process in general. To try to clarify the meaning of these acronyms and terms, a draft list of acronyms and definitions was included on the back of the agenda. Lisa explained that this is intended to be a working document, and asked the group to provide any suggestions for additional terms to be included.

To give context to the discussion, Lisa then provided a brief overview of the USACE's planning process and milestone deliverables. She described that there are four main deliverables: (1) Feasibility Scoping Meeting Report (FSMR), (2) Alternatives Formulation Briefing (AFB) Package, (3) Draft Feasibility Study and Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), and (4) Final Feasibility Study and EIS.

She explained that the FSMR (also referred to as a baseline conditions report) generally describes the existing and future-without-project conditions, provides an overview of the conceptual measures that have been or will be developed, and describes the various methodologies that will be used to develop and evaluate the alternative plans. The AFB package presents detailed descriptions of the measures and grouping of the measures into alternative plans. She explained that these two milestones serve as internal process checks, to ensure the project is in compliance with the USACE's internal guidelines and there are no flaws in the methodology. They will become the majority of the body of the draft Feasibility Study, and an accompanying EIS will be completed to evaluate the alternatives.

She explained that CH2M HILL is currently contracted to develop the FSMR, and is aiming to submit the draft to the USACE by the end of their fiscal year (September 30). She stated that according to the USACE Planning Manual ER 1105-2-100, the purpose of the FSMR is to "bring the USACE vertical team, the non-Federal Sponsor, and resource agencies together to reach agreement on the problems and solutions to be investigated during the feasibility study and the scope of analysis required." She explained that, at a minimum, the FSMR should include the following information: a detailed description of the problems and opportunities, statements of specific planning objectives and constraints, a detailed description of future without project conditions, a description of applicable management measures, the results of preliminary plan formulation and evaluation (screening), and the results of preliminary coordination and public involvement. Cindy explained that the USACE planning process does not require a public review of the document, but one could be included if warranted. She explained that the USACE was currently exploring this option. She stated that a meeting was being planned with OEQC to discuss specific state requirements, and the potential for public review would also be discussed during this meeting. Dennis stated that the meeting is currently scheduled for May 20th.

3. Update on Ala Wai Watershed Project

Lisa then provided the group with a matrix that shows the major tasks required to complete the FSMR, and identifies the specific methodologies that will be used to complete those tasks for each objective (with a focus on the three objectives for which the sponsors have a primary authority - flood damage reduction, ecosystem restoration and water quality). She explained that she would provide a status update and describe each task in more detail.

The first of the major tasks is identification of problems and development of objectives. Lisa explained that because this is a multi-objective project with many high-level objectives (e.g., flood damage reduction, ecosystem restoration, etc.), the term sub-objectives was being used to

describe the more detailed statements that would provide additional focus for each of those objectives. She stated that a lot of work had been previously conducted relative to the existing problems, but not necessarily documented to the necessary level of detail recommended by the USACE planning guidelines. The project team has been working (in coordination with the technical advisory teams [TATs]) to document the problems and, in parallel, flesh out the sub-objectives. She explained that the USACE planning guidance suggests that sub-objectives should have the following characteristics: specific, flexible (allow different ways to achieve the objective), measureable, attainable (can be challenging, but also realistic), congruent, and acceptable. Generally, the sub-objectives should avoid absolute setting targets and/or identifying solutions. Jon asked about whether or not the sub-objectives would conflict. Lisa explained that none of the sub-objectives should directly conflict, but it is acceptable to have some minor incongruencies. Cindy explained that the objectives would be weighted (e.g., human health and safety will be heavily weighted), which will help to resolve any of these incongruencies.

Lisa explained that the project team is currently working on defining all of the sub-objectives. To date, sub-objectives have been developed for the ecosystem restoration and stakeholder involvement objectives, as follows:

Ecosystem Restoration - Preserve, restore, or reverse the degradation of natural watershed function and processes, where possible, throughout the watershed, including the urban areas:

- Modify channel conditions to improve habitat and connectivity for native aquatic species
- Improve migratory pathway for native amphidromous species
- Improve floodplain functions in urbanized portion of watershed
- Reduce sediment inputs to streams, Ala Wai Canal and nearshore waters
- Increase extent and connectivity of riparian habitat

Stakeholder Involvement - Develop and implement a stakeholder collaboration process that will result in attainment of project objectives and foster a long-term sense of *kuleana* for the watershed:

- Involve many stakeholders
- Provide guidance on measures and alternatives
- Support project implementation
- Encourage private and public watershed stewardship

Lisa then described the second of the major tasks, which is documentation of the baseline conditions. She explained there were two general activities being conducted in support of this task: resource assessments and modeling. A variety of resource assessments are being conducted for the watershed, including cultural resources, biological resources, hazardous toxic and radioactive waste (HTRW), and geotechnical resources. Lisa explained that these will be screening-level assessments that will be used to identify baseline conditions and support the measure development process; more detailed assessments would be conducted following alternatives development for the purposes of the EIS. In addition, several models would be used to establish the baseline conditions for the three objectives for which the project sponsors have primary authority: (1) hydrology and hydraulics (H&H) modeling for the flood damage reduction objective, (2) ecosystem valuation modeling for the ecosystem restoration objective, and (3) WARMf for the water quality objective.

Cindy explained that the existing hydrology modeling is complete, but the existing hydraulics modeling is still being conducted; the estimated date of completion is early June. Lisa explained

that various ecosystem valuation models are being evaluated for selection, in coordination with the TAT. For the water quality monitoring, the City & County has selected WARMf for application island-wide. The project team is currently evaluating the data input requirements; the USACE will be performing the modeling. Jon asked if the results of the hydrology and hydraulics modeling would be used as input into the WARMf model. Cindy explained that the relationship between the two models is still somewhat unclear, but the USACE will be conducting both modeling efforts so they will be tightly coordinated.

Lisa explained that once the existing conditions have been modeled, the future-without-project conditions will also be modeled. The USACE has established the future conditions to be 50 years from present.

The next major task will be identification of conceptual measures. Lisa explained that for the FWMR, the measures only need to be described at a conceptual level. This effort will include the many measures that have been previously developed (e.g., as part of NRCS Manoa Watershed study, January brainstorming session, etc.). Additional measures will be developed as needed, in coordination with the TATs. She explained that measures can also be added in future phases of the project, if necessary.

Lisa described the final three tasks in the matrix, which include siting and refining the measures, combining the measures into alternatives, and evaluating the alternatives. She explained that these tasks do not need to be completed for the FSMR, but the methodology that will be used to conduct the task in future phases should be described. She explained that the methodology for these tasks is expected to include a spatial analysis model and an integrated evaluation model. She stated that the specifics of these two models have not yet been defined, but the project team expects to develop these methodologies in the near future.

James asked if the project would be addressing erosion (e.g., as related to landslides, feral pigs, etc.) in the upper watershed. Lisa stated that it is understood that these issues are problems, and they are currently being discussed as part of the project. However, the ability of the project to address these issues will largely depend on the authority of the project sponsors, and whether or not there are any stakeholders that are able to help address them. James explained that he may be able to offer existing data relative to these issues.

4. Discussion of Stakeholder Involvement Strategy

Sherry explained to the group that a draft stakeholder involvement strategy has been developed for the project in coordination with the Stakeholder Involvement TAT. The strategy identifies the specific tools and techniques that would be implemented to achieve the stakeholder involvement objective. However, in light of the budget constraints, the strategy has been scaled back and there are three specific techniques that have been dropped that the TAT thinks are critical to the success of the project: Community Advisory Group (CAG), Project Implementation Task Force, and Agency Action Group (AAG). Sherry provided a brief explanation of these three techniques:

Community Advisory Group (CAG): The purpose of the CAG would be to provide an opportunity for key community leaders and organizations to be involved in the formulation of the project and represent ideas, opinions, issues, and concerns of their communities during the planning process. It would help build a relationship between the project team and the community, and would help project development by including the community perspective. This

technique was dropped from the strategy because it is time intensive, and there is not currently enough funding to support the activities.

Agency Action Group (AAG): The purpose of the AAG would be to provide an opportunity for key agencies to be involved in project development by providing opinions, concerns, and advice throughout the planning process. The AAG would also have an active role in achieving project goals through initiation of activities to be conducted by other agencies in coordination with the project. Key agencies for the AWWP include those with current projects or regulatory authority in the Ala Wai Watershed, those with resources available for initiating projects affecting the watershed, and those that will be impacted by proposed project measures. This technique was dropped from the strategy because it is time intensive, and there is not currently enough funding to support the activities.

Project Implementation Task Force: The purpose of the task force would be to secure implementation funding, right-of-way agreements, permits, staff and maintenance commitments, and other related legislative support for the project at the federal, state, and county levels. She noted that this technique was dropped from the strategy because the USACE does not have the authority to form a task force that would be working to secure funding, as it could be perceived as lobbying. However, the USACE could provide a task force with logistical and technical support.

Sherri then asked the group to provide input on the need for these techniques, and to help brainstorm ideas on how the intent of the techniques could still be achieved.

Dudley explained to the group that some of these techniques could be subject to the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA), and the restrictions and requirements of FACA should be kept in mind. Specifically, FACA lays out specific rules for advisory committees. To avoid regulation under FACA, he suggested that the CAG could possibly be organized by an entity outside of the federal government, such as a community group. He also suggested that the USACE could still organize an AAG, as long as the public was not involved in decision-making as part of the group. Sherri noted that the problem with using a community group, such as the Ala Wai Watershed Association (AWWA), to organize the CAG is that these groups tend to be nonprofits, so don't have sufficient funding to support the effort.

Tom noted that the TAT had specifically decided that the term "group" should be used, rather than the term "committee" for the CAG and AAG, to highlight the fact that the groups would not have a highly formalized function, as is typical with a committee. He also suggested that the term "advisory" be used in place of "action" for the AAG. Tom asked for a specific reference for FACA - Cindy agreed to provide additional information to the group.

John Gollner explained that the project area is nearly a mirror image of Duke Bainum's council district; the district covers all seven of the neighborhood boards. He explained that they have many mechanisms to communicate with their constituency (e.g., a regular newsletter) and they would be happy to help communicate about the project. He also stated that they can help to interface with the City & County.

Sherri asked the group if it would be adequate to include the agencies as part of the TATs, in place of the AAG. Dudley suggested that the project needs a stronger outreach to agencies, especially the City & County. He suggested that it may be beneficial to establish an MOA, to help

formalize their commitment. Sherri noted that an MOA was established for the Manoa Watershed Project, but it took a lot of time to establish. Cindy commented that the City & County does have an agreement with DLNR relative to the water quality objective for the project, and it has helped to justify participation from ENV; perhaps a broader MOA could help justify broader participation from the City & County. Tom also noted that an MOA could be a useful tool to maintain consistency in agency participation with staff changes over time. He also noted that Kirk Caldwell is a Manoa resident and has supported the project in the past.

Sherri then asked the group for their thoughts about the need for a project implementation task force. She explained that the task force would be more critical during later phases of the project, but it would be useful to have the group in place now to help minimize the learning curve in the future. Risa asked if the CAG could serve as the task force, especially if the CAG was vocal and well-connected. Sherri explained that there could be some overlap, but the two groups were intended to serve two different purposes: the CAG is intended to advise the project, and the task force is intended to support project implementation. Cindy noted that the USACE does provide quarterly updates to Congressman Abercrombie's office, so there is already a degree of regular communication about the project.

Gene stated that the strongest advocates for the need for flood damage reduction should be those parties most likely to be affected, such as residents of lower Makiki and UH Manoa. He noted that none of these parties are involved in the project, but should be (with the exception of Jimmy). He stressed the need to create and maintain strong ties with these stakeholders. Sherri explained that Townscape is currently conducting a stakeholder assessment, to identify those stakeholders that should be involved and develop a strategy to engage them. She noted that they have started to meet with community leaders in Makiki, Manoa and Palolo. She stated that they plan to meet with representatives at UH, and stated that they would work with Jimmy to identify the appropriate contacts at UH. Sherri also explained that they had recently met with a representative of the Waikiki Improvement Association. A presentation to the association is planned for June; as part of the presentation, it will be important to provide a graphic or simulation that adequately illustrates the flooding threat to Waikiki. Sherri noted that we will need the results of the existing hydraulics modeling to prepare these materials. Other specific ideas the group had for the presentation were to show photographs and newspaper clippings from the 1968 flood, refer to DLNR's flood report for the 1968 flood, highlight the risk of failure to the force main and the resulting odor, emphasize the economic impacts, and to discuss the convergence of flooding with sea-level rise and a force main break.

5. Upcoming activities and path forward

Lisa asked Chris to provide an update on the golf course study that Mitsunaga was conducting. Chris explained that Mitsunaga had submitted a revised scope to DLNR as their contract was originally for work several years ago. He explained that DLNR was reviewing the revised scope and was expected to issue a notice to proceed in the near future.

Lisa explained that some of the other upcoming activities included modeling the future-without-project conditions, developing the alternatives screening criteria and methodology for the integrated evaluation model, and conducting a stakeholder assessment. She noted that each of these tasks had already been discussed previously in the meeting. She also explained that the project team had recently participated in several public events (e.g., Ala Wai Challenge and the

Mauka to Makai exposition), and planned to participate in more in the near future (e.g., Rediscover Makiki, Palolo Pride, etc.).

Cindy explained to the group that under the Water Resources Coordination Act, the USACE has a new requirement for additional agency and peer review. She explained that she is in the process of writing the agency and peer review proposal, which will include a detailed description of the proposed methodology and peer review process for the project. She noted that she would provide the document for review sometime in May.

Dennis Higa explained to the group that AECOM is responsible for implementing the NPDES program and public involvement for the City & County's MS4 program. He noted that Kewalo Basin is within the project area, and it could be worthwhile to coordinate with HCDA. The primary contact at HCDA is Steve Miyamoto.

Jimmy asked how the watershed boundary was defined, especially in the Kaka'ako area. Cindy stated that she thinks it was generally based on the hydrology modeling, but that some minor tweaks may have been made; she stated that she would confirm this understanding with the USACE hydrologists. Jimmy also asked if the existing hydraulics modeling would include the October 2004 flooding in Manoa. Cindy stated that she believes that it is included, but she would confirm this with the USACE hydrologists.

6. Update on associated projects/activities

Lisa asked FEMA or DLNR to provide an update on the Woodlawn bridge chute structure. Gen explained that FEMA is waiting for an update from DLNR on the design, then FEMA plans to participate in the EIS for the overall Ala Wai Watershed Project. Cindy asked Gen to provide the group with more information relative to the briefing with Congressman Abercrombie. Gen explained that Congressman Abercrombie had recently inquired as to why the project was taking so long to implement. During the briefing, FEMA's regional environmental officer explained that FEMA views the chute structure as being part of a single federal action (with the overall Ala Wai Watershed Project), and therefore believe it should be included with the EIS to avoid segmentation. Gen explained that Congressman Abercrombie requested that FEMA headquarters provide a position paper that documents the rationale for this decision. Lisa asked Gen about the current status, and Gen explained that the position paper was currently being prepared.

Lisa asked the group for any updates on current grant proposals. Neither Ken nor Mike were present, but Cindy explained that she didn't think they had yet been notified on their sustainability grant proposal. Karen then provided the group with an update on her 319 grant proposal. She explained that the proposal includes a streambank planting effort to address sediment and water quality issues, with possible sites near Chaminade, UH and in the upper watershed. Karen noted that the grant requires matching funds (either non-federal or in-kind), so asked the group to contact her with any potential leads on matching funds. Cindy explained that the USACE doesn't allow for demonstration projects, so this effort could provide valuable information for the project. Karen also noted that she was working on a separate proposal to provide community support for a private land trust.

Ross Timmerman introduced himself to the group, as working with Hawaii Ocean Observing System (HiOOS). He explained that he may have nearshore sensor data that is relevant to the project.

Cindy then asked the other participants to provide an update on any activities they are working on that may be relevant to the project.

Risa stated that she is currently working with various UH professors on a rain garden project. She noted that she saw good overlap with the work the grant proposals that Karen is working on, and stated that they were planning to coordinate.

John again reminded the group that Duke Bainum is willing to help facilitate any communication with Kirk Caldwell, as well as with the constituents and the City & County as a whole.

Jimmy explained that there is currently a high visibility project at UH medical school to address the flu pandemic. He noted that the UH medical school is located in Kakaako, near to the watershed boundary.

Gen noted that FEMA is currently working on modeling for Waikiki, in preparation for the State's annual hurricane response planning effort.

James explained that he is conducting a large multi-disciplinary research project on sediment transport and ecosystem restoration on Molokai.

Gene noted that he was recently asked by Ray Pendleton why DLNR is suddenly being required to obtain USACE permits to remove debris from the floating debris booms in the Ala Wai Harbor. Cindy was not aware of the issue, and suggested that he start by contacting DLNR for more information (then follow up with USACE regulatory if more information is needed).

Tom provided the group with a recap of recent community clean-up efforts in the watershed, including a clean up at Manoa District Park on April 11. He noted two upcoming recycling drives, including one on June 13 at Stevenson Elementary and one on October 17 at Kaimuki High School. He also noted the upcoming Rediscover Makiki event on July 25, and a stream cleanup effort by Iolani School planned for May 16.

Cindy noted that CZM was not able to attend the meeting, but wanted to inform the group of the watershed caucus they are organizing. The purpose of the caucus is to bring together the various agencies that are participating in watershed planning to help coordinate their efforts.

Cindy stated that the next meeting would be Friday, August 7th at 9:00am.

7. Action Items

- Request any relevant data on erosion in upper watershed from James Jacobi (Lisa)
- Provide further information (including citation) for FACA (Cindy)
- Explore the need for an MOA with the City & County (Cindy)
- Contact Steve Miyamoto at HCDA (Cindy/Lisa)
- Confirm how the watershed boundary was defined, especially in the Kaka`ako area (Cindy)
- Confirm that the existing hydraulics modeling includes the October 2004 flood event in Manoa (Cindy)
- Contact Ross to obtain relevant data (Lisa)

Ala Wai Watershed Project
 Quarterly Stakeholder Meeting, Participant List
 May 1, 2009

Last Name	First Name	Organization	Email Address	Phone Number
Ah Mai	Karen	Legislative Aide for Rep. Say	ahmai@hawaii.rr.com	955-7882
Ball	Chris	Mitsunaga and Associates	chrisb@mitsdesign.com	945-7882 x156
Barger	Cindy	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	Cindy.S.Barger@usace.army.mil	438-6940
Dashiell	Gene	Environmental Planning Services	dashiell.e@hawaiiintel.net	593-8330
Gollner	John	Aide for City Council, District 5	gollner@gmail.com	256-6425
Heinrich	Tom	Legislative Aide for Sen. Brian Taniguchi	jtomheinrich@hotmail.com	988-3469
Hiraoka	Sherri	Townscape	sherrihiraoka@townscapeinc.com	536-6999
Imada	Dennis	DLNR Engineering	Dennis.T.Imada@hawaii.gov	587-0257
Jacobi	James	USGS	jjacobi@usgs.gov	
Jayawardene	Danielle	NOAA, Pacific Islands Regional Office	danielle.jayawardene@noaa.gov	
Kettley	Lisa	CH2M HILL	lisa.kettley@ch2m.com	943-1133
Kubo	Dudley	NRCS	Dudley.Kubo@hi.usda.gov	541-2600 x124
Lagunero	Jimmy	UH Manoa, Emergency Management	lagunero@hawaii.edu	956-0773
Luersen	Paul	CH2M HILL	paul.luersen@ch2m.com	943-1133
Oram	Risa	UH Land Based Pollution Threats to Coral Reefs, LAS	risaoram@gmail.com	
Stercho	Richard	State Civil Defense	rstercho@scd.hawaii.gov	733-4301 x583
Tamura	Gen	FEMA	gen.tamura@dhs.gov	851-7917
Wong	Nami	DLNR Engineering	Nami.J.Wong@hawaii.gov	587-0253
Yee	Jon	AECOM	Jon.Yee@aecom.com	391-0141
Higa	Dennis	AECOM	Dennis.Higa@aecom.com	529-7220
Timmerman	Ross	US Oceanography	rtimmerm@hawaii.edu	347-5550