

Ala Wai Watershed Project

Quarterly Stakeholder Meeting

DATE: February 6, 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 then provided a summary of the project, as there were several participants who have not been involved with the project in the past. She stated the project goal and objectives, which include flood hazard reduction, ecosystem restoration, water quality, water supply, coastal issues, recreation, stakeholder involvement and infrastructure maintenance. She explained that the intent of the project is to develop a multi-objective plan that includes measures that can be implemented by a variety of different agencies or organizations.

She then provided an overview of the meeting agenda:

- a. Update on the Ala Wai Watershed Project
 - i. Summary of recent activities
 - ii. Technical Advisory Team (TAT) updates
 - iii. Upcoming activities
- b. Update on associated projects
 - i. Woodlawn chute structure
 - ii. UH activities
- c. Discussion items
 - i. Stakeholder roles and responsibilities

2. Update on the Ala Wai Watershed Project

- a. Summary of Activities Completed Between November 2008-February 2009
 - i. Hydrology and Hydraulics

Cindy reported that the Final Hydrology Report for the entire Ala Wai watershed has been completed, and the Draft Hydraulics Report for the watershed is currently in review. She explained that a meeting was held with Mitsunaga and Associates, who has been contracted by DLNR to investigate conceptual measures related to water diversion and deep-water pumping at or adjacent to the Ala Wai Golf Course. Finally, she stated that a meeting was held to discuss considerations for the 50-year without project condition, as the USACE is starting the future hydrology modeling and needs to define what the future conditions will be.

ii. Ecosystem Restoration

Cindy reported that all-day stream walks were performed along Makiki, Manoa and Palolo Streams with restoration technical experts from the USACE environmental lab, along with a small group of state and local agency representatives. In addition, a one-day brainstorming session was conducted to identify potential ecosystem restoration measures that could be implemented as part of the project.

iii. Water Quality

Cindy reported that a Water Quality TAT meeting was held in December, with a follow-up meeting with Department of Health (DOH) to discuss the water quality objective and potential target criteria. In addition, USACE has been coordinating with a senior class from UH NREM, who is investigating water quality issues in Manoa Valley. They are tentatively planning to conduct an inventory of channel conditions and potential sediment sources along a reach of Manoa Stream.

iv. Stakeholder Involvement

Cindy reported that the following stakeholder involvement activities have been conducted during the last quarter: (1) presentation of the project to the Waikiki Neighborhood Board, (2) coordination meeting with NOAA and DBEDT CZM, (3) project booth with Ala Wai Watershed Association at the Ala Wai Challenge, (4) development of a draft Stakeholder Involvement Strategy, and (5) briefing to the Executive Committee.

The Executive Committee meeting was held in early January, and the participants included Ken Kawahara, Carty Chang and Nami Wong from DLNR, Tony Paresa, Derek Chow, Steve Yamamoto, Michael Wong and Cindy Barger from USACE, and Gerald Takayesu from the City & County. The Stakeholder Involvement objective was presented to the executive team, and there was concurrence from all parties that this objective is critical to the success of the project. As a follow up, the public affairs departments at USACE and DLNR are working to develop materials that document project-related work that has been conducted to date. There was also discussion related to the need to get increased involvement from the City & County (e.g., DDC and DFM) as the project progresses. Again, the executive team concurred and USACE agreed to set up a meeting with the new Managing Director. Lastly, the meeting included a discussion of encouraging partnership with other agencies. As a follow up, the project delivery team will be preparing a stakeholder assessment to identify other agencies or organizations that should be involved, and the Executive Committee will assist with encouraging participation from these parties.

v. Other Activities

Other activities that have been conducted during the last quarter include the launching of the new project website (www.alawaiwatershed.com). The website allows members of the public to join the project mailing list, as well as to provide comments on the project. Several comments have been received, including suggestions on conceptual measures in and around the Ala Wai Canal.

Cindy explained that CH2M HILL has initiated several screening-level assessments of the resources within the watershed, including hazardous, toxic and radioactive waste (HTRW), geotechnical resources, biological resources and socioeconomic conditions. These assessments will help guide the development of measures and alternatives, and will also provide supporting information for the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). Finally, she

explained that CH2M HILL is preparing a Needs Assessment, which will document the additional activities needed to complete the Feasibility Scoping Meeting Report, which is the next milestone deliverable in the USACE planning process. She stated that the Needs Assessment will provide an unconstrained list of additional tasks, and the project delivery team will then need to identify which tasks can be accomplished within the existing budget and schedule constraints.

b. Technical Advisory Team (TAT) Updates

i. Stakeholder Involvement

Sherri Hiraoka provided an overview of the recent work conducted by the Stakeholder Involvement TAT. She stated that the TAT had revised the draft objective to “develop and implement a stakeholder collaboration process that will result in the attainment of project objectives and ongoing, community-based stewardship actions for the Ala Wai Watershed”. She explained that sub-objectives had been developed, including (1) involve all stakeholders, (2) gain consensus on the best plan elements, (3) organize commitments for project implementation, and (4) champion community-based watershed stewardship. She emphasized that the objective and sub-objectives are still in draft form and are being further refined by the TAT.

Next, Sherri presented the draft stakeholder involvement strategy that is currently being developed by the TAT. She explained that the strategy identifies specific activities that could be implemented to address each of the criteria at each project milestone.

Cindy stressed that the stakeholder involvement TAT is focusing both the implementation of the project, as well as long-term activities that will hopefully extend beyond project implementation. She also explained that public involvement activities are not easy for the USACE to implement, so this is a specific component of the project for which it will be critical to involve other partners.

Sherri identified some of the major hurdles that the Stakeholder Involvement TAT will need to address:

- **Support:** How do we gain and foster long-term support for the project?
- **Scale:** How do we get feedback and interaction for the project as a whole, while still addressing local issues at the neighborhood level?
- **Plan vs. Project:** How do we address both the project (implementation of infrastructure in the near-term), as well as the plan (long-term watershed stewardship conducted by other parties)?
- **Number of Stakeholders:** How do we reach out and involve all stakeholders (e.g., landowners along the streams alone include about 1000 parties)?

Jimmy stated that the TAT also identified the need to specifically address ways to obtain funding and resources. Tom stressed that the plan is to target all the various stakeholders, and stated that the TAT identified the need to address landowners as a specific stakeholder group.

ii. Ecosystem Restoration TAT

Lisa stated that the first Ecosystem Restoration TAT was comprised of the stream walks and the brainstorming session conducted with the USACE restoration technical experts. She

explained that the stream walks involved a small group of federal, state and local agency representatives, and was focused on identifying potential ecosystem restoration measures. The brainstorming session included approximately 30 participants, including technical experts from various agencies and organizations including UH, USFWS, and DLNR Division of Aquatic Resources (DAR). The brainstorming included small breakout groups focused on identifying potential ecosystem restoration measures in different geographic areas – upper watershed, urban core, Ala Wai Canal, outside of channel. The group also identified data gaps and research needs. Lisa stated that the next step for the TAT will be to articulate the target criteria and metrics for the restoration objective.

Cindy stated that the major hurdles the Ecosystem Restoration TAT will need to address include:

- **Goal:** What habitat restoration possibilities exist, given the extent of urbanization? As part of this, the TAT will need to identify the restoration goals, and how to define those goals.
- **Metrics:** How do we define/measure restoration in the project area? It was suggested in the stream walks to maximize passage for native species and minimize access for non-natives.
- **Priorities:** Lisa explained that one of the ideas generated during the brainstorming session (specific to measures in the upper watershed) was to start projects at the urban/conservation interface and move upward from there; the priorities for the various projects should be determined based on maximizing the efficiency of the measures.

She explained that as the project progresses, each TAT will likely generate questions that need to be addressed by another TAT (e.g., water quality issues related to habitat restoration).

Kristine asked about the scope of the objective, and whether the project would address coastal habitat in addition to the stream habitat. Cindy stated that the project likely wouldn't focus on restoration of the coastal habitats, but at least would not result in further degradation of that habitat. She explained that there is overlap between many of the objectives, but the coastal habitat would primarily be addressed as part of the coastal issues objective.

Karen stated that the project team needs to be mindful of maintaining public access for cultural practices.

Jimmy asked about the priorities of the project. He asked, for example, if projects are a priority in Manoa because more information has been developed in this area. Cindy explained that this will be something that the project team needs to determine, but for now, the goal is to get similar levels of information for the other subwatersheds, so that a complete baseline is available for the entire watershed. She also stressed that one of the priorities is to identify interim projects that can be implemented while the study is being completed.

There was a discussion among the group as to where the urban/conservation interface occurs in Manoa. Lisa stated that relative to the discussion at the brainstorming session, the

group was considering that interface to be near Paradise Park/Treetops Restaurant. Colleen stated that one of the advantages of considering the interface to be in the vicinity of Paradise Park is that there are fewer sources of pollutants, so they would be easier to track. Tom stated that the area referred to as “Manoa mauka” generally starts where the broad valley ends, near Waakaua Place.

Tom also reported to the group that there is a considerable amount of accumulated sediment at Woodlawn Bridge (approximately 20 inches above average water level, and 3 feet wide on the mauka side of bridge). He stated that the sediment was dredged just 10 weeks ago, but crews from the Division of Road Maintenance are in the process of dredging again.

iii. Water Quality TAT

Lisa reported that the Water Quality TAT met in December. The group reviewed the water quality objective and started to brainstorm target criteria and metrics. Examples of the target criteria and metrics that were discussed included number of types of BMPs, compliance with the State Water Quality standards, and compliance with the TMDLs. The group discussed the various advantages and disadvantages of the different criteria. A subsequent conference call was held with DOH, because they weren't able to join the TAT meeting. The focus of that call was to get input from DOH on the water quality objective and the various criteria.

The input from DOH highlighted major hurdles the project team and the TAT will need to address, including:

- **Scope:** The entire watershed needs to be addressed.
- **Participation:** Other responsible parties (not just ENV) need to be engaged.
- **Monitoring:** A clear defined monitoring plan needs to be developed.

Based on this conversation, the project team is working to clarify the scope, which will then be taken back to the TAT for input. The TAT would then move forward with articulating the target criteria and metrics.

Cindy emphasized the importance of understanding the sources; to make sure they are real, and not just perceived issues. She also stated that at the next TAT, Michael and Randall were planning to give a primer on the WARMf model.

Krsitine asked whether the project would address water quality in the coastal waters, and stated that the scope of the objective needs to be clearly defined. She suggested that the water quality criteria should specify whether the target is based on human health standards or biological standards. She also stated that there is a need to involve the agencies who are responsible for wastewater-related issues.

iv. Hydrology & Hydraulics (H&H) TAT

Cindy described the meeting that was held to discuss the 50 year without project conditions. The purpose of the meeting was to brainstorm the parameters that should be considered when the USACE conducts the H&H model for the future without project conditions. She explained that parameters that would be addressed would be those that can be reasonably

projected to occur based on current trends, but actions that are speculative (e.g., changes in regulations and human habitats) would not be included. The future without project condition will address climate change and sea level rise, based on research being conducted by Dr. Chip Fletcher at UH. Other parameters would include changes in development patterns, based on projections from Department of Education, DPP and others.

The major hurdles that will need to be addressed are:

- **Projections:** Agencies create their projections in different time frames (5 years, 10 years, 20 years). We will need to figure out how to take the varying projection timescales to develop a 50 year projection.
- **Activities to Include:** We will need to continue to work on determining which conditions are foreseeable and which are speculative.

Tom suggested that the census could be consulted to address population changes.

Cindy stated that the team will need to consider how rapid transit might affect growth, and will need to be incorporated into the projections.

c. Upcoming Activities

Cindy provided an overview of the upcoming activities, including the completion of the resource studies (e.g., geotechnical, HTRW, biological and cultural). In addition, the project delivery team will be considering the additional tasks that are outlined in the Needs Assessment, and determining which tasks should be completed based on the budget and schedule requirements for the project. A one-day workshop will also be held to develop alternatives screening criteria (which will be included in the Feasibility Scoping Meeting Report).

Upcoming stakeholder involvement activities include a legislative briefing, as well as participation in various public events, such as the Mauka to Makai expo (Earth Day), Conservation Week (July), and Samoan Flag Day (August).

Cindy asked Chris Ball to explain the work that Mitsunaga and Associates will be performing with regard to the golf course. Chris explained that Mitsunaga has been contracted by DLNR to develop conceptual design measures that could be implemented at or near the golf course, including: (1) diversion of water through the golf course (via features such as ponds, wetlands, etc.), and (2) flushing of the Canal using deep water wells. These diversions could require some re-design of portions of the golf course, but the goal would be to keep the golf course fully operational while serving multiple objectives. The deep water flushing would pump water from 200 feet below the ground surface to create an approximately one mile per hour flow, using the clean pumped water to improve the water quality in the Canal. The pumps would be located at the City & County baseyard. Dennis explained that this work is based on the study performed by Ed Noda and Associates during the Ala Wai Canal Study.

Dudley asked about the timing of Mitsunaga's work, and whether the work will be specifically focused on addressing the needs of the Ala Wai project. Chris stated that a topographic survey is being conducted, then Mitsunaga would initiate the design work. *(Note: After the meeting, it was clarified that commencement of the survey is pending DLNR*

approval.) Cindy explained that Mitsunaga will rely on hydraulics information from the USACE, so ultimately their schedule will depend on the USACE's studies. She explained that the work is being conducted in support of the project as part of DLNR's in-kind contribution.

Jerry asked if Mitsunaga is only considering flows from Manoa-Palolo Channel or also from Kapahulu storm drain. Chris responded that they would be considering all water that is entering the Canal from on or adjacent to the golf course, including the storm drain.

Brian Hunter stressed the need to get representatives from the golf course involved, because the addition of water features that could act as additional hazards might not be acceptable. Cindy responded that the project team is working to get them more involved. Tom stated that Hubert Minn, deputy director of the Department of Enterprise Services and Manoa resident, would be a good person to get involved. In addition, Tom stated that he and Karen would like to meet with Chris to discuss other projects/actions that they might want to consider in that area.

Dudley asked if Mitsunaga would be considering just the deep well pumping, or other potential measures. Chris explained that three different measures were considered in the original Ed Noda study: (1) flushing using water pumped from deep wells, (2) opening the other end of the Ala Wai to the ocean, and (3) installing a large pipe near Ala Moana to suction water out of the Canal. His understanding is that of those three options, the flushing system was considered to be the most feasible and therefore, is the only one of the three measures that DLNR has asked Mitsunaga to investigate. Cindy stated that if other conceptual measures were to be considered, the work would be done under the Ala Wai Watershed Project.

Karen asked whether Mitsunaga would be looking only at baseflow conditions, or if they would be considering different stormflow events. Chris stated that they would be looking at interval storms up to the 100 year storm.

Karen suggested that the results of the Mitsunaga study might be applicable to other open spaces in the general vicinity, such as the fields at Iolani School, Kaimuki High School or Ala Wai Park. Cindy explained that, based on the funds available, Mitsunaga is looking specifically at the golf course. However, Mitsunaga is working as part of the core team for the Ala Wai Watershed Project, so whatever work they do can be used by the USACE and considered for other locations.

Philip Moravcik asked if there were expected to be any concerns with subsidence due to the pumping. Chris stated that, based on the Ed Noda report, the City & County baseyard was selected as the best location for the pumping as there were little to no subsidence-related issues. Philip also asked about the volume of water needed to maintain an approximately one mile per hour flow. Chris responded that about 20-30 cfs would be required.

Tom stated that the project team will need to remember that the golfer constituency is very strong and vocal, and should be directly engaged as part of stakeholder involvement strategy. Karen agreed that, based on her experience with the neighborhood board, the constituency as a whole has very strong feelings about any potential measure that would affect the golf course. However, she observed that there are certain demographic subgroups

of the constituency that are less resistant than others; the project team should work with these groups to foster support.

Terry Hildebrand stated that secondary use of golf courses is common throughout Oahu, and this point should be heavily emphasized to help increase the acceptability of this concept from the public's perspective.

Dudley reminded the group of the flooding and resulting closure of the West Loch golf course, and stated that the project should consider this example for lessons learned. Chris agreed that sedimentation will be one of the major issues that needs to be addressed.

3. Update on Associated Projects

a. Woodlawn Chute Structure

Cindy briefly described the background of the Woodlawn chute structure project, stating that it is a mitigation project being performed by FEMA for flooding that occurred at the Woodlawn Bridge in 2004. Rick Stercho provided a status update for the project, explaining that FEMA is currently reviewing the design concepts. In addition, FEMA is considering whether the project can proceed with a stand-alone NEPA document - Environmental Assessment (EA)/Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) - or if it needs to be included as part of the EIS for the entire Ala Wai Watershed Project. Cindy explained that the Ala Wai project team has asked FEMA if there is the potential for a separate document to allow the chute structure to move forward since the Ala Wai study will not be completed until 2012. FEMA is currently evaluating if they have the flexibility to do so, given the NEPA regulations and FEMA policies.

Gene stressed that the project is unlikely to have significant impacts, and that the human health and safety benefits of the project should be a top priority. Cindy explained that cumulative effects need to be considered, and that FEMA is in the process of making their decision. Gene suggested that the project team and UH representatives should encourage FEMA to proceed with the project under an EA, such that it can be implemented in the near future.

Tom stated that he received a phone call from a Manoa resident approximately 3 weeks ago, regarding concerns about the accumulated sediment at Woodlawn Bridge. He explained to the group that the resident contacted DLNR and State Civil Defense, both of whom quickly responded by visiting the site and working with DFM to address. There are currently crews working to dredge the sediment.

Tom then raised the conceptual cut-off ditch just makai of Woodlawn Bridge near Noelani School. He stated that UH is looking at this area as future faculty housing. He reminded the group that Sam Callejo had previously made a commitment to construct this project, and stated that the project team should confirm whether there is still a commitment following Sam's retirement. Jimmy stated that he thinks there is no longer money reserved for this project. However, he stated that he would follow up with David Lasner, who is taking over Sam's duties, and would report back to the group.

Rick told the group that State Civil Defense has a keen understanding that the public has been waiting for flood mitigation activities to be implemented for a long time, and is working to get the project implemented as quickly as possible.

4. Overview of Stakeholder Roles, Responsibilities and Relevant Projects

The last item on the agenda was an overview of the roles and responsibilities of the various stakeholders, as well as a summary of any relevant projects each stakeholder is conducting within the watershed.

a. State Civil Defense

Rick stated that State Civil Defense's role in the project is to contribute to the work of the technical teams, as much as possible. However, at this time, State Civil Defense is not able to contribute much effort toward the project as they are working full-time on disaster relief efforts related to the December flooding.

b. DLNR

Dennis explained that DLNR is the local sponsor on the project, and their primary mission is to ensure the project is implemented. Their main contributions to the project are to provide input during planning, design and implementation. They can also assist with issues related to state permits or consultation with other state agencies and divisions in DLNR. DLNR's authority is limited to public works projects on State-owned land, and cannot implement projects on land owned by other entities.

c. USACE

Cindy explained that the USACE is the lead federal agency for the project. The USACE's authority is generally limited to flood risk management, ecosystem restoration, navigation, and storm protection, and watershed projects can include multiple objectives. For the study phase, the USACE has a 50-50 cost share with the local sponsors. During the implementation and construction phase, the cost share agreement is typically 65 (federal) - 35 (local).

The USACE can generally implement construction measures for flood hazard reduction, restoration or coastal issues. For the Ala Wai study, because of funding, measures to be implemented by USACE will be flood risk management and ecosystem restoration - coastal measures could be implemented as part of a supplemental study. The USACE also has a regulatory branch that reviews any placement of dredge or fill activities in Waters of the U.S., and may be able to assist with aspects of the project (e.g., special permit conditions, etc.).

d. UH, Center for Conservation Research and Training

Mike Kido and Ken Kaneshiro provided an overview of a current proposal they are preparing to develop a model for sustainability in the watershed. The proposal is being developed in response to an initiative from the UH vice-chancellor's office, and is intended to contribute directly to the Ala Wai Watershed project. The model would be a multi-disciplinary system that incorporates past and current data collection efforts to provide a mechanism for responsible resource management. One of the key components of the

proposal is the harvesting of invasive Albizia trees for processing in a biochar facility. The biochar facility could potentially generate electricity, as well as produce charcoal and soil amendments. The addition of the soil amendments back into the upper watershed soils would be expected to enhance the growth rates of replacement plantings by 200-300%. Overall, the process is expected to be carbon negative.

Ken stated that the proposal deadline is March 1. A separate meeting will be set up with USACE to discuss how to dovetail the effort with the overall project. In addition, Ken stated that it will be critical to get various technical experts from UH involved.

Jimmy stated that this proposal is very important in that it brings together the many different departments at UH, helping to integrate the various disciplines that are important to the success of the Ala Wai project.

e. UH, WRRC

Philip stated that WRRC is currently involved in many projects that relate to watershed management. Current project include the evaluation of contributions from the HDOT MS4s, as well as sediment modeling work.

Ali explained that he is currently finalizing a study on landslides, which could help to identify some of the sediment sources.

f. Land Based Pollution Threats to Coral Reefs Local Action Strategy

Risa Oram explained that she is the coordinator for the land based pollution local action strategy focused on coral reefs. Four local action strategies have been developed in Hawaii in response to a need identified by the Coral Reef Task Force. One of those four local action strategies is focused on land-based sources of pollution, which has a watershed focus. The local action strategies can partner with other organizations, including State and local agencies, and could potentially support the project through implementation of best management practices.

g. Hawaii Coral Reef Initiative

Kristine Davidson stated that through the Hawaii Coral Reef Initiative Research Program, there is typically a small amount of money available to fund research for coastal issues. She stated that they are currently involved in work in Maunalua Bay and on Maui, but are looking to get involved in other watersheds.

h. City & County ENV

Jerry explained that C&C ENV's interest in the project is related to sediment and termiticides. He stated that they also have an NPDES permit for municipal stormwater. He stressed that ENV only represents one division of the C&C. At its inception, the project was focused on flood control, and DDC and DFM were involved. He indicated that they are trying to determine their level of involvement based on the direction of the project.

i. City & County DDC

Terry stated that he is interested in the project from his perspective as the project manager for the renovation of the Ala Wai park clubhouse. Specifically, he is focused on the potential

for flooding at the clubhouse, which is a historic structure. They are evaluating different options, including returning the clubhouse to its previous use as strictly boat storage or expanding it to serve as a community recreation center. He is also the project manager for the natatorium project, in which they are evaluating alternatives for the natatorium.

j. C&C Rapid Transit Division

Susan Robbins explained that she is the chief of environmental planning for the consultant to the C&C rapid transit division. She explained that the long range goal for the rapid transit project is to extend the rail service to UH and Waikiki, and their interest is in understanding the relationship between the two projects.

k. NRCS

Dudley explained that NRCS' involvement started with Manoa project. Federal money for planning and implementing the project was given to NRCS, but the funding was stopped in 2006 just prior to the alternatives formulation phase. Much of the work NRCS completed for the Manoa project is directly related to the Ala Wai project, and NRCS is now working to help integrate that information. In general, NRCS' mission is related to erosion control, sediment management, and farmland management.

l. NOAA

Danielle Jayawardene stated that she is with the habitat division of NOAA's Pacific Island Regional Office. In general, their division is responsible for regulating activities that affect coastal habitats. Historically, most of the focus was specifically on projects in the coastal environment, but the focus is starting to shift to include land-based activities that may affect the coastal environment. She stated that if the direct link to coastal habitat can be justified, NOAA can potentially fund activities that would improve coastal habitat quality.

m. USFWS

Paula Levin explained that she works in the USFWS coastal conservation group, and her focus is on freshwater ecology. Their role in the project will be to help with providing technical assistance on native species and habitat (e.g., identifying impediments to native species migration), as well as helping to identify restoration approaches (e.g., control of native species, BMPs, etc.). In addition, USFWS will be responsible for consulting with USACE on the project.

n. DOH

Brian stated that he is a planner with the Clean Water Branch of DOH, which is responsible for overseeing the MS4 permits for entities including DOE, DOT and ENV. He explained that there are four sections with the Clean Water Branch, including engineering, monitoring (beach monitoring), enforcement, and non point source control. He stated that under the authority of the Clean Water Act, he is able to award grant money to fund water quality improvement activities, but not research. He also stated that DOH may be able to assist with beach monitoring efforts. He explained that DOH is also involved in the management plan amendment, which was further described by Kenny Roberts.

o. CZM, Office of Planning

Kenny stated that he works in the Office of Planning, CZM, and oversees the coastal nonpoint source pollution control program. He explained that the management plan focuses on management measures for a variety of different issues, including forestry, urban, marinas, hydromodifications, and riparian areas. The plan is currently being implemented at the watershed-level, and the target is to address five different watersheds per year. Kenny stated that they are currently prioritizing the various watersheds for plan implementation. He stated that they are able to match funds, but their money is fairly limited.

p. Ala Wai Watershed Association/Tom Heinrich

Tom explained that serves as session staff for Senator Taniguchi, chairperson for the Manoa neighborhood board, and president of the Board of Directors for Ala Wai Watershed Association. He stated that he can assist with community outreach and meeting with community members, as well as help to work with legislators.

He also reminded the group of two upcoming events. On Tuesday February 17th at 6pm, there will be an informational briefing on the City's force main sewer project. On Saturday February 21 from 8-10am, there will be a Makiki Stream cleanup at the intersection of Kalakaua and South King Street.

q. Ala Wai Watershed Association/Karen Ah Mai

Karen explained that she serves as legislative staff for Rep. Calvin Say (St. Louis Heights, Palolo), as well as executive director for Ala Wai Watershed Association. Because the agencies can typically only implement projects on public property, Karen stated that AWWA's role in the project is to help assist with the measures that may need to be implemented on private property. AWWA's current focus is working to get easements from private land owners and serving as a land trust, as well as protecting the community interests in the project.

5. Summary

Cindy thanked the participants for joining the meeting and stated that the next quarterly stakeholder meeting would be held on May 1st at 9:00am. She stated that TAT members would be contacted soon to organize the next round of TAT meetings.

6. Action Items

- Organize meeting with Ken Kaneshiro and Mike Kido to discuss the sustainability proposal (CH2M HILL)
- Summarize the roles and responsibilities of other stakeholders not present at the meeting (USACE/CH2M HILL)
- Schedule next TAT meetings (USACE/CH2M HILL)

Ala Wai Watershed Project
Stakeholder Meeting Attendance List
February 6, 2009

Name	Organization	Email Address	Phone Number
Agnes Martelet	Townscape	agnes@townscapeinc.com	536-6999
Aly El-Kadi	UH Water Resources Research Center	elkadi@hawaii.edu	956-6331
Brian Hunter	DOH, Clean Water Branch	brian.hunter@doh.hawaii.gov	586-7525
Chris Ball	Mitsunaga and Associates	chrisb@mitsdesign.com	945-7882 x156
Cindy Barger	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	Cindy.S.Barger@usace.army.mil	438-6940
Colleen Bergmanis	Ala Wai Watershed Association	bergmanie001@hawaii.rr.com	282-0714
Danielle Jayawardene	NOAA, Pacific Islands Regional Office	danielle.jayawardene@noaa.gov	
Dennis Imada	DLNR Engineering	Dennis.T.Imada@hawaii.gov	587-0257
Dudley Kubo	NRCS	Dudley.Kubo@hi.usda.gov	541-2600 x124
Eugene Dashiell	Environmental Planning Services	dashiell.e@hawaiiintel.net	593-8330
Gerald Takayesu	City & County ENV, Stormwater Division	gtakayesu@honolulu.gov	768-3287
Jimmy Lagunero	UH Manoa, Emergency Management	lagunero@hawaii.edu	956-0773
Joanne Hiramatsu	Oceanit	jhiramaust@oceanit.com	531-3017
Karen Ah Mai	Legislative Aide for Rep. Say	ahmai@hawaii.rr.com	955-7882
Ken Kaneshiro	UH, Center for Conservation Research and Training	kykanesh@hawaii.edu	956-6739
Kenny Roberts	Office of Planning, CZM	Kenneth.W.Roberts@dbedt.hawaii.gov	587-2803
Kristine Davidson	UH, Social Science Research Center	kristine.davidson@hawaii.edu	956-2577
Lisa Kettley	CH2M HILL	lisa.kettley@ch2m.com	943-1133
Mike Kido	UH, Center for Conservation Research and Training	mkido@hawaii.edu	956-4907
Paul Luersen	CH2M HILL	paul.luersen@ch2m.com	943-1133
Paula Levin	USFWS, Ecological Services Division	Paula_Levin@fws.gov	
Philip Moravcik	UH Water Resources Research Center	morav@hawaii.edu	956-3097
Richard Stercho	State Civil Defense	rstercho@scd.hawaii.gov	733-4301 x583
Risa Oram	UH Land Based Pollution Threats to Coral Reefs, Local Action Strategy	risaoram@gmail.com	
Sherri Hiraoka	Townscape	sherrihiraoka@townscapeinc.com	536-6999
Susan Robbins	City & County RTD	Robbins@infraconsultllc.com	768-6159

Ala Wai Watershed Project
Stakeholder Meeting Attendance List
February 6, 2009

Name	Organization	Email Address	Phone Number
Terry Hildebrand	City & County DDC, Facilities Division	thildebrand@honolulu.gov	768-8401
Tom Heinrich	Legislative Aide for Sen. Brian Taniguchi	jtomheinrich@hotmail.com	988-3469