

Ala Wai Watershed Project

Quarterly Stakeholder Meeting

DATE: September 4, 2009

ATTENDEES: See attached table

1. Introduction

Lisa Kettley started the meeting with a description of the meeting purpose, which was (1) to provide an update to the stakeholders on the status of the project, (2) to learn from the stakeholders about other activities occurring in the watershed, and (3) to present the results from the recent alternatives criteria workshop and seek additional feedback/input on the list of criteria.

2. Project Overview

Lisa then reminded the group 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 specific planning objectives are flood risk management, ecosystem restoration, water quality, water supply, infrastructure maintenance, recreation and stakeholder involvement. She reminded the group that there was originally a stand-alone objective to address coastal resources, but this concept has since been incorporated as part of each of the other objectives.

Lisa explained to the group that one of the overall challenges of the project is to develop a holistic watershed plan (meaning, a plan that addresses the wide variety of problems and recommended solutions across the various resources in the watershed), while still working within the limitations of the project sponsors' authority and realistic budget/schedule constraints. To address this challenge, the project team has developed a preliminary strategy in which there will be two distinct categories of measures - those that the project sponsors can and are willing to address (or actions for which there is another entity who is willing to champion), and those actions which the team thinks are important elements of a holistic watershed plan but are not within sponsors' authority. The first category of actions would be used to formulate the alternatives for the Feasibility Report (which the team generally refers to as the "project") and would be analyzed in detail in the EIS. The second category of measures includes ones that the project team will be working to adequately capture, but will need to appropriate parties to be at the table and share/develop the necessary information.

Lisa then provided a brief overview of the USACE planning process. She stated that the Principles and Guidelines (commonly referred to as the P&G), developed by the U.S. Water Resources Council, lay out the requirements for federal water-related projects, including USACE planning studies such as this project. The P&G identify a six-step process, which is reiterated in greater detail in the USACE regulations. The six steps are: (1) identify problems and opportunities, (2) inventory and forecast conditions, (3) formulate alternative plans, (4) evaluate alternative plans, (5) compare alternative plans, and (6) select plan.

Given the project's history, different parts of the watershed are in various stages of development. For example, in Manoa, many conceptual measures have already been developed (as part of the 2006

NRCS Manoa Watershed Study); however, problems and baseline conditions (e.g., extent of flooding) in areas including Palolo and Makiki are still in the process of being identified.

Lisa explained that, in general, the project is currently in Step 2 (Inventory and Forecast Conditions) with the Feasibility Scoping Meeting Report (FSMR) as the upcoming milestone deliverable. She described the purpose of the FSMR is an internal process check with the USACE headquarters team and local agencies to reach consensus on scoping and methodologies for upcoming tasks. The contents of the FSMR include a description of the problems, planning objectives, baseline and future without-project conditions, and conceptual measures. In addition, the FSMR should include a description of the screening process and draft screening criteria.

3. Project Update

Paul Murawski provided the group with an update on activities related to the flood risk management objective. He explained that the hydrology and hydraulics (H&H) technical advisory team (TAT) is working to develop specific flood risk management sub-objectives, which will generally address riverine flooding, sheet flow flooding (from hillsides), ocean storm events and climate change/sea level rise. He stated that metrics will be developed as soon as the sub-objectives have been identified. The USACE is finalizing the hydraulics modeling of the existing conditions, and expect to be finished within the next few weeks. The modeling of the future without project condition would then be completed, approximately one month later.

Cindy Barger noted that, for the purposes of climate change/sea level rise, the USACE is working with experts from UH as well as the various federal and State agencies. She noted that this is the first project in which the Honolulu District is defining climate change/sea level rise. She explained that, in parallel with this project, the USACE is coordinating with the relevant parties on a broader level to establish a program-level approach to addressing climate change/sea level rise for other Hawaii projects. She anticipates that an iterative approach will be used to refine the Ala Wai watershed project and the program-level strategy.

Paul then showed the group the draft map of the 500-year floodplain map. He noted that there are still several issues that need to be resolved, which will likely result in an expansion of the boundaries. Jimmy noted that the 500-year floodplain in Palolo is shown as extending beyond the concrete channel, and asked if the modeling accounted for the concrete channels. Cindy explained that the modeling incorporates cross-sections taken through the watershed, including the concrete channels in Palolo. She noted that it was reasonable to expect that flooding beyond the channel could occur during a 500-year event. Paul mentioned that the 100-year floodplain also extends beyond the concrete channel in Palolo. Jimmy asked why the graphic shows the 500-year floodplain, when previous project documentation typically showed the 100-year floodplain. Paul explained that the intent was to show the extreme extent of flooding. A map of the 100 year floodplain will be shared with the stakeholders when the existing hydraulics report is finalized and the sponsors (DLNR and the C&C) have had an opportunity to review.

Dudley stated that NOAA is updating their atlas with current rainfall amounts, and asked if the hydrology modeling for this project would be updated with this information. Cindy noted that the USACE is also assisting the State (CWRM) with updates to the State Atlas, and the project team will consider how the information should be incorporated as it becomes available.

Barry Usagawa asked how the results of the updated hydraulic mapping would affect flood insurance rates. Cindy explained that updates to the flood insurance rate maps (FIRM) are not automatic, and require submission by either the State or the City & County. She stated that USACE will provide the final maps to the State and City & County once they are completed, and it will be their decision to submit the maps to FEMA; they can also choose to submit maps that incorporate flood risk

management measures, once those measures have been implemented. Gene Dashiell explained that, according to FEMA, members of the public can submit the maps as well. He also noted that anyone can buy flood insurance, and it would be prudent to buy flood insurance now, as it will be cheaper than after the FIRMs are updated.

Jimmy asked if the extent of flooding shown only accounts for rainfall, or whether it also accounts for storms coming in from the ocean. Cindy stated that the USACE is currently updating the modeling to account for other events, including ocean surges, but noted that the objectives need to be finalized so it is clear exactly what the modeling will address. She also explained that the USACE can typically only address flooding that is hydrologically connected to the streams. Flooding that is isolated from the streams (e.g., isolated low spots) can still be identified, but the project team will be working to find the appropriate party to help address these types of issues.

Lisa then provided an update on activities related to the ecosystem restoration objective. She explained that the ecosystem restoration technical advisory team (TAT) has been meeting monthly and has compiled a comprehensive list of problem and developed sub-objectives. She reminded the group that because the project has multiple objectives, the objectives are really more like mini-goals, so sub-objectives are needed to focus project development. Based on the sub-objectives, the TAT has identified a list of draft metrics, which will be used to evaluate how effectively an alternative is addressing the ecosystem restoration objective. She explained that the TAT specifically decided to use physical parameters (as opposed to biological parameters) as metrics for this project, as those are the factors that the project will be most able to influence.

Based on the list of draft metrics, the TAT also identified an ecosystem valuation model, which will be used to quantify the change in habitat value for the different alternatives (typically measured as habitat units). The model selected for use is the habitat assessment component of the Hawaii Stream Bioassessment Protocol, developed by Mike Kido at UH. She explained that the model has two components– (1) an index of biotic integrity (IBI) which directly measures biotic features (e.g., populations of native aquatic species), and (2) a habitat assessment component which measures physical parameters of the ecosystem as a proxy for ecosystem health and integrity. Because the project metrics are focused on physical parameters, rather than biological parameters, the TAT decided to utilize the habitat assessment component of the HSBP. Moving forward, the next steps will be (1) to make minor modifications to the model to reflect the project sub-objectives, and (2) to implement the model to quantify the habitat values for the baseline and future without project conditions. CH2M HILL is currently preparing a model selection report that will detail all of this information, and expects to provide it to the TAT for review within the next few weeks.

Lisa explained that a biological resources assessment is also being conducted to identify the natural resources that occur within the watershed as a whole. The USACE has provided comments on the draft assessment; the final draft will be provided to the TAT for review.

Grant Arnold asked about the extent of ecosystem restoration and water quality measures. Cindy explained that the full spectrum of measures is currently being considered. For example, with respect to the sub-objective to improve access for native aquatic species, measures could include low-flow channels and increased shading of channels. She noted that specific challenges include the private ownership of many stream reaches, and the need to balance ecosystem restoration with flood risk management. She also reminded the group that the USACE's authority is generally limited to work within and directly adjacent to the streams and Waters of the U.S.

With respect to water quality, Lisa explained that the project team has worked to focus and define a clear direction for this objective. Based on work with the TAT, a draft list of the water quality parameters that will specifically addressed by the project has been developed. Based on this

information, the sub-objectives and metrics are being developed. Lisa stated that the USACE will be modeling water quality using WARMf once the sub-objectives are identified.

She reminded the group that ENV has contributed funds to conduct water quality sampling, specifically for pesticides and sediment. She stated that CH2M HILL is currently working to identify the specific focus of the sampling effort, then will be preparing a sampling plan. The intent of the sampling effort is to obtain data that will help guide the development of measures.

Lisa explained that Townscape is taking the lead on stakeholder involvement, and asked Sherri Hiraoka to provide a status update. Sherri provided the group with a description of the stakeholder involvement objective and sub-objectives. She then explained that Townscape is conducting a Stakeholder Involvement Assessment; the intent of the assessment is to focus the stakeholder involvement plan and ensure that all the relevant parties are involved in the project process in order to ensure a reasonable understanding of issues and concerns, and improve project development. The assessment is nearly complete, and will be provided to the TAT for review. Agnes Topp then provided an overview of the information that had been obtained from stakeholders as part of the assessment. She noted that the most common feedback is that more awareness and education is needed, particularly related to understanding the level of risk. Sherri then explained that the current level of stakeholder involvement will continue through this phase (e.g., information available via website, participation in public events), with increasing outreach in the next phase (primarily through small neighborhood meetings).

Karen noted the importance of culturally sensitive solutions, but stated that she doesn't think the information necessary for the development of these kinds of measures can be obtained through neighborhood meetings; she suggested that coordination with Hawaiian civic clubs could be valuable. She also highlighted the importance of stakeholder education, and explained that Ala Wai Watershed Association (AWWA) has been hosting an ongoing education series. Kaimo Muhlestein stated that Office of Hawaiian Affairs (OHA) may be willing to support components of stakeholder education, especially those that reach out to cultural practitioners to share their *mana`o*. Dudley agreed with the importance of educating the public, and suggested the use of expert-led workshops.

Karen stated that the project is generally focused on the use of public lands, but suggested that the use of private lands needs to be more strongly considered, as many of the stream reaches are privately owned yet are critical to an overall solution. Cindy clarified that the project will be looking at all opportunities, and is not restricting the use of private lands, although there will probably need to be a focus on public lands. If there are private lands where measures can make a significant difference, the sponsors will work with the property owner to seek their willingness to grant easements. She noted this is one of the major challenges of this project. Lisa explained that the project team recognizes the importance of acquisition of easements and rights-of-entry, and understands that it will be critical to identify the feasibility of land acquisition early in the project development process.

Jimmy noted that it has been almost five years since the 2004 Manoa flood, and expressed his concern that the project is too big and is taking too long to address the risk of flooding. He asked how the project team is addressing this concern with the public. Sherri explained that the stakeholder involvement component of the project is openly disclosing the fact that this is a long-term project, and there has been general stakeholder support for the inclusiveness of the project. She noted that in some cases, flood victims are choosing to address the problems themselves. David Hafner agreed that many landowners will be forced into addressing flood problems on their own, which could be counter-productive to the project objectives. As an example, he explained that UH may need to conduct a multi-million dollar project to redirect stormwater due to a City & County catch basin upstream of UH.

Cindy explained to the group that the USACE has a new requirement for peer review of the project documents; as part of this process, she has prepared a peer review plan and plans to provide it to the stakeholders for review and comment in the next few weeks. She noted that the peer review process allows for members of the public to recommend reviewers, and encouraged the group to provide suggestions. Any recommended reviewers will be vetted by the organization overseeing the peer review (normally National Academy of Science or its consultant) to ensure they meet the requirements for a reviewer and do not have any conflict of interest with the project.

Lisa then provided an update on the other project objectives, including water supply, recreation and infrastructure maintenance. She noted that these objectives are not entirely within the project sponsors' authority, so these are ones which the project team will be working to identify other entities who are willing to champion the necessary measures. She explained that the project team has been coordinating with the relevant agencies, and is working to develop sub-objectives and metrics. She also provided an update on a number of different watershed-scale assessments. She stated that the hazardous waste and geotechnical resource assessments have been completed. Cultural resource and historical property assessments, as well as a literature review of coastal resources, are underway. Grant asked about the scope of the cultural resource assessment. Cindy explained that it is a broad-brush assessment of resources within the watershed (as there are not yet specific project locations identified) and is intended to help incorporate traditional ecological knowledge as part of project development. Lisa noted that a more detailed assessment would be conducted as part of the EIS, once the specific project locations are identified.

4. Path Forward

Lisa then provided a brief overview of the path forward. She noted that the next big tasks will be completion of the modeling for existing and baseline conditions (flood risk management, ecosystem restoration, water quality) and the resource assessments. In addition, the conceptual measures will be identified and preliminary formulation of alternatives will be completed. This information will all be included in the FSMR, which the team is hoping to complete by the end of the year. She explained the next phase will be detailed alternatives formulation (expected to occur next year), with the draft/final Feasibility Report and EIS expected in 2011/2012, respectively.

5. Update on Associated Projects

Chris Ball explained that Mitsunaga and Associates has been contracted by DLNR to investigate the potential use of the golf course for detention. He explained that detailed topographic maps have been completed and the development of various layouts of detention basins is underway. He noted that the intent is to maintain use of the golf course, to the maximum extent possible.

Relative to the Woodlawn Bridge chute structure project, Cindy noted that there were previous concerns about the lack of separation of the NEPA documentation between the DLNR chute structure project and the USACE Ala Wai watershed project. USACE did not want to inadvertently delay the chute structure with the complex USACE planning and review process that doesn't apply to FEMA. FEMA and USACE had discussions and have documented the separation of the two projects. The chute structure will proceed under a separate NEPA compliance but Ala Wai will share any baseline information useful to FEMA. Both projects will talk about the other in terms of cumulative impacts. Specific questions on status and process of the NEPA and design process need to be directed to FEMA and DLNR.

Lisa then asked the meeting participants to provide any update on any other project or relevant activities occurring within the watershed. The group provided the following updates:

1. Tom Heinrich explained that he recently participated in meetings with Senators Akaka and Inouye staff to discuss the development of a land trust. He noted that there was a great deal of interest and support from the senators. He highlighted the importance of keeping the senators informed, especially because of the length of time required for the study.
2. Tom also noted the recent mowing of the restoration site at the Manoa Valley District Park. He explained that he recently spoke with the mayor's representative, and will be preparing remarks to encourage improved communications. Cindy noted that USACE can provide recommendations on alternative maintenance techniques.
3. Tom reminded the group that the south Oahu soil and water district has been dormant for the past five years, but that it is currently being reactivated. He noted that Karen Ah Mai is the primary contact on this issue.
4. Ron Rickman explained that USGS has been conducting ongoing stream flow monitoring within the watershed, and is currently working with ENV on a proposal to conduct additional sediment sampling. David asked what it would talk to install another real-time storm gauge at Woodlawn Bridge. Ron explained that it is possible to install the gauge if there is funding available (approximately \$20k annually). David noted that UH may be interested in pursuing installation of a new gauge.
5. Jerry Takayesu stated that ENV has several capital improvement projects to install catch basins throughout the watershed, as well as control valves on the storm drains in Waikiki to minimize sediment inputs. He also stated that ENV is working to mitigate the use of soap/shampoo in the public showers.
6. Dudley noted that the deliverable documents from the Manoa Watershed Project are available online through the NRCS site or the Ala Wai Watershed Project website.
7. Grant and Kaimo explained that OHA is not a landowner within the watershed, but noted that OHA is willing to help support the project.
8. Jimmy Lagunero stated that UH Department of Emergency Management actively working with State Civil Defense to help address areas of concern along the channels in preparation for Hurricane Felicia. He noted that there are continuing concerns with the area at and below Woodlawn Bridge, as well as under Kahaloa St. bridge (due to the accumulation of sediment).
9. Tom reminded the group that the UH Manoa long-range planning process is underway, and a public hearing is expected in the next 60 days. He explained that the plan doesn't address flooding, but does include some new facilities. A copy of the plan is available through UH's website.
10. Cindy explained that the USACE Deputy Chief of Engineers for Civil Works (MG Temple) was on Oahu last week, and she provided a brief tour of the Ala Wai watershed project. She stated that he was very supportive of the project.
11. Rob Iopa explained that he is a consultant to Kyoya Hotels, and is worked on a preliminary plan for deep seawater cooling for Waikiki. He stated that it would be a deep sea extraction and return system, and is interested in opportunities for collaboration with the Ala Wai Watershed Project (especially related to potential flushing of the Canal).
12. Jen Barrett stated that she is working for UH SeaGrant, and is primarily responsible for outreach in Waikiki, to both visitors and kama`aina. She stated that the program is conducting

both human use monitoring and snorkeling surveys, and can potentially serve as a platform for educational outreach in the Waikiki area.

13. Barry reminded that group that Board of Water Supply (BWS) is preparing watershed plans for the island of Oahu, but the Primary Use Center (PUC) plan is not expected to be developed for a few years. He reminded the group of the need to conserve water, noting that the Kaimuki station (which served lower Palolo and Kaimuki) has low ground water conditions. Structural improvements are planned for this station, but will not be completed in the near future.

6. Alternatives Screening Criteria

Lisa provided a brief overview of the criteria development process, explaining that the screening process and draft criteria were developed by the project team based on the USACE requirements and known stakeholder concerns, and a workshop was held with sponsoring/ cooperating/ permitting agencies in August. She reminded the group that a list of draft criteria and the screening methodology is required for the FSMR, which is expected to be available for public review and comment. She explained that the draft criteria will continue to be refined, as necessary, over the course of the project.

Lisa then provided the group with a basic definition of criteria, which is a standard on which a judgment or decision may be based. She explained that in the context of the USACE process, criteria are those standards that will be used to judge the various alternative plans and determine which should be dropped from further consideration and which should be carried forward as part of the planning process. She stated that the intent of the process is to use criteria to methodically narrow the set of alternatives, focusing on those that best achieve the criteria and eventually leading to selection of the plan that best meets the project needs.

She explained that there are a variety of different regulations that apply to criteria development for USACE studies. She provided the group with two excerpts, one from the P&G and one from the USACE engineering regulations. She explained that the P&G require that formulation of alternatives be based on four criteria: completeness, effectiveness, efficiency, and acceptability. The USACE regulations require that the criteria to evaluate alternatives include significant resources, outputs and plan effects. She explained that based on these two requirements and the project-specific needs, the project team developed an alternatives formulation and screening process that addresses Steps 3 - 6 of the six-step planning process. In keeping with the P&G and USACE requirements, the process includes two distinct types of screening: screening against the P&G criteria during the alternatives formulation phase (i.e. Step 3), and screening against more specific criteria during the alternatives evaluation/comparison phases (i.e. Steps 4 and 5).

a. Alternatives Formulation and Screening Process

Lisa provided the group with a flowchart illustrating the alternatives formulation and screening process, and discussed the individual steps of the process. She explained that the process includes five tiers of screening (Tiers 1-3 in the formulation phase, and Tiers 4-5 in the evaluation/ comparison phase). She emphasized the importance of iteration and reformulation as part of each screening tier, explaining that it helps to refine and improve the alternatives set. She explained that for the first four tiers of screening (corresponding with Steps 3 and 4 of the six-step process), the alternatives are screened against minimum standards/thresholds for each criteria, to determine whether the alternative qualifies for further consideration. Scoring of each alternative against the criteria is only done for Tier 5, at which point the alternatives are ranked to provide the basis for plan selection. She noted that the Feasibility Report will include documentation of the screening process and results, with clear rationale as to why specific alternatives were dropped.

Lisa explained that there are a variety of tools that can be used to facilitate the formulation and screening process, ranging from a simple Excel spreadsheet to complex software tools. She explained that CH2M HILL is evaluating the various tools in parallel with the criteria identification and will make a recommendation to the project team. She noted that the software tools are especially useful on complex projects such as the Ala Wai, as they assist with multi-criteria trade-off analyses and allow for sensitivity-level assessments. In addition, the software tools generally include a stakeholder outreach module, which can be used to clearly communicate the process and results with stakeholders.

b. Formulation Criteria

Lisa then provided the group with a detailed overview of the four P&G criteria to be used for the Tier 1-3 screening: completeness, effectiveness, efficiency and acceptability. She explained that all four criteria would be applied at each screening tier (Tier 1 – 3), but each tier would consider the increasing level of complexity and detail (e.g., interactions and cumulative effects) as formulation progresses from measures to single-objective alternatives and then to combined (i.e. multi-objective) alternatives. She noted that an alternative must achieve a minimum standard for each of the four criteria to be carried forward, unless the alternative is required for compliance with NEPA (e.g., no action alternative).

Lisa then provided the group with an example of screening for Tiers 1, 2 and 3. She explained that the list of measures used in the example include both previously identified measures from the Manoa Watershed Study, as well as hypothetical measures for other areas within the watershed (based on the concepts developed for the Manoa Watershed Study); she stressed that the list of measures/alternatives and screening concepts did not go through any technical analysis, and were intended for the purposes of the example only. For each tier, she showed examples of measures/alternatives that were dropped from further consideration and explained the rationale.

c. Evaluation Criteria

Lisa then provided the group with an overview of the draft evaluation criteria (Tier 4 and 5). She explained that the USACE regulations specify that evaluation criteria should be a study-specific set of standards. She explained that the P&G has established four accounts that encompass the various aspects of the human environment as required for analysis under NEPA, and these accounts serve as a useful mechanism for criteria identification. The four accounts are National Economic Development (NED), Environmental Quality (EQ), Regional Economic Development (RED) and Other Social Effects (OSE).

She explained that the effects of the alternatives relative to the full range of resources covered by these four accounts will be displayed as part of the Feasibility Report and EIS, but only those resources that are considered significant in the context of the project should be identified as criteria. In addition, each criterion should reveal a difference between alternatives.

She continued by explaining that for the Tier 4 screening, an alternative must meet a minimum threshold for each of the criteria, in order to be carried forward to the comparison step. For the Tier 5 screening, the alternatives are ranked based on weighted scores for each criteria; this ranking provides the basis for plan selection. She noted that a locally preferred plan can be identified by the local sponsor, in the event that it is different than the selected plan.

She then presented the group with the list of draft criteria identified by the project team, and asked the group for specific feedback. The feedback and input provided by the group is as follows:

1. Jerry asked if habitat for native species would be considered as part of the draft criteria. Paula Levin suggested that habitat would be captured as part of the native aquatic species criteria. Tom added that is important to consider the continuity of habitat.
2. Tom suggested that the criteria consider the cultural context (e.g., consideration of *ahupua`a*) of an alternative; he suggested that it be added under the category of "Other Significant Criteria". Cindy agreed that this is important, especially as a local issue, as it is not a concept captured as part of the national regulations. Kaimo agreed with this concept, adding that it could help capture the concept of *malama `aina*.
3. Tom also suggested that the concept of community vision be captured somewhere in the screening process (perhaps as part of formulation screening). He explained that many ideas have been long considered for different parts of the watershed (e.g., the Manoa Stream linear park/bike path). He suggested that it is important to consider how these previous visions have been captured as part of the formulation process.
4. Karl Brookins noted that aesthetics refers to other concepts other than just visual, and should apply to both humans and wildlife. He suggested that the criteria for aesthetics be expanded to also consider noise.
5. Karl also suggested that the criteria for native aquatic species should consider both endemic and non-endemic species, with more emphasis (or weighting) given to endemic species.
6. Jen noted that the native aquatic species criteria should explicitly include marine species. She also suggested that the criteria for special aquatic sites include other unique habitat. Cindy clarified that special aquatic sites are directly related to the regulatory requirements under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, but agreed that it could be expanded to include other unique habitat.
7. Jerry explained that the criteria in the Regional Economic Development (RED) category are generally confusing. For example, he asked why it only considers State and County tax revenues, and not federal tax revenues. Bob noted that federal tax revenues would be captured as part of the Federal Objective. Cindy explained that the criteria in the RED category are intended to address both beneficial and adverse impacts at a more localized scale, than those that would be addressed under the federal objective. David noted that one of the fundamental problems with economic criteria, in general, is the difficulty of capturing non-monetary benefits/costs.
8. Karl noted that the criteria should be clarified in reference to the timing of impacts (e.g. short-term vs. long-term) and geography (e.g., within the watershed vs. outside the watershed). Lisa noted that these concepts will be fleshed out as part of the development of the scoring methodology.

In general, there was consensus by the group on each of the above discussions. Lisa concluded the meeting by thanking everyone for their participation and encouraging everyone to continue to provide comments and input via telephone or email. She noted that the next quarterly stakeholder meeting is tentatively scheduled for December 4th, but may be held sooner if there is specific information that is ready for presentation to the stakeholders (e.g., final hydraulic modeling results).

Ala Wai Watershed Project
 Quarterly Stakeholder Meeting Attendance List
 September 4, 2009

Last Name	First Name	Organization	Email Address	Phone Number
Ah Mai	Karen	Legislative Aide for Rep. Say	ahmai@hawaii.rr.com	955-7882
Arnold	Grant	Office of Hawaiian Affairs	granta@oha.org	594-1764
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
Barrett	Jennifer	UH, Sea Grant	jjbarret@hawaii.edu	931-6061
Brookins	Karl	DLNR DAR	Karl.G.Brookins@hawaii.gov	
Dashiell	Gene	Environmental Planning Services	dashiell.e@hawaiiantel.net	593-8330
Finch	Bob	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	Robert.A.Finch@usace.army.mil	438-1664
Hafner	David	UH Manoa, Assistant Vice-Chancellor for Facilities	hafner@hawaii.edu	
Hiraoka	Sherri	Townscape	sherrihiraoka@townscapeinc.com	536-6999
Iopa	Rob	WCIT Architecture (Waikiki Seawater Cooling Project)	riopa@wcitarch.com	
Kettley	Lisa	CH2M HILL	lisa.kettley@ch2m.com	943-1133
Kitamura	Michael	Representative for Senator Akaka	michael_kitamura@akaka.senate.gov	
Kubo	Dudley	NRCS	Dudley.Kubo@hi.usda.gov	541-2600 x124
Kwock	Jeremy	Hawaii Dept. of Education	jeremy-kwock@doe.k12.hi.us	377-8301
Lagunero	Jimmy	UH Manoa, Emergency Management	lagunero@hawaii.edu	956-0773
Levin	Paula	USFWS, Ecological Services Division	Paula_Levin@fws.gov	792-9417
Luersen	Paul	CH2M HILL	paul.luersen@ch2m.com	440-0201
Muhlestein	Kaimo	Office of Hawaiian Affairs	kaimom@oha.org	594-1764
Murawski	Paul	USACE	Paul.E.Murawski@usace.army.mil	438-9526
Rickman	Ron	USGS	rrickman@usgs.gov	587-2407
Sawdey	Sharon	NRCS	sharon.sawdey@hi.usda.gov	541-2600 x125
Shariq	Linsey	CH2M HILL/Stanford	lshariq@ch2m.com	203-3075
Soon	Ray	Solution Pacific, LLC	rsoon@solutionpacific.org	440-0703
Stercho	Richard	State Civil Defense	rstercho@scd.hawaii.gov	733-4301 x583
Topp	Agnes	Townscape	agnes@townscapeinc.com	536-6999
Tsuchida	Bruce	Townscape	brucetsuchida@townscapeinc.com	536-6999
Usagawa	Barry	Board of Water Supply	busagawa@hbws.org	748-5900
Yee	Jon	AECOM	jon.yee@aecom.com	391-0141