MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

SUBJECT:  **16 November 2017** Consultation Meeting for the Programmatic Agreement for Routine Military Training and Training Area Management on O'ahu.

1. The United States Army Garrison, Hawai'i (USAG-HI) held a consultation meeting to continue development of a programmatic agreement (PA) regarding routine military training and training area management at Army installations on O'ahu. The meeting was held on Thursday, November 16, 2017 from 3:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. at the USAG-HI Natural Resources conference room located at 1480 Higgins Road, Wahiawā, Hawai'i. Eleven people attended the meeting. Enclosure 1 provides a full list of attendees.

2. The goals of this meeting were to review the progress on the PA, present and discuss the Army's proposed treatment measures to mitigate any adverse effects that may result from training actions and related activities, and to plan the next steps forward.

3. Those in attendance discussed the Army's four proposed mitigation measures: site visits and stewardship, virtual site visits, traditional cultural property studies, and educational videos. Consulting parties were generally supportive of the mitigation proposals and acknowledged the proposals addressed many of their concerns. All parties recognized that additional work is necessary to define the details of the mitigation measures and finalize the agreement. Enclosure 2 provides a summary of the meeting.

4. The points of contact are Ms. Darienne Dey, (808) 655-9738, Senior Cultural Resources Technician, Pacific International Center for High Technology Research (PICHTR), and Mr. David Crowley, (808) 655-9707, Archaeologist, USAG-HI Directorate of Public Works, Environmental Division (DPW-ENV)

   DARIENNE DEY  
   Senior Cultural Resources Technician  
   PICHTR  
   USAG-HI DPW-ENV
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1. List of Attendees  
2. PA Meeting Comments
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SUBJECT: 16 November 2017 Consultation meeting for the Programmatic Agreement for Routine Military Training and Training Area Management on O‘ahu.

Enclosure 1: List of Attendees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kate Kerr</td>
<td>Advisory Council on Historic Preservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Susan Lebo</td>
<td>State Historic Preservation Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ka‘ahiki Solis</td>
<td>State Historic Preservation Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lauren Morawski</td>
<td>Office of Hawaiian Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Lenchanko</td>
<td>‘Aha Kūkaniloko, Ko’a mana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Shirai</td>
<td>Kawāihapai ‘Ohana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhonda Suzuki</td>
<td>USAG-H DPW-ENV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Davis</td>
<td>USAG-HI DPW-ENV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Crowley</td>
<td>USAG-HI DPW-ENV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natalie Ortega</td>
<td>USAG-HI DPW-ENV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darienne Dey</td>
<td>USAG-HI DPW-ENV/PICHTR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

SUBJECT: 16 November 2017 Consultation meeting for the Programmatic Agreement for Routine Military Training and Training Area Management on O‘ahu.

1. Mr. Richard Davis, Cultural Resources Manager for U.S. Army Garrison, Hawaii (USAG-HI), opened the meeting at 3:00 p.m. Attendees introduced themselves.

2. Mr. David Crowley introduced the goals of the programmatic agreement (PA) meeting: review the progress of consultation, present and discuss the Army’s proposed mitigation measures, and determine how to proceed based on that discussion.

3. Ms. Lauren Morawski inquired about the availability of previous meetings’ notes. Public affairs is working to get the notes from previous meetings uploaded to the website and Mr. Crowley can provide copies in the interim.

4. Mr. Crowley reviewed the progress of PA development by looking at the steps in the PA process and revisiting the proposals to avoid, minimize, and mitigate effects to historic properties discussed in previous meetings.

5. Mr. Crowley shared that since the previous PA meeting on June 29, 2017, there had been several discussions with the State Historic Preservation Division (SHPD) and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), as well as with Army Installation Management Command, the Garrison Commander, and the U.S. Army, Hawaii (USARHAW) Senior Commander.

6. Ms. Morawski asked about plans for a public meeting.
   a. Mr. Crowley explained that a public notification had gone out in a press release but there had been no response and there was no plan for a public meeting.
   b. Dr. Lebo inquired about the nature of the public notice. Mr. Crowley stated that the notification was distributed by the Public Affairs office to a variety of press organizations and elected officials. The public may provide input through the contact information in the notice and USAG-HI web site.

7. Mr. Crowley referred to the PA timeline. Since the PA would not be finalized before the current Stryker Brigade Combat Team (SBCT) PA expires on December 31, 2017, a short-term extension of the SBCT PA is necessary. The SBCT PA will be extended until June 30, 2018, but the goal is to complete the new PA well before that date.

8. Dr. Lebo asked about the proposed schedule for meetings and drafts and the likelihood that a final draft will not be ready by the next meeting, tentatively scheduled for late December.
   a. Mr. Davis explained that the consultation process will continue until we are able to take any comments and concerns into account.
b. Mr. Crowley described estimated timeline as aggressive but said it is intended to keep the process moving. He stressed the importance of receiving feedback on the PA drafts and explained that comments received to date have been incorporated but comments have not yet been received from the Office of Hawaiian Affairs or the SHPD.

9. Mr. Crowley explained that the primary purpose of this consultation meeting was to present and discuss programmatic treatment measures USAG-HI is proposing to mitigate adverse effects caused by training and related activities. These proposed measures were all suggested by consulting parties over the past year and a half of consultation and are supported by the USAG-HI Garrison Commander and the USARHAW Senior Commander.

10. The first proposal from USAG-HI is to allow opportunities for site visits and stewardship activities in non-hazardous areas (i.e., outside of “dudded” and “high hazard” impact areas). Requests for site visits and stewardship would go to the Cultural Resources Manager, who will coordinate approval with range control and the Garrison Commander as required by Army regulations. Visits by small groups during business hours will be more easily accommodated. Details for consideration include determining who would be permitted to access sites, what procedures or protocols are necessary, and whether stewardship responsibilities for specific areas should be designated to certain Native Hawaiian Organizations (NHOs) or families.

a. Ms. Ka‘ahiki Solis asked if Drum Road and adjacent areas are non-hazardous, whether they would be accessible, and if cultural protocols could be performed in those areas.

b. Mr. Crowley replied that Drum Road is not hazardous area, though recent landslides have closed portions of it. Since Drum Road is on an Army easement running through private and State, accessing areas outside of the easement would require the proper permissions. Cultural protocols could be performed at any site that is accessible.

11. Mr. Lenchanko asked if the Army would clear designated pathways to allow for perpetual access to sites within impact areas (e.g. Hale‘au‘au Heiau) and how long the clearing process would take.

a. Mr. Crowley explained that Army will not clear pathways to, or allow access in hazardous areas at this time.

b. Mr. Lenchanko asked when USAG-HI intends to clear the impact areas of hazards so consulting parties can safely access known historic properties, assess any impacts to them, and properly steward them. Not being able to access sites precludes inspection for damages and does not encourage well-being for the land or people. He requested that the PA stipulate a timeframe in which the clearing might be completed.
c. Mr. Crowley acknowledged his concerns but stated that the Army has no plans to clear the dudged or high hazard impact areas at this time.

d. Mr. Lenchanko suggested that the Army adopt a regular cycle of clearing impact areas. He emphasized the importance of access to traditional cultural properties as essential for discovering, understanding, and implementing traditional beliefs and practices and to understand how people across multiple generations have connected with important places. He expressed additional frustration at the lack of usage of terms such as “traditional cultural properties,” “generational knowledge,” and “traditional beliefs and practices” in the PA, recommending that such value-laden terms be included.

12. Dr. Lebo asked what activities constitute stewardship and care of sites and, if it is possible replace the word of “sites” with “areas,” reasoning that some “sites” might actually be “traditional cultural properties” and requesting to see a map showing the sites or areas in question.

a. Mr. Crowley stated that specific activities appropriate to stewardship and care of sites would be at the discretion of those charged with caring for particular sites.

b. Dr. Lebo highlighted the importance of identifying and agreeing on ways to “care” for sites in order to avoid potential misunderstandings about proper activities.

c. Ms. Suzuki asked about the degree of specificity required in the PA document and suggested that while such terms might be left broad within the PA, additional site-specific documents could allow for more detailed elaboration on processes for implementing previously broadly defined concepts.

d. Dr. Lebo agreed that, while the definition of “care” did not need to be specific in the PA, the process for defining it (and other concepts) would need to be delineated, proposing that such addenda be completed within one year of the finalization of the PA document.

e. Ms. Davis summarized the discussion: requests to visit specific sites would be submitted considered on a case-by-case basis while following a previously determined process that met the satisfaction of consulting parties and families associated with those sites.

f. Mr. Lenchanko and Dr. Lebo added that only NHOs and ‘ohana (families) who actively contributed to the creation of the PA should be consulted on the process for caring for sites.

g. Ms. Morawski asked how other parties might contribute to the creation of the process if they did not participate in PA development

h. Mr. Lenchanko responded that the consulting parties should be consulted and it is important to consider the longevity of involvement of consulting parties in the PA process.

13. Mr. Lenchanko expressed discontent about the National Historic Preservation Act process and the usage of a site model to delineate space. He shared his opinion that
the term "site" was limiting and implied a part of a greater whole, whereas the term "property" was more inclusive and connoted a more appropriate vastness.

a. Dr. Lebo concurred, but suggested the term "area" instead of "property." She would like to see the properties shown on a map.
b. Mr. Crowley agreed that a map showing the locations of "properties" would be part of the PA, but care would be taken not to publically disclose locations.

14. Mr. Thomas Shirai asked for clarification about the discussion of stewardship and access to sites.

a. Mr. Crowley summarized what Mr. Lenchanko had recently shared: that only individuals and groups who have demonstrated long-standing commitment to sites and who have provided input in PA consultation about how to steward those sites would be involved in future discussions about their stewardship. Groups that would like to join later would require discussion between consulting parties.
b. Mr. Shirai was pleased and readily supported Mr. Lenchanko’s sentiments. He expressed that individuals who have kuleana (responsibility, privilege) to one particular place should be consulted when people want to visit an area.
c. Mr. Crowley summarized Mr. Shirai’s concern: consulting parties who have been actively involved in the PA process should be called upon to make decisions about stewardship of sites, and anyone else who would like to visit these sites would be subject to the approval by the consulting parties. Mr. Shirai concurred.

15. Ms. Morawski asked if stewardship agreements would be part of the PA.

a. Mr. Crowley responded that stewardship agreements would not be needed to complete the PA, but individualized site stewardship agreements could be added to the PA as they are developed. Site visits could begin as soon as the PA is signed.
b. Ms. Morawski asked for a guarantee that USAG-HI will follow through with the stewardship agreement, that cultural accesses would be included as part of the mitigation for the PA.
c. Ms. Rhonda Suzuki stated that the Army is proposing to allow site visits and stewardship as a mitigation measure within the PA and the Army will be held accountable for compliance with the PA by SHPD and ACHP. If any signatory objects to the way the agreement is implemented, they can request to terminate.
d. Dr. Lebo suggested including a provision for adding stewardship agreements within the PA with a predetermined amount of time during which a process for stewardship agreements will be developed following the completion of the PA itself. Ms. Suzuki agreed with Dr. Lebo’s suggestion.
e. Ms. Morawski suggested that, since consultants and community member have already been waiting so long for access to sites, a stewardship agreement should be included with the PA before it is finalized.
f. Ms. Suzuki explained that unsupportable because of effort required to individualize site-specific stewardship agreements. The PA framework needs to be in place before stewardship agreements are developed.

g. Dr. Lebo suggested first delineating the areas that would be eligible for visits and stewardship, then discussing the procedures for how to accomplish it.

h. Ms. Suzuki recommended working towards finalizing the PA and then working on stewardship agreements to avoid derailing the PA process.

i. Mr. Lenchanko and Ms. Morawski expressed the importance accessing dudded and high hazard impact areas. Dr. Lebo recommended that a provision acknowledging this ongoing discussion should be included in the PA.

j. Mr. Davis explained that at this time, nobody including DPW-ENV Cultural Resources staff, is permitted to physically access hazardous areas, but one of the mitigation proposal yet to be discussed may address this concern.

k. Mr. Crowley stated that a provision for accessing dudded and high hazard impact areas is not acceptable to the Army and would not be included in this PA.

16. Dr. Lebo asked about the duration of the PA and Mr. Crowley explained the PA is proposed to last 15 years.

a. Dr. Lebo asked if the dudded and high hazard impact areas would continue to be used for training during those 15 years.

b. Mr. Crowley confirmed they would and showed the location of the impact areas in West Range. Currently there is no alternative for live-fire training.

17. Mr. Crowley explained the second mitigation proposal to allow virtual site visits in hazardous and inaccessible areas using 3D rendered imagery captured by an unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV or “drone”).

a. Ms. Solis asked if records have been kept regarding the types of munitions used and for how long.

b. Mr. Crowley replied that records are being kept, but he did not know how long they had been collecting records. He explained that dud-producing munitions are now only used within the high-hazard impact area but there are significant challenges posed by the historical use of dud-producing ordnance.

c. Dr. Lebo asked if a UAV would be able to visit and capture imagery of sites that Mr. Lenchanko would like to otherwise physically visit. Mr. Crowley responded that it would.

d. Dr. Lebo inquired why only some areas would be included in this virtual site visit effort. Mr. Crowley explained other areas could be included, but the priority would be for the hazardous, inaccessible areas. Mr. Lenchanko added that vegetation and forest canopy will limit the UAV in some areas.

e. Dr. Lebo requested that the PA clarify the specific reasons why not all areas are capable of being even virtually visited. She also suggested that the stewardship agreements include provisions about virtual site visits and specifying who would have access to the UAV footage.
f. Mr. Crowley agreed that, like physical site visits, the group would have to decide
details such as who can participate in the virtual visits.
g. Ms. Suzuki suggested that virtual site visits could even be real-time, with UAV
operators transmitting live footage to consulting parties and receiving direct
feedback about where to maneuver in order to capture the desired imagery. She
also shared that the Army is currently dealing with hardware challenges
regarding UAVs produced in China and does not have a timeframe for virtual
site visit development at the moment. Ms. Suzuki emphasized that safety
regulations are the limiting factor for physical site visits, and that she hoped
virtual site visits could help address some of the concerns about sites in
hazardous areas.
h. Ms. Solis is encouraged by the virtual site visits and asked if they hinged on the
signing of the PA, to which Mr. Crowley responded affirmatively.
i. Dr. Lebo requested that there be a means through which consulting parties could
provide feedback on what was captured during virtual site visits and suggested
that the virtual site tours also be archived in an accessible repository.

18. Mr. Crowley described the Army’s third mitigation proposal to conduct traditional cultural
property (TCP) studies, emphasizing the importance of knowledge, input, and guidance
from consulting parties as means to more informed decision making by USAG-HI.
   a. Mr. Lenchanko stated that this is the most important mitigation and should come
before the others. Other mitigation like site visits can be informed by TCP
studies. He commented that some information about sites could be shared
publicly while some should be reserved for a select audience.
   b. Mr. Lenchanko expressed the importance of seeking the guidance of people
actually from the area. He elaborated on the connectedness of various cultural
and religious features across a landscape, specifically Schofield Barracks West
Range. Mr. Lenchanko stated that physical engagement with traditional places
was necessary to confirm their locations as well as to interpret them. Regardless
of the site significance assessed under the NHPA, the community regards them
as invaluable. He suggested that that previous TCP studies should not be
dismissed, suggesting that progress on these continue, drawing upon existing
documentation.

19. Ms. Solis asked if community members could direct USAG-HI in terms of determining
priority TCP studies.
   a. Ms. Suzuki said that priorities should be developed with consulting parties but it
would be challenging to receive direct community input on priority TCP studies,
especially since the work would be primarily in-house and resource driven.
   b. Dr. Lebo asked if Schofield Barracks West Range would be among the priority
TCP studies. Mr. Crowley concurred that West Range is a priority area. Mr.
Lenchanko commented that West Range’s TCP study might be one of the
easiest.
c. Dr. Lebo summarized previous comments: USAG-HI will work with consulting parties to decide what TCP studies will be prioritized. She also suggested that TCP studies should both satisfy the guidelines provided by the National Register Bulletin and be guided by processes defined by consulting parties. Mr. Lenchanko stressed that the damage to TCPs within the high hazard impact needs to be assessed and a way should be found to include such vulnerable TCPs on the National Register, giving them perpetual status and protection.

d. Mr. Crowley highlighted the importance of allowing consulting parties with knowledge of the area to identify TCPs, and referenced National Register Bulletin 38. Dr. Lebo agreed, stressing that the community should define TCPs, regardless of whether or not the TCPs fit the National Register criteria and provided an example of a TCP study at PTA that disregarded input on the cultural significance of water.

e. Mr. Lenchanko differentiated between community and family: members of the community can receive education about TCPs (e.g., via virtual site visits), but only members of specific families can identify TCPs and grant permission to access them. He went on to share that he attends PA meetings as a liaison for his family, more whom would likely attend meetings should there be observable progress in the PA process.

f. Mr. Lenchanko requested that the word “study” be replaced with “analysis.” He also expressed a preference for “place” over “property” since “place” conveyed the appropriate amount of specificity (e.g., Schofield Barracks West Range), while “property” was too expansive (e.g., all of O‘ahu). Mr. Lenchanko stressed that the damage to TCPs within the high hazard impact needs to be assessed and a way should be found to include such vulnerable TCPs on the National Register, giving them perpetual status and protection.

20. Mr. Crowley presented the fourth mitigation proposal to develop an educational video that would feature Native Hawaiian consulting parties. The goal of the video is to express the importance of the ‘āina (land) and instill appreciation and respect for Hawaiian values. Soldiers would be required to viewing the video prior to training on USAG-HI lands.

   a. Mr. Lenchanko approved the message of “appreciation and respect for Hawaiian values” and added “this is our home—treat it like yours.” A simple message like “appreciation and respect for Hawaiian values” would appeal to Soldiers’ human part and keep them in check.

   b. Dr. Lebo recommended having Mr. Lenchanko, Mr. Shirai, and/or members of their ‘ohana deliver the desired message(s).

   c. Ms. Suzuki explained said that video could be similar to that produced by the Navy and Marines (which can be viewed on YouTube). Footage would be collected with consulting parties’ permission, and different videos could be produced, depending on their intended message or purpose (e.g., training for soldiers, education for soldiers’ families, education for soldiers when off-base), though incorporating many of the same elements.
d. Ms. Morawski asked if the videos would be shared with Range Maintenance staff since they have the potential to affect cultural resources. Mr. Crowley agreed.

e. Ms. Solis suggested that the message come from someone with *mana* (power, authority) and *kuleana* for the lands being discussed. She recommended expressing concepts of *mālama* (care for, protect), *kuleana*, and *aloha* (love, respect) through the video.

f. Mr. Lenchanko shared that the Hawaiian Civic Club of Wahiawā has previously done outreach with elementary schools at Schofield Barracks through the *kūpuna* (elders, grandparents) program. Kids learn about Hawaiian culture in school and then take it home to teach their parents, some of whom are soldiers.

g. Ms. Suzuki recommended involving the Army Public Affairs Office, so that the message can reach senior leaders who do not normally receive the same briefings (since they do not participate in training on the installations).

21. Mr. Crowley focused on the next steps in the PA process. The next draft will incorporate the four mitigation proposals presented today along with the comments and concerns expressed.

   a. Ms. Solis requested that documentation from TCP studies be shared with SHPD.
   b. Mr. Davis agreed but qualified that that sharing of documentation would be with permission of the NHOs directly involved. Dr. Lebo assured everyone that SHPD keeps military documents separate and confidential, unless written authorization is provided by the Department of Defense.
   c. Mr. Lenchanko commented that he trusts responsible agencies because they know that they are legally accountable in matters of confidentiality. Ms. Suzuki added that violating confidentiality also violates trust, which is counterproductive for establishing and maintaining community relationships.
   d. Dr. Lebo suggested having one version of a document for official record-keeping and one version that is intended for a more public audience.

22. Mr. Crowley revisited the PA timeline and asked about the next meeting.

   a. Dr. Lebo discouraged the group from having the next meeting so close to the winter holidays.
   b. Mr. Crowley stated the priority is complete the appendices and integrate feedback into new draft. The draft will be distributed in January at or before the next consultation meeting.

23. Mr. Crowley thanked everyone for attending and concluded the meeting at 5:00 p.m.