

**Final**

# **Soft Sounds Interviews Report**

**Input and Feedback from Key Stakeholders and Community  
Influencers Regarding Potential Beneficial Repurposing of the  
Red Hill Bulk Fuel Storage Facility (RHBFSF)**

Contract No. N6247823P2502

Prepared for:



Prepared By:

Nakupuna Consulting LLC  
3375 Koapaka Street, Suite B200  
Honolulu, Hawaii 96819

August 2023

# Table of Contents

---

Table of Contents ..... i

Acronyms and Abbreviations ..... ii

Executive Summary ..... 1

1.0 Introduction..... 2

    1.1 GOALS..... 3

    1.2 OVERVIEW OF SOFT SOUNDS INTERVIEW PROCESS ..... 3

    1.3 STAKEHOLDERS INTERVIEWED ..... 5

    1.4 SOFT SOUNDS INTERVIEW QUESTIONS..... 7

2.0 KEY FINDINGS AND RECURRING THEMES ..... 8

3.0 PREVALANT RESPONSES TO INTERVIEW QUESTIONS ..... 19

# List of Figures

Figure 1: Interview Summary

## Acronyms and Abbreviations

---

DHHL	Department of Hawaiian Home Lands
DOD	Department of Defense
DOH	Hawaii Department of Health
NC	Nakupuna Consulting LLC
NGO	Non-Government Organizations
OHA	Office of Hawaiian Affairs
PFAS	Per- and Polyfluoroalkyl Substances
R&D	Research and Development
RHBFSF	Red Hill Bulk Fuel Storage Facility
UH	University of Hawai‘i

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of this report is to present the findings of a series of one-on-one "talk story" interviews, also known as "soft sounds interviews," conducted with key stakeholders and community influencers throughout Oahu. The objective of these interviews was to gain insight into their perspectives on repurposing the Red Hill Bulk Fuel Storage Facility (RHBFSF) after the tanks are defueled and the facility is closed. The results of these interviews helped inform the development of the quantitative survey which presents options provided during these interviews for evaluation by residents across Oahu.

The interviewees represented a diverse cross-section of the community, including Native Hawaiian organizations, environmental groups, neighborhood boards, academia, business, the nonprofit sector, and local government. Both individuals who have been actively engaged in Red Hill-related issues and those who may not have been publicly active were invited to participate in the interview process.

Each interviewee received a brief overview of the repurposing outreach project and was invited to engage in an informal one-on-one interview. A set of open-ended questions was used during each interview, carefully designed to allow the interviewees to share their thoughts comfortably, providing as much or as little information as they preferred.

The questions focused on the following aspects:

- Potential repurposing ideas for the RHBFSF after closure.
- Reactions to four repurposing categories: Department of Defense use, non-Department of Defense use, alternative energy use, and non-alternative energy use.
- Which repurposing idea would be most beneficial to the people of Hawaii.

The key findings from the interviews are as follows:

- Demonstrated the importance of prioritizing the protection of Oahu's aquifer, community benefit, and environmental preservation in any potential repurposing of the Red Hill facility. A multi-faceted, inclusive approach will be essential to achieving a future scenario that meets the needs and aspirations of all stakeholders, resulting in a mutually beneficial outcome for the people of Hawaii.
- Showcased diverse perspectives on the future of the RHBFSF, with varying degrees of support for the different repurposing categories. Finding a suitable solution that addresses the concerns of stakeholders, ensures public safety, and benefits Hawaii's communities will require ongoing dialogue, careful evaluation, and collaboration among multiple stakeholders.
- Addressed importance of rebuilding trust between the Native Hawaiian community and the military before any future use of the RHBFSF can be contemplated. Providing the Native Hawaiian community with a significant role in decision-making and ensuring their benefit from any future developments emerged as key themes. By addressing these concerns, it may be possible to forge a path forward for the future of the Red Hill site that is acceptable and beneficial to all stakeholders involved.
- Emphasized the importance of transparency, accountability, cultural sensitivity, historical understanding, and providing comprehensive information to engage in meaningful discussions about the future of the RHBFSF. Addressing these missing elements will be crucial for fostering a more inclusive, informed, and constructive dialogue among all stakeholders involved.

The following are the general categories of the ideas raised by the interviewees. These include the interviewees' personal ideas that they have thought of and/or support, as well as ideas that they have heard about from other sources such as news coverage, conversations with friends, family, colleagues, constituents or acquaintances, or that were discussed during community and neighborhood meetings or other forums. The ideas are listed in no particular order:

- Return it to the state or Native Hawaiians and let the people decide what to use it for
- Allow it to return to its natural state / environmental sanctuary / park area
- Housing
- Homeless shelter
- Renewable energy
- Water storage – potable, non-potable, rainwater catchment
- Wastewater reclamation
- Research and development
- Storage
- Museum, visitor attraction or educational use
- Agriculture / food production
- Emergency preparedness
- Landfill for dry, non-hazardous material waste
- Office space
- Secure facility for DOD
- Homeland security purpose
- Entertainment/recreation/

Overall, the "talk story" interviews provided valuable insights into the perspectives of key stakeholders and community influencers regarding the repurposing of RHBFSF. The diversity of views and ideas gathered from this inclusive approach will be instrumental in making informed decisions about the future use of the facility and its potential benefits to the people of Hawaii.

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

This Soft Sounds Interviews Report has been prepared by Nakupuna Consulting LLC (NC) for the Department of the Navy under Contract Number N6247823P2502.

The Nakupuna Companies subcontracted CommPac, LLC, a Honolulu-based communications firm, to engage with key stakeholders and community influencers throughout Oahu to gain insight on how different segments of the community feel about repurposing the Red Hill Bulk Fuel Storage Facility (RHBFSF) after it is defueled and closed.

This report reflects suggested ideas, perceptions, concerns, observations and comments relating to the potential repurposing of the RHBFSF that were expressed during one-on-one interviews with key stakeholders in the community. The highlights from the interviews are compiled in this report. This report does not rank the ideas raised by the interviewees, nor does it provide any recommended course of action on repurposing the RHBFSF.

The interviews are part of an effort by the Navy to learn about the community's ideas for potential beneficial non-fuel uses for the facility after it is defueled and closed. In addition to the interviews, an online qualitative survey was made available to the public between March 31, 2023, and May 31, 2023, to give the public the opportunity to provide suggestions for how the facility should be utilized after it is defueled and closed. Both the findings of the interviews and the qualitative survey were used in forming the questions for the quantitative survey which was initiated in late July 2023 to a geographically representative set of households from across Oahu with an oversampling of households in the Red Hill area. This survey will be conducted by mail with households in geographic areas surrounding Red Hill and via the internet with a

sampling of households island-wide. The surveys are being developed and administered by local firm SMS Research & Marketing Services, Inc., which was subcontracted by the Nakupuna Companies. The Navy intends to use this community input on the recommended beneficial non-fuel use of the RHBFSF in a separate report due to Congress in February 2024.

The goal was to gather community perspectives, ideas and concerns, and to integrate community feedback into clients' understanding of the issues. The community building practice was based on the belief that the community deserves a place at the table and a voice in the discussion about the issues that affect it. The findings of the interviews were used in forming the questions for the quantitative survey. The Department of Navy will make the final decision on the beneficial non-fuel reuse for the RHBFSF.

## **1.1 REQUIREMENT**

On May 6, 2022, the Hawaii Department of Health (DOH) issued an Emergency Order to the Navy requiring the Navy to defuel and close the RHBFSF. A requirement in that order for closing the facility was for the Navy to meet with the DOH. That meeting was held on July 14, 2022, and included discussion on closure alternatives and elements the DOH required in the Closure Plan. The Navy's Closure Plan, submitted to the DOH on November 1, 2022, included provisions for the Navy to explore and evaluate potential options for beneficial non-fuel reuse. The Department of Defense (DOD) will not allow for fuel or hazardous materials to be stored in the RHBFSF.

## **1.2 GOALS**

- Listen and learn about potential ideas individuals might have regarding how RHBFSF could be repurposed for beneficial non-fuel use in the future.
- Gain insights on the views of key stakeholders who represent different segments of the community regarding the repurposing of the facility.
- Identify issues to be addressed and/or better understood, and community concerns relating to the potential reuse of RHBFSF.
- Acquire in-depth and detailed information to help inform the Navy's report on potential reuse options for RHBFSF that will be submitted to Congress in February 2024.

## **1.3 OVERVIEW OF SOFT SOUNDS INTERVIEW PROCESS**

A series of one-on-one "talk story" interviews, also called "soft sounds interviews," was held with key stakeholders and community influencers throughout Oahu to gain insight on their views of repurposing RHBFSF for beneficial non-fuel use. Interviewees who represent a cross section of the community including Native Hawaiian organizations, environmental groups, neighborhood boards, academia, business, the nonprofit sector and local government, were identified and invited to participate in the interview process. The individuals included residents who have been involved with and/or vocal on Red Hill-related issues as well as those who may not have been publicly active. Each individual was provided with a brief overview of the repurposing outreach project and invited to participate in a one-on-one informal interview.

A list of open-ended questions were used during each interview. The questions were designed to allow the interviewees to provide as much or as little information as they felt comfortable. The questions solicited interviewees' thoughts on potential repurposing of RHBFSF after the tanks are defueled and the facility is closed, ideas the interviewees might have for alternative uses of the facility, reaction to four potential repurposing categories (Department of Defense use, non-Department of Defense use, alternative energy use and non-alternative energy use), and what repurposing idea would be the most beneficial to the people of

Hawaii. Specific examples of potential repurposing ideas were not included in the questions so as not to influence the responses or to give the impression that any particular idea was being favored over any others.

The prepared questions served as a starting point for the interviews, and in many cases, led to the individuals taking the conversation in a direction that they felt most comfortable with. The questions served as a guide for the discussion, and depending on the conversation, not all questions were asked during each interview. Because of this, the findings that are detailed in this report do not include any rankings of the ideas and suggestions that were raised by the interviewees.

To encourage candor, interviewees were assured that their comments would not be attributed to them directly but would be compiled into a report along with comments from other individuals.

## 1.4 STAKEHOLDERS INTERVIEWED

A total of 51 individuals were invited to participate. Thirty agreed to be interviewed; 21 declined, did not respond or were unable to schedule a time to be interviewed. Twenty-nine of the one-on-one interviews were conducted via Zoom and one interview was conducted in person. The interviews took place between April 3, 2023, and May 31, 2023.

The list of 30 interviewees who agreed to participate along with their organizations was posted on the [www.redhillrepurposing.com](http://www.redhillrepurposing.com) website on June 12, 2023 as requested by a member of the Defueling Information Sharing Forum.

The following individuals were interviewed.

1. Kelsey Amos, Co-Founder, Purple Mai'a
2. Michael Broderick, CEO, Broderick Dispute Resolution; Former Family Court Judge
3. Kevin Chang, Executive Director, Kua'āina 'Ulu 'Auamo
4. Jason Chung, Vice President, Military Affairs Council, Chamber of Commerce Hawaii
5. Mahealani Cypher, Community Volunteer
6. Dr. Kā'eo Duarte, Vice President, Kamehameha Schools Community and 'Āina Resiliency Group
7. John De Fries, President/CEO, Hawai'i Tourism Authority
8. Kiersten Faulkner, Executive Director, Historic Hawai'i Foundation
9. Jerry Gibson, CEO, Hawai'i Hotel Alliance (HHA)
10. Mahena Hind, Senior Advisor to the CEO, Council for Native Hawaiian Advancement
11. Rep. Linda Ichiyama, Co-Chair, Hawai'i House of Representatives Special Committee on Red Hill; Chair, Committee on Water and Land
12. Kalani Ka'anā'anā, Chief Brand Officer, Hawai'i Tourism Authority
13. Brent Kakesako, Executive Director, Hawaiian Alliance for Community-Based Economic Development
14. Ernie Lau, Manager and Chief Engineer, Honolulu Board of Water Supply
15. Keoni Lee, Director, Hawai'i Investment Ready
16. Rep. Nicole Lowen, Co-Chair, Hawai'i House of Representatives Special Committee on Red Hill; Chair, Committee on Energy and Environmental Protection
17. Kehaulani Lum, President, Ali'i Pau'ahi Hawaiian Civic Club
18. Sherry Menor-McNamara, President & CEO, Chamber of Commerce Hawaii
19. Kamana'o Mills, Chair, O'ahu Island Burial Council; Member, Clean Water and Natural Lands Board
20. Melissa Miyashiro, Executive Director, Blue Planet Foundation

21. Colin Moore, Associate Professor and Chair, School of Communication and Information,  
University of Hawai‘i (UH) at Mānoa
22. Laurie Moore, Executive Director, Armed Services YMCA Honolulu
23. Jonathan Osorio, Dean, Hawai‘inuiākea School of Hawaiian Knowledge, UH Mānoa
24. Sharlette Poe, Chair, Wai‘anae Coast Neighborhood Board, No. 24
25. Rudy Ramirez, President, Associated Students of the UH Mānoa Senate
26. Chace Shigemasa, Chair, Aliamanu-Salt Lake Neighborhood Board, No. 18
27. Wayne Tanaka, Chapter Director, Sierra Club of Hawai‘i
28. Miki Tomita, Executive Director, Malama Pono Foundation
29. Jack Wong, CEO, Kamehameha Schools; Chair, Hawai‘i Business Roundtable
30. Stephen Wood, Chair, Aiea Neighborhood Board, No. 20

## 1.5 SOFT SOUNDS INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

The following are the questions that were developed for the soft sounds interview. Note that prepared questions served as a starting point for the interviews and served as a guide for the discussion, and depending on the conversation, not all questions were asked during each interview.

1. What is your opinion of the potential repurposing of the Red Hill Fuel Storage Facility after the tanks are defueled and the facility is closed?
2. What ideas if any would you suggest for repurposing the facility after it is closed?
3. Initial discussion has identified four possible non-fuel categories for repurposing: DOD use, non-DOD use, energy use, and non-energy use. Do you have a preference for either of the four categories, or do you think any make the most sense?
4. Why specifically do you prefer that category?
5. What idea would you suggest that would fall under your preferred category and why do you think it should be considered?
6. What repurposing category (DOD, non-DOD, energy, non-energy) would be your second choice and why?
7. From your second choice, what idea would you suggest and why would you like it to be considered?
8. Have you discussed any of these ideas or had any other Red Hill repurposing discussions with other people or groups? If so, which ideas were discussed with who, and how did they react? With what other people or groups have you discussed this idea and what was their reaction?
9. Of all the ideas that you have considered, discussed with others, or heard about, which do you think would have the most public support?
10. Which idea would be the best for the people of Hawaii?
11. Of all the discussions you may have heard regarding the repurposing of Red Hill, do you think anything is missing from the conversation? If so, what?
12. Do you have any other comments you would like to add or issues regarding the repurposing of Red Hill you would like to address?

## 2.0 KEY FINDINGS AND RECURRING THEMES

### MIXED OPINIONS ON WHETHER TO REPURPOSE RHBFSF

- There was no clear-cut consensus on whether or not the RHBFSF should be repurposed or reused after it is defueled and closed.
- While nearly half of the respondents agreed with the overall idea of repurposing the facility, and that “looking at ways in general to reuse and repurpose our assets is a good practice,” that support came with numerous caveats, with most respondents saying any alternative use must foremost ensure the protection and safety of the aquifer, and that any mistakes of the past that led to the current crisis must not be repeated. Respondents also were adamant that any reuse of the facility must not impact the environment, jeopardize public health, or pose a safety risk to anyone who might work at, visit or utilize the facility in its repurposed state or in the surrounding areas.
- The majority of those who said they were in favor of possible repurposing also expressed that any future use should benefit island residents to the greatest extent possible, serve a broad community need and help Hawaii become self-sufficient. Any uses must be acceptable to residents in the surrounding area and island-wide and should be culturally appropriate and acceptable to the Native Hawaiian community.
- Concerns were raised that any future use or activity in the underground facility would require some sort of fire suppression system, which could “put us right back in the same position” with contamination from forever chemicals such as per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) contained in Aqueous Film Forming Foam used in the RHBFSF’s current fire suppression system that leaked in November.
- One individual who supported repurposing recommended looking to other places, particularly Europe, where underground facilities have been converted to other uses. “I think for a space like this, it’s a challenge, but an opportunity, I think. Having non-DOD players and looking globally for other examples to at least think about, I think is a healthy exercise to do, to globally look at how people have repurposed underground bunkers and other things that I know has been done in other places.”
- Several individuals said they oppose repurposing the facility and believe that nothing should be done with the site after it is closed and cleaned up, and there should be no future use or activity over the aquifer. A number of individuals supported the idea of allowing the area to return to nature after the facility is closed. A primary reason cited by those who oppose repurposing is the unknown impact any future use might have on not just the aquifer, but also the environment and human health and safety. There is an overarching belief that any alternative use would pose “unnecessary risk for further contamination.” One individual said, “I’m not confident at all that there could be a safe repurposing of this facility, especially given all the uncertainties regarding the structural integrity of the tanks themselves and the concrete ... as well as just a general safety of the facility in terms of worker and visitor protections.”
- Some who oppose reusing the facility are skeptical of the Navy’s intentions. One said repurposing the RHBFSF is, “just a way for it (the military) to keep it intact so they can repurpose it in the event of an emergency for using it for fuel, and as long as it is there, our aquifer is in dire straits, it has to be shut down.” Another individual said, “primarily disable it so nothing can come back into that facility.”

- One individual who supported not repurposing the facility said doing so would leave the problem for future generations. The individual stated, “the part that concerns me the most is by doing that (not repurposing and not removing the tanks), do we then kick the can down the road to our grandchildren, our great-grandchildren, and that you know, 100 years from now, they're dealing with decomposing fuel tanks that are crumbling, and again, somehow getting into the water source.”
- Many believed the discussion about repurposing is ill-timed, with several saying their primary focus is the immediate defueling, remediation and shutdown of the RHBFSF, and that the Navy’s initiation of the repurposing conversation is a distraction from the task at hand. Others said the discussion is premature because there are too many unknowns and that, “we just don't have a firm understanding of the structural integrity of these massive tanks.”

### **LACK OF UNDERSTANDING “REPURPOSING” OR “REUSE”**

- Many of the individuals interviewed expressed uncertainty about what repurposing means, while others said there is a missing step in the repurposing discussion to date, since there are still unknowns about the potential consequences or benefits of reusing the facility versus leaving it as is after it is defueled and closed. Others were hesitant to provide an opinion about the potential repurposing of the facility or to prejudge an idea without knowing what is being proposed, what are the alternatives, the impact, feasibility, benefits or cost.
- Many respondents felt they do not have the technical knowledge, subject matter expertise or enough information about the facility itself to determine whether or not they support or oppose potential repurposing. While several of the individuals interviewed were familiar with the RHBFSF, including some who have toured the facility and seen it firsthand, others did not have a clear idea of what the underground facility looks like, the size of the tanks, the underground space, the access points, or the elevation levels, even after the facility was described to them by the interviewers or based on what they have read or seen in news reports. Some asked what type of existing infrastructure is in place that could support any future use of the facility.
- Others questioned what exactly will be repurposed. Is it the tanks themselves, the land above and surrounding the underground facility, the series of tunnels leading to Pearl Harbor, the operations center? Some wanted to know the size (square footage, acreage, mileage, height) of the space, both underground and aboveground. One individual questioned if repurposing involves reusing the materials at the RHBFSF, including the metal pipes and steel tank liners.
- Some individuals were unsure of the engineering and technical feasibility of reusing the facility, and questioned the structural integrity of not just the tanks, but also the concrete walls and rock walls they are built into, as well as the tunnel system. A few individuals questioned the terrain of the land above the facility and what type of aboveground activity could be supported on that land.

### **DESIRE FOR OPEN DIALOGUE AND TRANSPARENCY**

- There was strong agreement that there should be ongoing discussions about the future of RHBFSF that involve all stakeholders (community, neighbors, government officials, Native Hawaiians, cultural practitioners, military, environmentalists, water protectors, health experts, scientists, engineers, historic preservationists, etc.). One individual expressed that, “we're not going to find a one-size-fits-all answer,

not everybody is going to be happy with what we end up doing or what ends up happening or what the final result is,” but inclusive conversations have to take place to discuss all options and to reach majority opinion. One individual clearly stated, “this is not a conversation that the military gets to dictate,” a sentiment that was expressed by nearly all of the individuals.

- Along similar lines, nearly every respondent said regardless of how DOD proceeds with determining potential repurposing alternatives, there remains a deep distrust of the military at all levels throughout the state. Many questioned if the military can regain the community’s trust and return to a level of confidence that is needed before the public will be open to potentially reusing the facility for other purposes.
- Interviewees expressed the desire for transparency and more opportunities for public dialogue, including town hall meetings and forums where all members of the community who wish to can voice their support for or opposition to repurposing the facility, as well as provide their ideas, concerns, and questions about potential future uses. While the interviewees appreciated being invited to share their views through this process and acknowledged the online survey, many said that there needs to be additional ways for continued, open dialogue with the broader community.

#### **NATIVE HAWAIIAN COMMUNITY INPUT ON *KAPŪKAKĪ (RED HILL)***

- The lack of trust was especially expressed by Native Hawaiian leaders and others who were interviewed. The overall sentiment was that the relationship between Native Hawaiians and the military, which has long been fractured before the Red Hill crisis, must be repaired before any potential future use of the site, military or otherwise, is allowed to move forward and the Native Hawaiian community must have a say in what happens. One individual stated, “It’s very apparent that the Native Hawaiian community are upset based on just like the memories that they have of the past, and how they see things repeated.” Three individuals specifically compared the Red Hill situation to the Navy’s return of Kaho‘olawe, which they pointed out still has not been cleaned up. One interviewee said, “we have another Kaho‘olawe which has great potential. Kaho‘olawe has an amazing potential to educate and allow for culture experiences, but it’s unsafe still yet. ... So I would want that, personally, and our organization would advocate for Native Hawaiians having definitely a larger say in what happens there (at Red Hill), and also benefit, and anything that comes out of that. If there is such a thing that happens.”

#### **POTENTIAL IDEAS MUST BENEFIT COMMUNITY, HELP FULFILL HAWAII’S NEEDS**

- Individuals who were interviewed shared a range of ideas for potential alternative uses of the facility (underground and aboveground). While the ideas were diverse, the common threads, as emphasized throughout this report, are that any future use(s) must:
  - Be safe and not pose any threat to the aquifer or impact the environment
  - Ensure public health and safety
  - Benefit the community and help address/serve a community need, including reducing dependence on imports and increasing Hawaii’s sustainability and self-sufficiency
  - Involve extensive, inclusive discussion and transparent sharing of information throughout the entire process
  - Be culturally appropriate and acceptable to Native Hawaiians

- **Water storage** (potable or non-potable) was the top answer among those who were in favor of repurposing the facility. However, many said they are unsure of the feasibility of storing water in the tanks, specifically whether the tanks can be cleaned properly in order to allow for safe drinking water storage. If non-potable water is stored, interviewees raised concerns about the potential impact to the aquifer if the tanks leak. Other questioned the integrity of the tanks and their remaining lifespan and ability to store water safely.
- **Energy use** was another leading response, including hydroelectricity/gravity-fed electricity, solar energy, battery storage (including non-chemical-based batteries), and compressed air energy storage. One individual raised the idea of a pilot project for alternative fuel development, possibly for DOD ships or planes, in cooperation with the U.S. Department of Energy. Respondents were in favor of exploring whether the site could be used for energy-related purposes, pointing to the need to reduce Hawaii's dependence on imported fossil fuels through the development of clean alternative energy sources, and the importance of lowering carbon emissions in order to address climate change. However, concerns were raised about what type of energy could safely be generated and/or stored in the facility or aboveground that would not threaten the aquifer or the environment. Some respondents were concerned about storing water in the tanks for hydroelectricity as this would still pose a threat if the tanks leak. Housing batteries in the facility above the aquifer could also pose a threat due to the risk of the batteries leaking. Those who supported potential energy use agreed that the use of any type of fuel is not an option.
- **Agricultural use / food production** was another popular idea as a way to help Hawaii increase its food sustainability. Some of the ideas raised included aquaponics, vertical agriculture and mushroom farming inside the underground facility; and more traditional crops above ground. One individual suggested using the facility to create a seedbank for the storage of seedlings of native or endangered plants and crops. While individuals supported the idea of using the facility to grow food, concerns were raised about whether there would be any impact to the aquifer (water and irrigation requirements, draining the aquaponic tanks, use of any type of fertilizers, etc.). Others were concerned about the safety of growing food for human consumption, given the uncertainty about whether the tanks and other areas of the underground facility can be cleaned and remediated to meet health and safety standards.
- **Return the land to nature** was raised several times by interviewees. The general sentiment of those who suggested returning the area back to its natural state and letting nature take its course is that, "it's just healthy for the environment, it's health for Hawaii, it's health for its people." Some individuals supported the idea of converting the land into an environmental sanctuary or park area for recreation, education and preservation purposes.
- **Return the land to Native Hawaiians** was suggested by several individuals, but there were few specific ideas of what Native Hawaiians might use the land for, if anything. One individual was unsure who in the Native Hawaiian community would get the land if it were to be returned, and whether it would be an agency such as the Office of Hawaiian Affairs (OHA) or Department of Hawaiian Home Lands (DHHL), or other groups and organizations. Individuals who supported returning the land to Native Hawaiians said it is important to learn more about how the area was previously used, including any cultural purposes, and to seek insight and advice from kupuna about the Hawaiian place names and what they represented. One individual said, "those names carry a lot of information that could have helped in better planning, or even be able to dissuade somebody from putting a system like that (RHBFSF) in that particular place."

- **Return the land to the State of Hawaii** and let the community decide what to use it for was raised, but no specific details were provided regarding what the state should do with the land or the underground facility.
- **Emergency use** was brought up multiple times, with ideas that included using the underground facility to store emergency supplies (blankets, tents, cots, generators, etc.) and developing into an emergency shelter in the event of a natural disaster. One individual recommended using the facility to store essentials that local residents always seek out in the event of a dock workers strike or natural disaster – toilet paper, Spam and rice. One interviewee who supported the idea of using the facility as an emergency shelter also suggested a dual purpose in which the underground facility would also be used as a bunker if there was an invasion or war.
- **Housing** was offered as a potential use, but questions were raised about the safety and practicality of people living underground. The main concern was whether the facility can be remediated to ensure health and safety. Other concerns and questions included the potential impact to the aquifer from the sewage system and other utilities required for housing, whether the air quality and circulation is sufficient, the lack of natural sunlight, and whether land above is suitable for housing. Some individuals suggested using the facility as a homeless shelter, with similar questions and concerns raised. One individual who discussed the idea of using the facility as a homeless shelter also raised the point that doing so would give the impression that we are trying to hide the homeless underground.
- **Museum, visitor attraction or educational use** was suggested as a way to preserve the historical significance of the facility and honor the local residents who were part of its engineering and construction. Suggestions included making the Red Hill facility part of the Pearl Harbor Historic Sites, along with the USS Arizona Memorial, the USS Bowfin and the Battleship Missouri, as well as focusing on the engineering aspect of the facility. One individual shared an idea they had heard about to make the facility into “a museum to military malfeasance in Hawaii.”
- **Research and development (R&D)** ideas were suggested, including housing a UH laboratory in the underground facility, or using the space to conduct research and development for technology or artificial intelligence. One individual acknowledged that the R&D idea does come with risks, as any materials or substances used in a laboratory setting could leak and impact the aquifer.
- **Landfill use** was raised as a potential alternative, particularly for dry, non-hazardous materials such as construction waste or excavated materials. Anything that is put into the landfill would need to be screened and/or cleaned to ensure there are no toxic materials that could impact the aquifer or environment. Those who mentioned landfill use agreed that the facility should not be used for regular garbage or any type of wet/liquid waste.
- **Grow organisms or plants** that are beneficial to the island’s environment was suggested by two individuals. While they did not know the feasibility, practicality or science behind this idea, one person suggested growing coral polyps to replenish Hawaii’s reefs that are being impacted by climate change, and two suggested raising native organisms such as ‘opae‘ula (Hawaiian red shrimp) or hīhīwai (freshwater snails).
- **Entertainment / recreation** ideas were presented by one individual, who believes the dark, underground space might be conducive to entertainment uses such as video or gaming production or related activities, a movie theater, an underground nightclub, amusement rides such as a roller coaster

or a casino. Another idea that one interviewee had heard about involved creating the world's largest brewery, though the interviewee said that the idea was probably a joke.

- **Tourism use** such as an underground hotel was raised as an opportunity to explore potential ways to promote regenerative tourism. The idea is to look at if certain tourism facilities or activities “can be done underground in a more environmentally friendly way, to use less real estate, potentially free up real estate, or ... create a destination that is not distracting from our natural landscapes or affecting our communities in a really negative way.” The individual pointed to examples of underground hotels in Europe.
- **Opposed uses** raised by some individuals included storing munitions or anything that could later become a target. Several interviewees also opposed using the tanks to store any liquid, other than water. In addition a number of individuals repeatedly opposed using the facility for any type of fuel or hazardous material, despite being informed by the interviewers that DOD has committed that the tanks will never again be used to store fuel or hazardous chemicals.
- **List of Repurposing Ideas.** The following is a compilation of all of the ideas raised by the interviewees. These include the interviewees’ personal ideas that they have thought of and/or support, as well as ideas that they have heard about from other sources such as news coverage, conversations with friends, family, colleagues, constituents or acquaintances, or that were discussed during community and neighborhood meetings or other forums. The ideas are listed in no particular order:
  - Return it to the state and let the people decide what to use it for
  - Allow it to return to its natural state / environmental sanctuary / park area
  - Give it back to Native Hawaiians
  - Determine the original use and cultural significance of the land and place
  - Housing
  - Homeless shelter
  - Renewable energy
    - Solar
    - Battery storage
    - Hydroelectricity / gravity-fed energy
    - Compressed air energy storage
  - Water storage – potable, non-potable, rainwater catchment
  - Wastewater reclamation
  - Research and development
    - UH laboratory
    - Technology development
    - Artificial intelligence (AI) development
  - Vault / storage for archival records
  - Museum, visitor attraction or educational use
    - Make it part of the Pearl Harbor Historic Attractions
    - Museum to highlight history of the facility, engineering aspect
    - Museum to the military malfeasance in Hawaii
  - Agriculture / food production
    - Vertical farming
    - Aquaculture
    - Mushrooms
    - Traditional crops (on land above facility)

- Seed bank for native / endangered plants and crops
- Grow coral polyps to replenish reefs
- Raise ‘opae‘ula (Hawaiian red shrimp) or hīhīwai (freshwater snails) or any kind of organism or plant that is beneficial to our islands and our ecosystems
- Emergency preparedness
  - Storage of emergency supplies
  - Storage of Spam, rice and toilet paper for dock workers strike
  - Emergency shelter
- Landfill for dry, non-hazardous material waste
  - Construction waste
  - Excavated material
- Office space
- Secure facility for DOD
- Homeland security purpose
- Diving instructions
- World’s biggest brewery
- Regenerative tourism
  - Underground hotel
- Entertainment / recreation
  - Underground nightclub
  - Theater
  - Video and gaming production
  - Casino
  - Amusement rides / roller coaster

## IDEAS THAT WOULD HAVE MOST PUBLIC SUPPORT AND BE BEST FOR HAWAII

When asked which ideas for repurposing would receive the most public support and would be best for Hawaii, responses were mixed and most respondents did not provide a specific idea. However, as cited throughout the interviews, there were several prominent themes, with little distinction between ideas that would garner public support and ideas that would be best for Hawaii.

- **Protect the aquifer** – The majority of respondents emphasized, repeatedly, that repurposing ideas that would receive the most public support and be best for Hawaii would be those that do not impact the aquifer or jeopardize the integrity of Oahu’s drinking water.
- **Benefit the community, common good** – Many of the respondents said repurposing ideas that benefit the community or meet a pressing public need would be supported by the public and be best for the Islands, including ideas that would provide economic benefit, help Hawaii become more self-sufficient, help Hawaii meet its renewable energy goals, support Hawaii’s efforts to address social needs, or benefit the environment.
- **Do not repurpose** was cited by several respondents as the course of action that would have the most public support and also be best for Hawaii. Many individuals said the priority should be to defuel, remediate and close the facility, and not use it for any other purpose. Several raised the concern that anything that is put above the aquifer would still pose an ongoing risk and continue to perpetuate the mistakes that have been made.

- **Return to nature** – Along similar lines, several respondents said returning the land back to nature would receive the most public support and be best for Hawaii. “I think the idea that would be best for the people of Hawaii is for that the ‘aina is to be allowed to have absolutely no development or no use assigned to it, except to grow back to its own natural state, or, you know, given, allowed to grow again, allowed to thrive.”
- **Water and energy** – Individuals who did share their opinions on which specific potential repurposing idea would have the most public support and be best for Hawaii tended to favor water storage and energy use. However, these respondents also emphasized that these ideas should only be allowed to move forward if they can be done safely, without impacting the aquifer.
- **Non-DOD use** – Multiple interviewees said due to ongoing distrust of the Navy and the lack of confidence that the military can be good stewards of the land, any idea that does not involve military use would receive the most public support and be best for Hawaii.
- **Address importance of land to Native Hawaiians** – One respondent said in order to get public support and galvanize people, any repurposing idea would need to take into account the importance of the land to not just Native Hawaiians, but all residents who live here.
- **Unicorn** – Several interviewees pointed out that it will be challenging, if not impossible, to get consensus on a single idea that might receive the most public support and be best for Hawaii. One individual said, “It’ll almost have to be like a unicorn scenario” that will require buy-in from the federal government, non-government organizations (NGOs), nonprofits, community, and other stakeholders.” The individual said ongoing discussions will be required, and “the best thing for Hawaii would be a future scenario that those different elements, almost like a Venn diagram, where they all overlap. That part in the middle, that sweet spot would be the best-case scenario.”

## NON-DOD USE FAVORED

Interviewees were asked for their opinions on four potential repurposing uses for the RHBFSF: Department of Defense (DOD) use, non-DOD use, energy use or non-energy use. Responses to this question were nuanced, with many interviewees saying the categories were either too broad or too narrow, and their support for or opposition to a particular category would depend on numerous factors including what options are being considered, project details, feasibility, cost, purpose, benefit, impact, community input, who is involved, and repeatedly, how each category might affect the overall safety and integrity of the aquifer.

- **Non-DOD use** was the most favored category, with interviewees citing distrust of the military, “hurt feelings in the way DOD has managed the facility,” and lack of confidence in the repurposing process. One interviewee’s response was reflective of others who favored non-DOD use: “Given the Navy’s actions to date, covering things up and not taking care of their own service people, the distrust of them as steward of the place ... I would rather have the DOD out.” Another individual said, “I think there’s a general sense in Hawaii now that the military is about the military. The military takes care of the military. The military doesn’t really care about the larger community. That is an absolutely strong sentiment in the Hawaiian community who are very resentful of the military being on some of the most choice land on the island.” Another individual said, “I’m going to be really clear that I think that it (RHBFSF) needs to be removed from military custody in the same way that Kaho‘olawe was. It was the demonstration of just this complete deaf ear and uncaring attitude toward the threat that they posed. ... I just I really think that for me the military does not deserve to have that space assigned to them.”

Another individual supported the non-DOD use category “mostly because I think the kinds of activities that would be suited for there would need private investment, and investors and developers, I think it would have to be non-DOD.”

- **Energy use** had almost even support with non-energy use. While some interviewees believe some sort of energy use would be beneficial to Hawaii and help increase the Islands’ self-sufficiency, questions remain about whether any energy use could be done safely, without impacting the aquifer. Other questions centered around what type of energy use might be pursued; what energy technologies are currently available or may be available in the future that would be appropriate for Hawaii; whether the energy would be for military use, general community use, or both; who would develop, maintain, operate and pay for the energy facility; and overall feasibility and cost.
- **Non-energy use.** Those who favored non-energy use thought this category was overly broad, but selected this category due to concerns about potential energy use and the impact on the aquifer. Several interviewees were in agreement that a non-energy use would provide “a broader suite of options” and more opportunities to identify a use that would meet a community need such as housing, food production or dry waste storage. Many felt this category needs to be further defined before being able to evaluate potential repurposing options, with one individual saying, “non-energy is such a generic and open category you’d have to actually drill down to the specifics. Is it going to be used for housing? It’s going to be used for this or that? ... I think we’d have to determine that before we could figure out the priorities or prioritization of which one is better than the other.”
- **DOD use** received some support, with several interviewees saying they understand the importance of the military’s presence in Hawaii, but any future use of the facility would be closely scrutinized, would require full transparency about the DOD’s plans and intentions, and should benefit the state and community. One individual said if the DOD pursues a potential repurposing alternative for the facility, the military should look at “how can this best benefit the people of Hawaii? ... It’s not so much like who is using it versus what is the purpose of it, is what is important. And so I think the purpose of it ultimately, whether it’s DOD that’s doing it, whether it’s the state or private company it ought to be for the benefit of Hawaii, and that’s how it ought to be viewed, right, for the benefit of the people of Hawaii.” Another said, “If the Department of Defense can define what its use would be, that would not be a threat to the aquifer, then I would be inclined to have the Department of Defense move forward with it.” Another interviewee with a similar position said, “I’m not opposed to, continued DOD use. I mean, I think we have to be careful that the military still sees Hawaii and Pearl Harbor as a place to locate one of its major bases. I mean, I don’t suspect that’s going to change, but I think Hawaii would be in rough shape if they decided to relocate large parts of their operation to San Diego. So I should say that a cleaner, more responsibly managed version that stays under DOD control, I wouldn’t object to that in an ideal world.” Another individual who favored the non-DOD category, was hopeful that the DOD would be involved in finding a repurposing option “to help generate or reclaim that space for a healthy Hawaii.” The individual said, “I think most people would feel like non-DOD (is the preferred category), just because that seems to be where a lot of the pilikia came from. I would also say, though, that if the DOD has it in mind that they could do something beneficial for Hawaii through its own repurposing and with its own funding then why not let them try? ... And I hope that the military can be part of that because if we keep treating the military as if they are not part of our community then they keep acting like they’re not.”
- **None of the above** – Several interviewees did not support any of the four categories, saying the facility should be shut down and not be used for any other purpose in the future. Others said any alternative use above the aquifer would pose an unnecessary risk and return us to the current crisis situation.

Several also questioned whether the facility can be cleaned to health and safety standards to allow for any use and if the underground facility is structurally sound.

- **Combination, multi-purpose use** – A handful of interviewees said all four categories have pros and cons and that there may be multi-purpose uses for the facility. In particular, one respondent supported a combination of uses, “because the DOD may have needs in common with the general public ... with the non-DOD, so I really think it should be both. If there is a safe public purpose, it can be derived up.” Another individual said given how big the facility is, there may be “multiple solutions,” adding that “it might be hard for any one person to handle financially the whole thing. My guess is, it'd be very challenging for one investor or our government to try and handle that much, you know that much space. It might require a myriad of activities.” Another individual said potential reuse of the facility depends on “what does that land want to be used for? What does that space call for? And so I think any of those applications, if it's meant to positively impact Hawaii and her people and help create a thriving like economy and employment and a healthy and clean living space for folks, like that's if it can contribute in any way to that, then that's what we would want.”

## MISSING PIECES

When the interviewees were asked what, if anything might be missing from the conversation about repurposing RHBFSF, the most prevalent responses focused on the need for transparency and for the Navy, and DOD in general, to rebuild trust with the people of Hawaii and to engage in meaningful, respectful and responsive dialogue with the public.

- **Transparency and authentic conversations** – The majority of those interviewed cited the need for the Navy to provide more information about the repurposing process and intentions, and how the input that is being gathered will be used to determine what happens to the facility. Several respondents called for the Navy to hold open, ongoing conversations with the public, including opportunities for public hearings and town hall meetings to allow all residents to voice their opinions. While the respondents appreciated being invited to participate in these interviews, many said there needs to be a wider forum for impacted communities and the general public to provide input, raise questions and express their concerns. One interviewee said, “I think what's missing is a transparent process, and then the opportunity to build relationships with the decision-makers tied to this issue in the DOD and the Navy.” While respondents called on the military to provide more opportunities for these discussions, some said the public needs to take a more active role to make their voices heard in order to ensure that the conversation includes all perspectives, and not just the opinions of the most vocal individuals or groups.
- **Urgency and accountability** to defuel and shut down the RHBFSF are missing, according to a number of respondents who said they are not able to focus on repurposing until the defueling is completed and the facility is closed. Several respondents said to date, it doesn't feel like there has been a lot of accountability by the Navy to fulfill the promise to defuel and closed the facility.
- **Heart of the people, humility and Aloha** were cited as missing pieces from the conversation. Given the complexities of the Red Hill crisis, one respondent said it is important to discuss these issues, not just from a scientific or engineering standpoint, but also in terms of Hawaiian culture and potential impacts to things that Native Hawaiians hold sacred. A heartfelt connection to the people and the culture is missing. The individual compared the Navy, which has “put up experts in front of the community who are just talking right past each other,” to Board of Water Supply Chief Engineer Ernie Lau, who has a technical background but has been able to “make a very heartfelt connection on a topic that's very

important and he did it in a way that inspired people and continues to inspire people.” Another individual said Aloha is missing, specifically “the ability to forgive, and then to try to work together to find a resolution that will make us good ancestors.”

- **Historical perspective** was cited by a couple of individuals. One interviewee said, “what is missing at this point is a really detailed understanding of what that land was historically, basically looking at the timeline from before contact through the kingdom and into the territory, and why it is ... what we have today ... to give us a really good understanding of what that ‘aina was used for, and who it was sacred to, and who controlled it, how it was sort of seen right in that ahupua‘a system really an understanding of it. I think that that has to happen so that we can see its value if it’s left to heal and how it might be incorporated into a more sustainable usefulness right to the people here.” Another individual said there has not been a lot of discussion relating to Red Hill about how any potential action might affect the historic property, as is required by the National Historic Preservation Act.
- **Lack of information** was cited as missing from the conversation. As covered earlier in this report, many of the interviewees feel they do not have enough information to make an informed opinion or decision about potential repurposing alternatives. This includes lack of technical expertise, not knowing any specifics of ideas that are being discussed and not knowing enough about the process and how decisions will be made.

### 3.0 PREVALANT RESPONSES TO INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

The following are prevalent responses to the questions that were asked during the interviews. The questions served as a discussion guide and in some cases, depending on the conversation, not all questions were asked. The responses are listed in no particular order.

#### 1. What is your opinion of the potential repurposing of the Red Hill Fuel Storage Facility after the tanks are defueled and the facility is closed?

“I definitely think that repurposing has different meanings. Do we repurpose the facility and bring it back to its regular or normal state of nature? Do we return it back to the environment? Do we fill the hole? Or do we use it for housing, or some type of water storage, or something like that? I mean I definitely think that we should look at repurposing the facility, that's important. But how to repurpose it I think it definitely needs all the stakeholders, all the groups that come together, you know, and I think that we're not going to find a one-size-fits-all answer. Not everybody is going to be happy with what we end up doing or what ends up happening or what the final result is. But I think if I we have a majority opinion, then I you know I think we should move forward with any type of repurposing.”

“I'm not sure. So I should say that I haven't really thought that much about what you could use that facility for. I mean, I can think of some options. I mean, I think the ideal one would be if there's some potential for creating hydroelectric power, you know that would be my preferred outcome. But I don't know how feasible that is to take a facility like that and turn it into you know, a clean energy-generating facility. But that certainly would be my ideal choice if it's technically possible.”

“I have real concerns. I know the closure plan supplement one of the tank closure plan dated February 28, 2023, still identifies no formal alternatives. So I have a lot of concerns about repurposing.”

“Are you talking about repurposing the facility that's actually underground, because in terms of what we would do with the facility, or that you're assuming the tanks are sort of in place, too? So I think part of it starts with what does it sit on top of? If it sits on top of an aquifer then we would ask ourselves, like, what would you put on top of an aquifer? So I think that would limit, you know quite a bit. I do think the concept of water storage, that I'd support that as well. It's the extent you could use that area to store water and tanks and other things to allow us to kind of have a better, more flexible supply, I think that would make sense. Other than that, I don't have too many opinions about the repurposing the underground part because it does sit over an aquifer. So we'd obviously be really careful. I do think community involved in the input is really going to be what drives it so for me to say that I have a definitive answer really, isn't make a lot of sense.”

“I think it's a good thing to repurpose it. I think the key is going to be finding a purpose that can resonate with the community as well, I think, connect to and connect the community really to the, to the military. So they see that there is value in the facility and what the military is trying to do.”

“I think, once it's been defueled, closed, cleaned, piping all set and all that to use it for something else really makes sense to me as long as the integrity of the machinery and the tanks and everything is in order, and I assume that engineering tests all those components, and it's you know it's not in any danger to the public, I'm all for repurposing.”

“Well, well, I think it needs to be repurposed, and I'm not sure whether it's the military that should be allowed to make the decision on what that land is used for, and even perhaps, what the what the tanks are

used for. I think that that conversation needs to be entered into immediately. I know the first thing is that you know we're all going to insist that that fuel never, that that it ever act as a fuel repository again, and that repair or replacement of the tanks is not an option in order for them to continue this, I think, and this is really based not just on not just on pragmatics. It's really about trying to make certain that public health issues, community public health issues have the highest priority in the decisions we make about land use in Hawaii that, and I think that this is not a conversation that the military gets to dictate, that this is really must be the sober and informed calculations of legislators, policymakers, community leaders, residents. So I'm glad that this interview and this study is taking place. I'm really, really hopeful that people will insist that you know Kapūkākī is repurposed, and that the decisions about that repurposing are taken from military hands.”

“I think one of the most important things for me is that we don't repeat mistakes of lessons learned by this incident, and so I think, whatever it ends up being needs to ensure that it doesn't put the aquifer back at risk again. And so, in thinking through what repurposing could look like, I think that's the measure of the standard that I would set is that we don't do something that potentially threatens the aquifer in a similar fashion.”

“As far as the repurposing goes, I would just like to see it, the land returned back to its natural state ... because I can't imagine how you would, how would you repurpose these huge tanks, that's like oh, like a 100 feet above the water table. So I think the more probably the most responsible thing is just to close it. Remove the tanks, or fill in the tanks with dirt or what have you. Any kind of repurposing, I wouldn't know how that would negatively impact the water table, positively or negatively impact the water table. I'm not an expert in that field, so for me it'll be just to return the land back to its natural state as close as possible. ... In given the choices between preservation and place of human remains or relocation, it always comes back to, if at all possible, to preserve things in place, preserve things in their natural state. They're like that for a reason in nature. It's good. It's healthy. And yeah. So I always like returning things to its natural state, its natural form.”

“That's a very difficult question for me to answer because they don't really have too much knowledge about the infrastructure. I do understand that the commitment is to close it down, and I think that's a good idea. But in terms of repurposing, I don't know what that means. If you are to remove the tanks themselves won't that implode? I mean, especially if the tank is not holding on, the geology of it, would it collapse? I think the long term it's more than just simply repurposing the tanks. It's then what happens after that? How do you ensure that everybody is safe, and how does that impact all the infrastructure around it?”

“My honest reaction is I'm pretty concerned about just defueling and closing it and doing that as soon as possible. So I'm kind of less concerned about figuring out what will happen with it afterwards. I feel a strong urgency to just defuel it and clean it up and close it as soon as possible. As far as what. I guess the only, you know, other thing would be that I would hope that if it is repurposed and used for something that it is not used to contain any other fuels or chemicals, or objects, or other materials that could also be hazardous to our aquifer or to the water supply. That's my main concern. Yeah, just that it be cleaned up and not used for something toxic in the future.”

“I don't think they should do anything there. I think the potential, the risk is real for further contamination if the site is used, and you know it's just, it's unnecessary risk to continue a use of that facility and it's unnecessary risk to our, one of our most precious resources and for our survival. I think they just need to protect the aquifer. Do what's necessary to defuel and shut it down, and make sure that that facility, even if it is, if it's deconstructed, or if it's halted use, that the potential impacts or risk to further harm of the aquifer are mitigated.”

“Hopefully, it's it is defueled and closed, that's the first thing. But I haven't even been able to give much time to think about how something like that is repurposed. I understand they're big tanks in the ground. I'm not an expert on how these things have leaked in the first place so I don't know what kind of repurposing we would other than maybe, I don't know, fill it with compost or something. I have no idea, at least right now. I'm sure that as things develop I will try to educate myself more.”

“I'm looking at it both in terms of you know, community use and environmental protection, but also in terms of the historic resource and what's appropriate for treating a historic property. So when I think about Red Hill, it's not just the tanks. It's also the surrounding area. It's the fuel lines. It's the distribution lines, it's the hill itself. You know the geography. It's an entire system and landscape, and not just 20 tanks. And so I think it's important to think about it in terms of the whole, and not just the individual pieces and I'm completely in support of draining these tanks, protecting the community, protecting the health and well-being of the environment. But when people talk about demolishing the tanks or demolishing the system, I think that could have a lot of unintended consequences that we be careful about. So from a historic preservation perspective, these are an engineering wonder and marvel. It's a really incredible system of engineering that created these in the middle of World War II in secret, and I think that story needs to be documented, it needs to be told. What I don't know is if they go through areas where there are archaeological resources or cultural layers, or iwi kupuna that might be disturbed, that has to be taken into account. Because if you start trenching and ripping out all those pipelines, and all those kind of infrastructure, again, there could be unintended consequences to native Hawaiian burials. If there's any way to reuse or adapt or modify these tanks to something that is safe which I don't know. But is there a museum aspect? Is there a historic interpretation aspect? Is there a way to learn about constructing, construction, or I don't know deep rock mining during World War II? But again, I don't know what the hazardous materials are. I don't know what's breathable down there. I've heard of different techniques that can be used for things like growing mushrooms as a way to decontaminate different sites. Or maybe there's a way you can grow an alternative fuel like an algae fuel, or something. I don't know what's possible there, but anything like that, I think, would be more exciting than just filling them up with more concrete, and so forth.”

“Well assuming the facility is also disinfected from whatever toxins might be adhering to the walls of the tanks and things like that, if it can be, if it can be completely closed, I can't see wasting that space without using it for some good public purpose. So in my view, those tanks should be reused if they can be. If they can't be cleaned to a safe level for occupancy with anything in it then I guess we have to maybe use it as a landfill for trash or something. I think that my core purpose in commenting is that I can't see wasting the space. It's a very large area and large facility, and so it should be reused, and if it can be reused safely for something, some good public purpose other than just pure defense, I think that that it should be put to those uses, something that not won't harm the environment.”

“I think there needs to be more discussion on the safety of (repurposing). If repurposing means leaving it (tanks) there, what are the implications on the environment for that? No matter what goes in it, just the containers themselves right? Just those huge fuel containers. What would be the impact on the environment of it staying there in its current form and or their removal right? And then I think the definitely, well, I definitely know the community will be able to make a much more educated contribution to that discussion once that's kind of figured out. So I think there's a missing step in that question. right? What are we being allowed to know about the consequences of it staying in place as is or being removed right? And if there's no plans for removing it right, if there's no will to do that at this particular time, and no large cry for that to happen. If it's safe to remain there, I think that discussion, the repurposing of it needs to take a whole other level of discussion once we've identified if it's safe or not to have it there. What would be safe activities to have in there and so forth. And I'm not clear about that at all.”

“I was really glad to see the outreach that's being conducted and really trying to crowdsource ideas for repurposing. ... I really appreciated that from a community engagement standpoint because it's certainly a messy unfortunate situation. ... I am really interested to see what others are envisioning. Some of the ones that I've heard about that are interesting to me are the things around kind of restoration of the area, or you know the ecosystem and using it somehow to support one of the many other social challenges that we're facing in Hawaii. So I know there's some proposal around can it be used for storing drinking water? Can it be used for some type of energy, renewable energy production. So those types of repurposing solutions are interesting to me, so that it could kind of move from a bad situation into supporting the future direction of some of the other societal goals that we have in Hawaii.”

“I think that's (non-fuel use) absolutely the right way to go. I think that the lack of trust in the community is so great right now that to do anything other than to repurpose would be a serious mistake.”

“My thoughts or my kind of intuition is not so much about the physical structure or the physical plant, but more about the intention and the purpose of the space. And so, in terms of repurposing, I think my questions would be about what is possible in the space to reclaim what perhaps was there before it was a fuel facility. .... If we just think about what was excavated from that aina in order to build that space, that perhaps the land itself rejected. And that's why the facility and all of the things that have happened in the meantime have happened. What would it take to regenerate the ancestral purpose that existed in that space? Whether it is through agriculture, through medicine plant-based medicine, through spiritual practice, through education. I'm not sure what to do with the physical plant so much as like can we think about what the intention of the space, what that land wants to be, what it was before, and what it might want to be again.”

“I think it depends upon the repurposing. I've heard a lot of different ideas. Some people are saying we should store water, some people we should use it, say, we should use it for like a hydro, you know. Sort of pump electricity. I don't know, because I'm not sure really what all of the options are, and what are the potential risks, benefits, risks to those proposals.”

“It depends on what the proposals are. I don't think it makes sense to say, I have an absolute position on whether it should be repurposed or not. It's just like, what are the proposals? What are the impacts of those? Are they feasible? What benefit are they to the state of Hawaii? Do they have any impact on the remediation efforts and all of that? So it just it's a big, it depends.”

“In terms of you repurposing it, there could be utilization of that space, or that vicinity or other usages. I do think that it's not an easy task to just cleaning it up and removing those equipment and other infrastructure. I think that one thing to consider is what may be residual after the fact, and may be stored in the environmental setting and just keeping that as a consideration. If there are still implications of those substances being of an exposure then limiting that interaction of humans and maybe having that area be repurposed for other usages besides just casual human interactions just in case there is additional exposure to some degree.”

“Looking at ways in general to reuse and repurpose our assets is a good practice right. In this specific case, I think it depends upon what it is, and does it lessen the concern and the potential unintended consequences and impacts to existing issues or adding concerns about water quality. But then also would the repurpose also serve to address existing and ongoing problems? ... I do have one clarifying question that I did not have a chance to go back through the plan to look at is when they talk about repurposing the facility, how much of that is that from where the entrance is, where it is housed, the entire area of it all the way down through pipelines?”

“I think it's good thing it's a step in the right direction. I believe the public has spoken, and the military did receive the order from governor's office. So you know, I think it's a good thing at this point in our state that it should be moving to a different location. But I do know the importance of what Red Hill provided, and what it does for our military and our security. So I do recognize the importance, but I do believe that this was the necessary step.”

“I think that in general that we should do something with that facility, and repurpose it for some other use. Absolutely 100%.”

“I don't from all of the information that I have read and seen, I'm not confident at all that there could be a safe repurposing of this facility, especially given all the uncertainties regarding the structural integrity of the tanks themselves and the concrete ... as well as just a general safety of the facility in terms of worker and visitor protections. I almost feel like a conversation to repurpose is premature, because we do not have a firm, and no one, we just don't have a firm understanding of the structural integrity of these massive tanks. I think any use of the tanks for storage of anything is problematic, because you know, I appreciate that the current posture is that this facility will never be, or that you'll never store hazmat in these tanks. But you know that posture has only recently arisen after years and years from decades of staunch assertions that the tanks are safe, the facility is safe, it's essential to national security. And so no one here, no one in the DOD is going to be able to predict who's going to be in the White House in 4, 8, 16, 20 years, and so that's an assurance that it's a little bit disingenuous to guarantee that when you can't, it's something that can't be guaranteed. Who knows if an administration changes and a change in geopolitical dynamics results in reversion to wanting to use this as a gas station? So if there's any repurposing, it would have to be in a way that completely, physically prevents these tanks from being used to store anything.”

“Well, I think I have to ask the question first, and maybe you know the answer to this, and maybe you don't. Will these fuel tanks remain under DOD control, or will that be passed to someone else. Another entity. Do you know that answer? I think for me it kind of that matters in terms of who owns them. Yeah, I think that matters. So. Okay, repeat the question if you would, then, because I got myself a little sidetracked with my own question. At this point I think it's best for everyone if they're safely shut down and left closed and not repurposed. And if I was the owner of those, I would not want to assume any liability associated with whatever comes next, because we know they're old. We know, no matter what we do, they've got to be shored up, fixed, you know, and it's just so much money to put into them, and I don't see what the benefit is.”

“I think it should be reused and I think it's an opportunity to, and whether it's reused by the military, or reused or given back to, I don't know who owns the land, I assume it's the military. But yeah, in general, I agree with reuse.”

## **2. What ideas if any would you suggest for repurposing the facility after it is closed?**

“I think you have to look at the cons and the pros of every single idea that's out there, Number one, do we give it back to what it's original cause was, or the original state of being, which was nature? Do we fill the hole, and we try to return the hole back to what it was? Is there a research that can be done at that facility that can be reused? Is there some type of project that you want to have that type of housing or office space, or any kind of space that you have activities that you want to do in a secured location? Maybe not storing fuel there, but potentially having some type of military facility that's housed there, sort of like a secret facility like they have the NSA in Kunia. Some people push the idea of a water tank, and we change those and to store millions of gallons of water for the future. But I mean we gotta look at the cause and effect every single idea, and what implications it will have to our future generation. You know you can potentially

have a spill of any kind depending on what you use the facility for. If the UH was to use it for a lab, you might have a lab spill. Could that affect the aquifer? If you have housing, you could have a sewage spill. Would that affect the aquifer? So then you gotta look at all of those different things and figure out, okay, what things can you put in place?”

“Primarily disable it so nothing can come back into that facility. Of course, clean up the mess that’s left behind that’s going to be there for a long, long, time.”

“I do think the most natural one would be to actually allow it to go back into some kind of natural state. I don't know that just because we built it, that we somehow feel like we have to put (it) back into it a particular use. I think a lot of it has to do with try to start from what you know what its original purposes were, kind of kind of pre the building of the facility. So I would hope that we would be open to that idea as well, that you don't have to have an economic use, you don't have to have a physical use. If you have a use, it's both cultural as well in this natural state. And I would hope we would sort of start there to see what does that look and feel like, you know, rather than trying to quickly run in and put some other use that we might think the economic goal that might be useful rather than letting it speak for itself. The place.”

“At one point you would think, okay, you know it'd be great if you could actually store water in it. But I know you can't from an environmental standard, since there's been fuel in it. I really don't have an idea. I've heard a few, and I thought, those are pretty good ideas. I don't. I don't have a personal thought about what would go into the facility itself.”

“I think we could use water for, the for the tanks for, is to save water and we could fill them with water. And then in the summertime and other times when it’s not raining as much, and when we don't have as much water, we could certainly use these tanks. ... If everything was cleaned up with the piping systems and that kind of thing we could save the water rather than it's simply going out into the ocean and use it for the island.”

“I’m not sure it's practical, but I’m not sure it's impractical that that the tanks be prepared to fill water at minimum, since it's it designed to be a water tight, and has systems of being able to intake and flow out of it. So if there is a practicality to us, storing water, capturing rainwater and utilizing the tanks to store fresh water, that's one thought that comes to mind. The other thing that comes to mind is whether there's any value in seeing it as a vault that might be able to secure things like seedlings or yeah, basically be a storage of seeds that could produce future crops if we so needed them. But just utilizing that space as a vault for whatever might be seem to be a priority and practical.”

“I don't have ideas. I've read different people's ideas about perhaps using those tanks once they're completely cleaned and pristine to store water. I do not understand the engineering of that, I cannot be sure that that would be useful in any way. I don't know whether the water would remain potable over a period of time. Another opinion that was offered, and I don't know who it was that offered this is that the tanks could remain in place once they are empty, and the interior of that could be a museum to military malfeasance in Hawaii. And that we might then use the surface of the land and replant in native flora, indigenous flora so that we have, a kind of what we think of as a sanctuary, as an oasis for the regrowth of native plants again. I particularly like that idea. ... I think that if we, if we prioritize, in addition to the health of the community the health of the environment and the native environment in particular, then we can make engineering decisions based on what is the best for perhaps seeing in the future an ideal kind of kula land space, which is what Kapūkakāi is, right, those uplands. They are there are those uplands that were used before to plant things like sweet potato and dry land taro, and other kinds of dry land crops. Maybe we can still do that without filling in the cavern. I'm not really sure about the engineering of that. But I do think it starts with kind of prioritizing other things. As I said before, community health and the health of the native

environment. If we can prioritize those things, I think we can make the right decisions about how that land prioritizes is repurposed.”

“I know it seems ironic or funny, but like water. I don't see a challenge storing water in times of drought. You know, Oahu was in drought condition for a long time, you know, prior to recent rains, and we know that may be a challenge for us. And so, being an island community, having our most precious resource and more of it certainly doesn't hurt in my mind.”

“Natural state, right. For me, the big worry is knowing where the water table is, not sure if any other repurposing, even with good intents, how it could have some negative impacts or not. I don't. I don't know. But yeah, natural state is where I would like to see it.”

“Whatever is there today, and in the long term, is that something that can be transformed into a productive use for community? ... Is it a place where people can live or not, I don't know. ... and then it could be utilized for a purpose that would be productive for the aina, then that would be good. They could be used for agricultural use, so if it could be used for agricultural use or aquacultural use that would be good. ... Is it possible to use them (the tanks) for a purpose that would be beneficial to the aquifer?”

“Well, if you look at Hawaiian culture in one of the creation chants called Kumulipo, the first life form is the coral polyp. That's the very first life form, and then all the plants and animals, and on the land and the oceans, and they are birthed. And this happens for thousands of years until the human is birthed. So everything else comes from before. So if coral polyp is origin, and we're concerned in this instance about our continuation as a species or continuation. Is it possible that you can use the tanks to grow coral? Because we need coral. We know that we need it. And I know that, I know that people are growing coral. I don't know if the conditions allow for that over there, what is necessary. But I know that we talk about the bleaching of our coral, and how critical it is for Hawaii, that we're losing our reefs. So if you can populate that amount of space with coral growing, that might be a really awesome return to the ocean eventually, and then if it leaks it doesn't matter right, because it's just coral. There are all kinds of animals that are in the water that are beneficial to the water that are not existing very much. Opa'e ula (Hawaiian red shrimp) is another one. But I don't know if that can be done, because I imagine it's about space right? So I don't know if they can be grown in a dark space. But who knows? You know you have researchers in Hawaii, both public and private. We're always trying to ameliorate the conditions that have occurred, especially concerning now with climate change. So maybe maybe those could be spaces for that? And then that way the restoration is in total alignment with the intention. I don't know who would not want to do that.”

“The Hawaiian practitioners are the ones that to observe these things is not being present. And so, the thing about it is you have access to fresh water there right, because it's over the water. So I think you have access to fresh water so you could input maybe, you could fill the tanks with water. Yeah. and then you would have that access If presuming it's all clean, and I don't know people are using genki balls now to clean everything. So maybe the people who do the genki balls want to make the genki balls. I don't know, but something like that. I think would have a really universal benefit.”

“I assume that it's a big empty space. It can be used to hold something. What if anything, would be safe to hold you know, several 100 feet above the aquifer? Water, perhaps? It comes to mind. I don't know why we would need to store water there, and I would be concerned about if the facility can be, you know, can get to a place of being cleaned up enough that it could safely store something like water that's being used for that. I guess another thing that I could foresee people thinking of might be like a landfill or something like that. I don't really see that as a positive option either because there's plenty of I guess yucky things that go into our trash, and that could be put into a landfill, and that would cause the same kind of problem as or,

you know, slightly different. But similar problem of potential groundwater contamination. So yeah, and not a lot of bright ideas for reuse from me I guess.”

“Well, I think they should just make sure that if there's accidental leaks and spills that are continuing to get into the aquifer, and they can't control it, then how do you protect what passageways, or you know, I mean they're only a hundred feet off the aquifer, so how do they, how can they protect, how can they, how can they rehab, or do whatever it needs to be done so that facility is no longer a risk to our, to our aquifer?”

“If they can't be cleaned to a safe level for occupancy with anything in it then I guess we have to maybe use it as a landfill for trash or something. I don't know. You know, things that we won't use again. Sometimes they need a place to store excavated materials, and they're always looking for places to store excavated material. So if it can't be used safely for other things that will be reused, then I would use it to dispose of stuff. Dry waste, maybe that's one option. If it can be cleaned up, then I think it should be used to store supplies for emergencies like disasters and disaster recovery. Things like that, other kinds of supplies. If the material is stored, they can be reused if the tanks are totally disinfected and safe. Otherwise, it would be for like disaster recovery, equipment and supplies. And if it can't be reused, then it would be for dry waste discarding things that we have a hard time getting rid of on the surface. I would not want munitions or things that can be used to get into war again, even though it's mainly for defense purposes. But I think we're all worried about things going into the ground that could later be a target.”

“Whatever is built there, I think, needs to benefit the Native Hawaiian people. Our agency, our organization, and just myself even personally, we're kind of all in alignment with that there needs to be a structure put in place that allows for Native Hawaiians to benefit, and the local community to benefit from that. So whether that is percentage amounts or the fact that it has to be then kind of like Kahoolawe, when Kahoolawe, and this is a horrible example, because Kahoolawe still hasn't been cleaned up. But what they did was they created a commission to oversee it and then they returned it back to the state. ... When it was returned back from the federal government to the state, and the language that is there now is that it should be held in trust by the state until the time Native Hawaiians have some type of self-determined entity to take control of it right? The hard part was it wasn't fully cleaned up. And that's my fear with this is that we skip a few steps. We try to get to the end. And we have another Kahoolawe which has great potential. Kahoolawe has an amazing potential to educate and allow for culture experiences, but it's unsafe still yet. ... So I would want that, personally, and our organization would advocate for Native Hawaiians having definitely a larger say in what happens there, and also benefit, and anything that comes out of that. If there is such a thing that happens.”

“When I think of competing crises in Hawaii, you know certainly the importance of our water resources, agriculture, energy, renewable energy production. Is there some type of I guess, disaster preparedness or emergency response, purpose that that facility could play? That's not fossil fuel-based or doesn't get us into the same fuel leakage trouble. So those are some of the ones that are most interesting to me. At the same time, I understand the complexity of any proposed solutions. So it might sound like a great idea. But there are so many complexities surrounding it. So I think there's also in addition to the ideas there's a range of what's actually feasible based on the site and just the realities of government and all that. So I think it's balancing.”

“I have no ideas other than this. It needs to be something that benefits the local community. We might get into later, but I think the sentiment towards the military is shifting to a negative, a negative perception. and I think that whatever they do has to have some positive benefit beyond the military.”

“Whenever we have a capacity like a physical facility that has power and plumbing, and all of those things, I immediately think housing right, because we do have a lack of housing. Perhaps something like that is

possible. I also think of things that could grow food right, and I don't know what that would be like and what it would take to treat any of the tanks to be able to be aquaculture ready. Is it possible for spaces like that to be used for commercial ag in sort of an extreme, you know, mushroom facility, or something like that where suddenly it doesn't require a lot of above-ground space, or can it be fit with grow lights to increase our food security right? We're talking about a lot of acreage, perhaps planting acreage that's available. If there was infrastructure for lights and water, I think of again with housing and how in a lot of the shelters, a lot of the houseless communities are that access to running water is really what is the difference between a healthy housing community and one that's not. And so is it something where there is an opportunity to create housing and job training? Right? How might we do any of those things like really create a city or a village unto itself that can regenerate itself from the inside out?"

"I'm not sure. I actually haven't given much thought to what I think the facility should be used for going forward. To be honest, more of my focus and concern has been how do we ensure clean drinking water for Oahu or the future? I think that has to be the primary goal, you know, because there's going to need to be a lot of soil remediation, testing, long-term monitoring, and I wouldn't want anything that the facility is repurposed for to interfere with that, or to make that more difficult. So I think I would say my primary concern would be making sure that we are protecting our aquifer, and there's still some 180,000 gallons of fuel that's unaccounted for. We don't know where it is outside of facility, and I think until we have a better handle on that question I would be hesitant to say yes, open the facility for tours or repurpose it for something else until we really understand the scope and the potential challenges for the future."

"I've heard, I think, all the same things that you've probably heard by now. We've all heard all the different ideas floated. So now I think it's a matter of taking some of those ideas and run, you know, doing feasibility assessments of them, and seeing who is interested in developing them right like we've heard a lot of different things. So okay, not lot of concrete things. And until you see the concrete analysis, it's hard to say."

"I think there's opportunities ... maybe they could be, that area used for research purposes and having determinations of that being applied for other areas. Also, I think, maybe just for PR purposes, maybe it could be just transitioning renewable area, a renewable source of energy. ... So maybe solar panels or wind farms could be something to consider as a way to limit more human interactions into that space. It could also be maybe a plot of just a nature reserve. But also, I think people would consider what those animals or species be exposed to any substances, if somehow they were still lingering. I'm open to ideas."

"You have, like all of that spacing capacity in there. Is there a use for that? I don't even know if it's homeland security, if it is research and development for like AI and all these different technologies. I'm just looking at the space over there. Now for the pipes, I have no idea what you'd repurpose for, except to remove maybe materials and find some way to reuse those or recycle those. In our need to build more truly affordable housing, not always based upon AMI calculations, but, according to our possibly inverted tier versus living wages, can that support some of that industry, right, or even construction in general. When it comes to the tanks. So this is where some of the collection of ideas have come from right? They're like, can we store water for emergency use, like Board of Water Supply has some of their tanks right? But the questions is how often do you need to cycle that water? One of my associates had come across repurposed missile silos, closed former missile silos for use for housing, for emergency shelters, right or some of these things. Some of the other things was like training grounds. ... Others have been, especially my kanaka groups, you can just give it back to the Hawaiians. And then the question is, well, what group is that besides DHHL or OHA?"

"I can't answer that. I do think that obviously like with any huge initiative project, always engage in the community from the very start, to get their ideas of what it could be used for. You know I don't know how you know whether even if it's capable of housing or any other type. But that's going to take a while too,

because to demolish all the tanks. But you know, I think for me it's just going to be important to engage the community to see what their thoughts are and what they will like, because this is in their backyard, and then see what they feel could be the most useful of that space of that area."

"When I did the online survey, I actually proposed 3 different things. You could probably incorporate all 3 into a similar type scenario. But the first thing that I mentioned is to create basically like I guess, a historical educational type venue in the same vein as like the Missouri, or the Bowfin or the USS Arizona Memorial. And I would say, attach it to that honestly, so that there would be like a tour bus. How similar tour buses go from the Memorial out to the Missouri on to Ford Island. Similar situation where a tour bus would take tourists or visitors to this location, and then give them a tour of the facility itself. ... So this facility kind of breaks up in the 2 different locations, right. You have more of the storage tanks at, and then you have that tunnel that goes all the way down to Pearl Harbor, and then you got like the command center down there right, and where they do all, you know. I think that's where all the pumping is and everything is. I'm not talking about that part. I'm talking about where the storage tanks are at that goes up there, and then take visitors into the facility itself underground in the mountain. Take them to one of the storage tanks and literally have them walk out on that catwalk that goes out into the middle of those tanks, and then give them a history lesson in the process. Right? You know why they built it. You know how many people you know gave their lives building it, because there's people that died building that you know, and how many people it took, and the timeframe and everything else, and how the strategic importance of it was to us not only winning World War II, but all the other activities that occurred here in the Pacific in terms of, especially during the Cold War, right, and stuff. So you know that one of the sites was classified up until the eighties, mid-eighties. I think so. So there's a lot of history there, and there's a plaque out front that says it's one of the engineering marvels of the world, you know kind of thing, and so I just don't think that we should just fill it all in, you know. Honestly, it should be a part of history, and it should be. It should be taught, you know, it should be a part of that, like a tour. Visitors can come when they go to memorial. They can buy a ticket and go to this as well, too. You know that kind of thing. That's the first thing. The second thing. So there's 20 of them. I think you only need to do one or 2 of those tanks honestly, the other 18 tanks or 15 tanks, whatever, could actually be used as a water battery, and what I mean by that is that in LA they use reservoirs. They pump water up into one of the reservoirs there, and then at night they actually pump them. They let that water draw out, and they use hydroelectric and generate electricity that way, in the nighttime, because during the daytime you have an abundance amount of solar energy. And so rather than have that just depleted or go off or get. You know I don't know what they do with solar energy honestly during the day, but they use the cheaper solar energy during the day to pump this water up into the reservoir, and then at night, when the energy is more expensive, because there is no solar energy, they will use it to create energy at nighttime, so using it like a solar battery is one other thing, or I'm sorry, water battery is another option. And then the third option was just as a water storage facility, you know, for when droughts and other emergencies might occur, you know, and I don't necessarily know if we could get it to a point where it would be potable water, but it could definitely be, you know, a gray water usage, right? So we could use it that way as well. So those were the 3 things that I proposed. And actually one of my constituents actually mentioned this, and I didn't think about it at the time. But there was a fourth thing. One of the things that we have here on island that we're severely lacking is a shelter system from hurricanes. You know, tsunamis, whatever it might be, this would be a prime location for a shelter system. Be put in place to house people during a catastrophe like that."

"So you know, I've thought about this, and again, this is not my area of expertise. So I'm coming at this. It's just some schmuck off the street, was probably a bonehead idea. But, yes, I have a couple of different thoughts. One, and this is a very unpopular thought. But I'll share it with you, because I think it's important. It's an important different perspective. It frustrates me because I think the military should have done this right in the first place, and there are fuel tanks all over our nation that are operated safely right. And so these had the potential to being very useful to the military if they done it correctly. And so it's very hard to

see something like that, and I represent military families, I represent, you know, service members and things like that. So it's very hard to see an asset like that not cared for. And we're seeing that over and over with our military, you know. I mean they're not caring for their buildings. They're not caring for their aircraft, their ships like they should be. And my feeling is this should have been done right, it should continue to be done right. And there may come a time when we actually, as a nation, need those as a strategic reserve to hold fuel in. I mean, China is around the corner. Things are not going well, and I think it was foolish of them to give it up as they did. Again, not a very popular sentiment, but I do think if we look at the long-term picture that could be a, it could have been a very big mistake. It's unfortunate. However, comma, none of us want fuel in our water. I understand how this is terribly polluting our island, and that's horrendous. So I think the concern, you know. I've thought about. What could we do with those that make sense? It would be helpful to us as a community, be helpful to the environment of our of our island, and unless we spend a lot of money to, you know, improve the leaks, and ensure that these last for hundreds more years. I'm not sure that we should do anything. So let's look at this two different ways. If we're going to spend a lot of money and we're gonna make sure that these are leak proof and foolproof. What if we use them? I mean we ship so much trash off island. We're burning trash like crazy. which is not environmentally friendly. Why wouldn't we use them as some sort of dump, you know, for non-pollutant kind of trash? But again I think we'd have to do a lot of work to ensure that anything we put in there wasn't leaking into the aquifer, so there's that. I mean, we could use it as storage. We put toilet paper and rice and Spam in there for the next dock workers strike, the next hurricane. I don't know, you know. I think we close it down."

"Yeah, I mean, there's some things, and I'm no expert on this, but I have seen kind of in in different spheres, some thoughts, I know, in other countries like I know in Europe there are some really cool nightclubs and hotels that are repurposed large underground areas. So, nightclubs, gaming, movie theaters, things that you know obviously are in the dark, or even some really fancy regenerative hotels that try to make use of, you don't need air conditioning, it's more cool. So, I think, for potential entertainment, recreation, regenerative tourism, if you know, if the right developers were found to put the money into it, it could be a cool opportunity to, especially with climate change, to think about making use of underground spaces. I don't know if it would work, because from a gravity perspective it might not work, but you know, one thing Hawaii is trying to do more of this wastewater reclamation and treatment, and I know, in other places underground areas have been used to do that. But the location might be such that this might not work. But that was one thought was wastewater and reclamation, or, you know, using tanks to do that kind of work. ... Another thought related to energy, this in my day job we do some renewable energy work, there's some really novel ideas around compressed air, using large vacant areas, large containers to basically use excess energy to compress air and then you release that. So it's like a battery, basically using air as a battery. Reading an article from MIT around technologies, around non-chemical-based batteries for energy storage and compressed air, but you need large spaces over to which you compress air, and you release it to produce energy. So, and because obviously large cavernous areas, it could be a large battery potentially for renewable energy. For that matter, even hydro for water, you know, because it's 250 feet. There's some potential around hydro. I don't know. I don't know what else I can think of, aside from entertainment and tourism. Again, nightclubs, movie theaters stuff like that have been done elsewhere. ... One last one, related to entertainment is a ride. I mean, I don't know what kind of space is there, but maybe there's like some kind of ride or that kind of entertainment feature, a rollercoaster type. ... I mean from what I hear, the place is so big that you can have multiple uses, right? You got multiple forms of entertainment. There's not one use. It could be multiple uses."

**3. Initial discussion has identified four possible non-fuel categories for repurposing: DOD use, non-DOD use, energy use, and non-energy use. Do you have a preference for either of the four categories, or do you think any make the most sense?**

“Given what I shared to date, the non-DOD use would be the ideal. And I think my question for clarity is also tied to the distrust of the process, again, I'm not sure where these four ideas came from, and it needs to be more transparency around when this comes to life like how these four ideas came about, and what discussions actually led to these. But yeah, given the four sources and what I said earlier, yeah, DOD should not be involved in the future of the property, I guess. To build on what I shared, that should be up to the State, and then again the people around. The Navy should not have any part of it. I feel the best with, the Navy would not, and the Department of Defense would not be involved with the facility. They would give the facility back to the State and allow the state, then obviously that most ideally, the community around the facility to decide what happens with the facility. But at this point the Navy has shown and the Department of Defense has shown they're not good stewards of the land, and even protectors of their own people, their own service people, so hard to trust an entity that has not stepped up for their own people, that's not, again, been accountable and it's only doing things now because of ongoing advocacy by their own people and folks who call this place home. So I think ideally the Navy and the DOD would not have anything to do with the facility. And again, after they take kuleana for the defueling and the shutting down of the facility, jurisdiction goes back to the state and to the people in the area.”

“Well, I think definitely, I would say, non-energy, I'm not too sure what you would do in the facility like Red Hill to induce energy, I don't know. Is there an idea as far as what they mean by energy use. I would say probably the most least likely would be energy use. So I would say that would be the at the end. Non-energy use, as far as you know, do we use it for housing? Do we use it to store water? I think it would depend on what the use would be? Non-energy is such a generic and open category you'd have to actually drill down to the specifics. Is it going to be used for housing? It's going to be used for this or that? You'd have to, I think we'd have to determine that before we could figure out the priorities or prioritization of which one is better than the other. ... I would say that would be the exception that'd be there, because I mean looking at the Board of Water Supply too. Right? I mean the Board of Water, could they potentially use that facility for water as well. Right? I think that's a good question to have with my concern would be, can you turn a facility, that housed fuel to hold water, and and can you clean it enough to be under EPA action levels?”

“Well, so let me give you a slightly more nuanced answer to that question. Then I mean, I think an energy-generating facility would be terrific. Although I think that I'm not opposed to, continued DOD use. I mean, I think we have to be careful that the military still sees Hawaii and Pearl Harbor as a place to locate one of its major bases. I mean, I don't suspect that's going to change, but I think Hawaii would be in rough shape if they decided to relocate large parts of their operation to San Diego. So I should say that a cleaner, more responsibly managed version that stays under DOD control, I wouldn't object to that in an ideal world. I'd love to see it become, a you know a hydroelectric energy facility, if that's possible. But you know I don't think we should become so unfriendly to the Navy that they decide it's no longer possible or feasible to stage a big part of their operations, particularly the you know, the maintenance and a repair operation that provide a huge number of very high paying jobs to local folks.”

“I'm not sure if I got the question straight but none of them make sense if there is any type of repurposing. Some things from my perspective, first of all, what happens if none of these, if they, for example, someone says oh yeah, this is great for hydroelectricity and then they choose to go down that route and then find out it doesn't work? What are they going to do? There's no talk about, you know, nobody is taking the steps, it's just they present us with four options and say, hey, isn't this a great idea and then there's no what happens down the road, you know, no planning, no process. I think, I personally think that all those options are bad, they're not going to work – why would anyone want to drink water out of tanks that have held gasoline for 80 plus years?”

“I think if I had to pick what I would, I would pick it, probably to try to find a way if there was an energy use if it was truly clean, and that really wasn't going to create more risk for the aquifer then I would probably think because you would be able to say how we repurpose this in a way that it can actually help with the production of energy, something we're gonna have to do one way or another, and use it for something like that. I just don't know that you want to put into another kind of fossil fuel or some other use that has use of chemicals. Is that okay? Sitting over an aquifer, you would never allow that for anything else. So why would we be allowed here?”

“I think they're all applicable. But again ... it depends upon the lens that you look at, look at that question through. If you look at it from a DOD perspective, hopefully, you're not looking at myopically right from okay, how can this benefit the Department of Defense? I think what you really need to do at this point is to look at the lens of Hawaii and say, what can we do that will benefit Hawaii? That will have the biggest impact to the people of Hawaii? Because the military should be looking at it from the perspective of how do we try to, which, as we know, it's incredibly difficult, regain the trust if at all possible? So I think the lens that the military should look at it is, how can this best benefit the people of Hawaii? And then again, I think if you're Hawaii yes, you look at it from that lens. Yes, how can this benefit our people? You know whether that's economically, whether that's you know from resourcing in terms of whether it's some type of thing that can store in there that can support families or can support, kind of you know, economic opportunities or job opportunities for local folks. I think that's where the focus should be. ... It's really to me. It's not so much like who is using it versus what is the purpose of it, is what is important. And so I think the purpose of it ultimately, whether it's DOD that's doing it, whether it's the state or private company it ought to be for the benefit of Hawaii, and that's how it ought to be viewed right for the benefit of the people of Hawaii.”

“I'm thinking if it's not, if it's energy use it would have to be some type of volatile liquid. So I would say I wouldn't, I don't think that'd be for that (energy use). So non-energy use would be something like water. I would be all for that. ... Non-DOD, I would be for that, for the island. That would be for the island.”

“Let me say this. Whatever its utilization and function be it storage or otherwise, it cannot be toxic right. We cannot defuel and then dedicate the future use to anything that would threaten the aquifer. So energy use causes me to think about use of elements like hydrogen, and that would concern me because of the toxicity. And the Department of Defense. If the Department of Defense can define what its use would be, that would not be a threat to the aquifer then I would be inclined to have the Department of Defense move forward with it. That would be my first choice.”

“I worry about energy and what that means. I absolutely. I think it should be non-DOD. I'm going to be really clear that I think that it needs to be removed from military custody in the same way that Kahoolawe was. It was the demonstration of just this complete deaf ear and uncaring attitude toward the threat that they posed. And in this case, you know we're talking about the threat that they pose to hundreds of thousands of people who depend on that aquifer. I prefer non-DOD. This is definitely something that I would check off. ... I don't see the use that they (DOD) could have. I mean they could use it as a waste dump for all the you know, their big green desks, and you know not toxic things, and it would still drive me crazy. Frankly, I just I really think that for me the military does not deserve to have that space assigned to them. And in terms of my overall belief that military, military needs and military intentions need to be deprioritized under others in the state of Hawaii. That's pretty much my perspective and point of view on that. ... But then, if you move into energy use, I wonder what that means? I mean when we think of energy, usually we're thinking about fossil fuels and it's hard to imagine unless they are planning on, you know what, you were creating huge batteries, fed by sun or other kinds of non-fossil fuels. Perhaps under those circumstances you could check off. Okay, but I'm more in favor of really considering the return of Kapūkakā to a kind of natural state, and allowing, you know, allowing that land to rest, allowing it to regrow, allowing and perhaps

encouraging the growth of native flora, and hopefully, fauna as well. I would favor that over all other purposes, and I don't think that would allow for a consideration of energy uses such as you know, solar panels or wind windmills."

"I suppose I think of them as separate layers, but I guess non-DOD is my initial for the first two, and the energy one I would have some questions about just understanding what kind of energy."

"All 4 really don't ring with me."

"Oh, that's too narrow. I don't know. Could I say none of the above? I take none of the above. Well, I guess that question would then be in that, it's kind of a loaded question because it's been narrowed up at each of that, and there's no guarantee that whatever it is, would not have the same consequence of keeping the fuel inside there right, because nobody knows what they, if it's another kind of a product, right like whatever other product is being used currently to replace fossil fuels. Is it gas you're talking about is, you know I mean all those kind of things. I just think that it's unfortunate that it's only so narrow because our Islands need so much help, and that's why I try to find it in the concept of what is really beneficial to our ecosystem? Energy is about ourselves as people, people-driven. But if we're talking about the healing of our aquifer and the healing of the land and the healing of the water, the response is not going back to how can people extract. So it's about. What can we give to the land, to the water? I don't know everything about alternative energy, you know, like that. So I might be pleasantly surprised. But instead of maybe energy, if you were able to, when I say restrictive, it's just only in that realm of energy, right, and not in the realm of agriculture or of regenerations in terms of the life of the land .... it could be used for regeneration of the land and the water. Then I would sense regeneration of the land and the water."

"Well, it's a little unclear to me, you know, what those things would mean exactly in terms of like what actual substance would be in there. I think you know energy use or non-energy use to me like it could be potentially more fuel or other, you know substances to burn. What would be energy use non-fuel, then at that point, I mean, I presume, renewable. But I don't know what the facility could do for like wind or solar, or those kinds of renewables is, do you have that kind of information? .... I'm still inclined to kind of say, non-energy as a sort of safeguard, and then DOD use or non-DOD use. You know I have a fair amount of hurt feelings about the way the DOD has managed the facility, so I would prefer non-DOD use. Maybe that's vindictive. But I feel like maybe they should turn it over at this point and allow someone else to manage it."

"Well, I don't think any of them. I think we should just not use it. If you know energy, if anything, if it is about some sort of what they call gravity-flow type energy, renewable energy systems, I mean that can be done above surface. It doesn't need to be done so close to the aquifer because, but as far as the tanks themselves, being, you know, underground and inside of the mountainside, I think that's a dangerous repurposing."

"Probably the second one (non-DOD use). Yeah, yeah. I mean, what are you gonna do like store bombs in there? I mean, they're already storing bombs throughout the island. I don't know if I would like more of that kind of stuff going on."

"I think those categories are too broad to be able to say if what the pros and cons are for each of them. There's probably both feasibility and practicality and cost, and you know, so forth. And I really don't know what would work or not work. But I will say, I think there's different alternatives that are more practical or more feasible, no matter who is the ultimate owner. What I'm hearing from constituents and different community members is there's such a deep distrust of the Department of Defense that they would actually follow through on any commitments that they have squandered whatever goodwill they had, and getting it

back is a very, very difficult uphill climb at this point. So if Department of Defense can come forth with some kind of proposal that makes sense, and is practical and satisfies everyone, they would still have to overcome the distrust that they would act in good faith and do what they say. So I think that may be a barrier that can't be overcome. But you know, never say never. Maybe they can come up with something. But the idea of having maybe a Department of Defense-run museum, you know. Maybe that could work. I wouldn't say they couldn't. Or maybe they want to turn this into a pilot project for alternative fuel developments in cooperation with the Department of Energy. Maybe you know they they've done some other really interesting alternative fuels for ships and planes, and this could be a place where they could, you know, test some of those ideas, so I wouldn't rule it out. But I would say that their community trust is so low that it's a very difficult barrier to overcome.”

“I think it should be a combination, because the DOD may have needs in common with the general public, you know, with the non-DOD, so I really think it should be both. If there is a safe public purpose, it can be derived up. And I think of non-DOD is anything other than defense purposes, like communities, state and county, general public. My first choice is a combination. And then the second choice. I really don't have a second choice, because I don't think it would be workable or feasible, or acceptable to the entire community, including DOD or non-DOD if we choose one or the other. We're stuck with a compromise between all the parties. I think that would be more effective and better for everybody.”

“I don't have a particular, you know topic. Again, this is another point of alignment between all of that is that there is no trust with the DOD. We can't trust them to keep us safe when it comes to our natural resources. So that right there, you know ... there's a strong indication for not DOD, whether it's used for energy with some type of renewable, or you know I don't know. I don't even know what was on the table thus far with that we would have to weigh its impact against doing harm with the with our natural resources. Yes, but the DOD one, you know. I think it's a resounding no, because there's just no trust there.”

“My first reaction is that, and just an overarching challenge I see with this issue is there's been a lot of trust lost with the military through this process, and I think that they will have a really tough sell in saying, hey, this is something that we want to continue to manage. And even, you know, on the energy side, we are seeing a lot of push back on energy projects, even renewable energy projects across the state. I wonder if some of that kind of mistrust that's happened in the energy space, coupled with mistrust of how the Navy handled the situation, if that will kind of impact the range of solutions that are proposed. I guess this is where I maybe I'm a little bit personally conflicted because I have my (deleted) hat on, you know, hey, we need to move away from fossil fuels resources in a really timely manner. There's a need for different types of renewable energy resources on the grid. So there's a definite need for that, and could have some really great societal benefits around you know, rate reduction. I just wonder and then thinking like personally, it feels like there's been again like a lot of, there's a lot of mistrust. There is a deep sense of hurt and harm. So, having a repurposing, that is maybe more community-focused feels like what would be most needed, and what would be most responsive to the level of harm-cost here. And so maybe there's some kind of community ownership piece of this energy, an energy proposal. The other thought I had. Maybe on other uses. I don't know what this looks like, but if there is a way to have some, if there's like educational opportunities that can be woven into, however it's repurposed, if it's for use or the general public. I think that can help in in building trust, and even if it's an educational opportunity to talk about and highlight the importance of protecting our water resources.”

“Would the energy use benefit to just the military or the larger community? I think anything we can do around energy we should do so I would say energy use. I think that's a great use of our resource.”

“I think most people would feel like non-DOD, just because that seems to be where a lot of the pilikia came from. I would also say, though, that if the DOD has it in mind that they could do something beneficial for

Hawaii through its own repurposing and with its own funding, then why not let them try? And then, in terms of energy or non-energy use, I mean again, it's what does that land want to be used for? What does that space call for? And so I think any of those applications, if it's meant to positively impact Hawaii and her people and help create a thriving like economy and employment and a healthy and clean living space for folks like that's if it can contribute in any way to that, then that's what we would want."

"I don't have a preference for any of them. I think. Yeah, it kind of goes back to my answer to the previous question. Whoever is owning or operating it, going forward, still want to make sure that we can address the unaccounted fuel."

"It depends on the project. Yeah, it just depends on the project. I mean, it is a DOD facility, so if they are deciding they want to reuse it for something, they're going to be able to have the first say in that. I can't remember is that on DOD-owned land? Or is that one of the leases. Is that a lease they have? I think they own that facility. And whether it's DOD or non-DOD is kind of their call right? If they want to use it for DOD purposes, it's gonna be up to them. But you know it just depends what makes the most, it depends what makes the most sense."

"I would say maybe, optimally maybe the energy use."

"Obviously, I would like to see it go to non-DOD use. And where I was kind of getting to on one of the things is there's indoor farming right, since those tanks and the pipelines have to be cleaned extensively, could they be repurposed for controlled environment, for vertical farming, indoor farming and address our food security needs and reduce our import dependence from 80 to 90%? Even if we did like 10% a year, that would be a huge accomplishment for Hawaii. And then in that time, there's all these other things that need to happen, so that Hawaii residents actually consume our own products, including distribution outlets. But that is a massive area that could be used. But you know, for food security needs, and that's just in the tanks right? So primarily, I'd like to see, like I was saying earlier, no impact to our water natural environment and helps to address our current and existing needs."

"I think energy use just because we need to look at alternative options, and if that particular space allows for alternative energy, then that would be my priority. Second to that, I don't know if it'd be good for the DOD to continue to use it, but rather perhaps have the community be able to provide input to see what they want that space should be used for."

"Well, I think the DOD use is kind of out of the question at this point. Right? I don't think that's going to be a viable option going forward. Secretary of Defense has already said they're closing that stuff down. You're not going to utilize it. So it would have to be non-energy, energy. And what was the third option? There's a non-DOD, yeah, non-DOD use so I think those would be the three options going forward, and I think probably everything that I mentioned kind of slots into one of those three."

"So, just from a safety standpoint. I can't endorse any kind of reuse. Not until we know that it's not going to just collapse on itself, right. And again, another thing, I think to be mindful of is the fact that even if you're not using these tanks to store hazardous materials, there might be other things associated with the repurposing that could involve the use of stuff that you don't want 100 feet above a drinking water source, a core amount of the Navy's own drinking water well. So yeah, any kind of any future for this facility has to make sure that not only residual contamination, but that other things beyond fuel, that maybe you know, in these tunnels, in these pipes, like generators and sump tanks, like all those things are taken care of because it is so so close to our drinking water supply."

“I don’t have a preference. I wouldn’t want to own it from a liability standpoint, but that way I don’t want it, and I think whatever entity takes, it’s potentially a long-term PR nightmare for them. ... I think DOD is kind of, you know, they’ve run themselves into a tough spot. So, I think there’s going to be a lot of people that don’t want DOD to own it. I happen to don’t, I don’t have that strong a feeling.”

“I would think non-DOD, mostly because I think the kinds of activities that would be suited for there would need private investment, and investors and developers, I think it would have to be non-DOD, I think, whether it’s any of the options I talked about, or others, I think, have to be non-DOD. And then, like I just said, I think the non-energy has a broader suite of options. Energy might work. I don’t know if the energy idea will work. But to me there’s proven examples elsewhere in the world of underground bunkers, and so forth, being used for non-energy uses, some of which I mentioned, so non-DOD, non-energy, but the energy one would be cool if it actually works. Or both. Again, if it’s that big, this may not be a one, you know, this may be a multiple type of multiple solution. In fact, it might be hard for any one person to handle financially the whole thing. My guess is, it’d be very challenging for one investor or our government to try and handle that much, you know that much space. It might require a myriad of activities.”

#### **4. Why specifically do you prefer that category?**

“It’s a trust thing for me at this point. You know a well-resourced organization like DOD at all levels can’t say that they’re not adequately funded. And so, if we were able to have an incident like this happen it’s a trust thing for me mostly.”

“I think energy use can be problematic for an underground facility. I’m not sure what they would, how they would use it for energy, and because of that unknown I would prefer to leave it open to DOD plus non-DOD purposes, whatever those may be. I think that still has to be determined.”

“It may be related to what I may have mentioned as a possibility of areas where not many people would be present around, such as solar panel areas, if it’s that type of energy, wind farms. I know there could be other types of energy-producing spaces, so that could just limit the interactions of individuals being there.”

“I just think it’s an important issue right now, and we need because of our limited space, we do need alternative sources of energy. So, because of a limited space, and we’re an island state, it’s always good to use space in order to, for the long run, lower the cost of energy for the community, as well as to provide more alternative energies for our state.”

#### **5. What idea would you suggest that would fall under your preferred category and why do you think it should be considered?**

“When I was reading this initially, I was thinking about water. I think that came in mind quickly, and then I don’t think it would be the integrity of the machinery, or the towers themselves would be good enough for gas like, you know, liquefied gas I don’t think we’d want to do that, anyway. As I said so, I don’t know what else could go in there. I can’t think of what else you put in there. What else is there other than water. I don’t. I don’t know what would be interesting to put in there other than water. That’s the only thing I can think of.”

“Yeah, like I said I think water would be one, right? Storing something as important as water for us, potable water in particular, is important to me. You know, I also think about other uses like seed banking, you know. Hawaii is home to a number of endangered, critically endangered species. And so, if there was an

opportunity to create a seed bank that was unique to our, you know, ecosystem and plants, I think that that may be appropriate. And then, I think also like from a like archival storage kind of perspective might make sense. Again, I'm cautious, though, with that in technology like fire suppressants if we were to use it for something like record storage or archiving that, looking at fire suppression systems are putting us right back in the same position we were."

"What I mentioned was common purpose, something in common that the DOD has that the general community, the non-DOD, we also have similar purposes. That would be the ideal mixture. I would prefer that it not be limited to one or the other (DOD or non-DOD), because we need our community to understand, and the military to understand, that they are not isolated from each other. They interrelate, they interact, they affect each other in different ways, and we need both. So I kind of think it needs to be a combination. It shouldn't be one or the other. Otherwise one side will feel cheated."

"Well, it's all the same things I think people I've heard of lots of different things ranging from the world's biggest brewery, which I think is just a joke, to you know, using it for a water storage or some kind of pump storage, energy storage facility. Again, don't know how much of that makes sense. There's a lot of questions. I mean. You could establish it as a visitor site. It certainly is an interesting piece of military history. I've heard water storage. I've heard it for like diving instruction."

**6. What repurposing category (DOD, non-DOD, energy, non-energy) would be your second choice and why?**

"I do think you know a non-energy use would probably make sense and I can think I don't know what the Department of Defense might or might not do with it, whether it's energy or non-energy use so I'm reluctant to kinda go in that direction because I do think, you know, we have long-term trust issues in the community with the Department of Defense. And whether they put something else in there or not, I don't know if at the current moment that we can really get past those issues about whether they're really going to take care of it. And I think that's gonna put a heavy burden on the Department of Defense to try to continually prove that they can be the stewards of it again, right over an aquifer."

"I would say, DOD activity and non-energy use are competing. But I put, I say, DOD activity in the secondary because of the relationship that the Department of Defense and the U.S. military has with the community. ... I've spoken with the PAO Office. I've spoken with many of our leaders in the military that we have to repair the relationship with the community with the organizations, with the groups. Number one, because if we say, hey DOD activity is going to be continued there in the secure location, they're going to maybe build offices inside there and have a secret facility that doesn't have fuel, you'd have to make sure that you create that image where the community can trust you, what you're doing there, and that there wouldn't be any kind of any future spills in the future, and what mitigations are being done if we're not using it for fueling activity, but other types of activity. ... You know it's gonna be hard to trust the organization if they're not upfront with the community, they're not going to be front and center on everything, and very open to what would be what would happen there in the future. I'm sure that any type of activity at that facility that would be DOD, non-fuel would be open, I would have open mind to, but I would just be concerned on that relationship-repairing with the community and making sure that the community is a partner in that, I wouldn't say design, but be a partner in the process. I would say it shouldn't at all house any liquid or any, what I mean by DOD activity, I'm saying, if they were to turn it into office spaces, or if they were to turn it into a headquarters of some sort where you have personnel there. I would say that that would be something that would be permissible by the community. But any storage of any type of substance, I would say it would be not the best course of action for the military at this time."

“I think non-energy use, because anything that's energy use would be toxic, or some type of burn fuel and I don't think that that's what we want. ... We wouldn't have to chemicals again and we wouldn't have to go through this ever again, think would be would be wise.”

“I would probably do non-energy use, even though I'm a little vague about what that might mean. But if I had to sequence it, Department of Defense first, and non-energy use would be my second choice.”

“So again with the energy thing, I think I'm cautious right if we're going to go put liquid natural gas right above the aquifer again. That's a no for me right. And so what energy are we talking about, and what the source of that energy is? Even on the other end of the spectrum, if we're talking about batteries, perhaps to make the grid more resilient, and allow us the capacity to add renewables. The batteries themselves and their storage present a threat to the aquifer, and I'd be really cautious about that, too, in the energy question.”

“No, I feel like I need to understand how, what kind of energy use is, or how it would happen.”

“Non-DOD.”

“Probably DOD use. I don't know that I have an energy yay or nay. Because I would think that the DOD has, well, hopefully, I would hope, I think that's the hopeful choice, is that the DOD would recognize that it needs to do something to bring back health in that space. And so what might it do in a different if it's repurposed and it's not going to be used for the same purpose then what might the DOD do to sort of help to regenerate or reclaim that space for a healthy Hawaii.”

“So DOD purposes. If they were able to do more studies in that area and use that for applications for future prevention or future knowledge of how to handle those situations. Maybe if it wasn't done by the same agencies it could have been done by other agencies to that they may need that information provided to them. So I could see how DOD could be beneficial.”

“Since I believe strongly in Hawaii attaining its food and energy independence and security, I would like to see an innovative idea that is robustly discussed right from all sides on the potential energy uses as long as whatever fuel, or if it creates fuel, it is not stored there right, and then that that really kind of the very last resort thing. Preferably it might be the operations or how they have like hydro. Is there a way to utilize the tanks to, you know, create energy in motion? ... But if it is direct creation of utilizing like water, even clean water. But there may be some issues. People may bring it up that well, you know that's not fresh water. ... There are great technologies in water reclamation and cleaning that can get it up to certain levels of safe usage. Hawaii's laws don't allow for consumption of it, but it could be used for landscaping that they use now and then, possibly for creating energy. I would be open to these discussions about looking at different technologies that could do that.”

“Non-DOD. Well, I believe that it should be again going back to the community. I think there's been this disconnect, this lack of trust. So, having the military, the DOD, continue to use that facility unless they are able to engage the community and get the community on the same page to the usage of that then fine, you know, have the DOD use the space. But if not, I think it's the community's right to determine what that space should be used for in collaboration, obviously with State government and other stakeholders.”

**7. From your second choice, what idea would you suggest and why would you like it to be considered?**

“I think my orientation toward agriculture, or that the protection of seedlings, or I don't know what else might fit in that. Let me say non-energy use that is somehow related to Hawaii's efforts to be sustainable. And that's why I'm kind of drawn naturally toward agriculture without knowing enough about what might be possible in that category or water even, is why I'm drawn to that. Anything that would help to sustain life in Hawaii going forward would have my vote.”

**8. Have you discussed any of these ideas or had any other Red Hill repurposing discussions with other people or groups? If so, which ideas were discussed with who, and how did they react? With what other people or groups have you discussed this idea and what was their reaction?**

“So over the last couple of years we've been part of discussions around the future of that facility, immediately tied to when the spill happened, or the spills over the couple of years. So these are community groups, many Native Hawaiian-led. Sounds like you folks may have interviewed some of them, but the majority are not happy with what's been going on, so they would in our discussions rather, again, (prefer) non-DOD use. The DOD should be out of the picture and the community in the area should have choice and control over what happens.”

“I've talked with my community members. I talked with some of the elected officials currently in office. I've talked with former elected officials. I've talked with some community leaders, not in my specific community, but in other communities and Native Hawaiian community leaders. And I think that definitely defueling is the number one priority. Defueling is number one. As far as repurposing, I hear a lot. The idea to store water in the tanks or repurpose the facility to hold water. I do hear that one quite frequently. And what I share with you on the hesitation of the DOD trust in any activity that involves the DOD to continue utilizing the facility for other purposes. There is that distrust feeling in the military that can we even trust them to have an office there, and can we even trust them to have any type of use there? I've heard ideas of potentially the UH maybe repurposing it. I've heard the idea of in some of the groups, and this is just people just talking, potentially making it a historical site where you know people can come and visit, and it's now an area that someone can buy a ticket and maybe watch a movie on the building of it, and then walking through the tank and walking through the facility and that type of experience. And as far as, the main point that I want to make across today, .... is the question on the activity with Native Hawaiian groups, right and groups of our ancestral lands. I'm also a Native Hawaiian, and I agree that the relationship must be repaired prior to any type of military use there, and I think that's the common commonality in the conversation that I have had is any type of repurposing, for military activity would have to have deep ties to the community and open relations with the community. I've talked with a few housing people that potentially want to turn that into underground housing. And how would that look like right? So I think lots of ideas thrown out. But you know, you gotta look what's financially feasible, what makes sense, and you know in my understanding of our laws, and the way the way it is now, I do believe that at the end of the day, I know we're talking about repurposing, and there's no idea fully set in stone. But I have an inkling that it would definitely turn into a facility of ... I have a feeling that it will be a military facility going forward, and I have no problem with that, if number one, it doesn't hold fuel, and any other substance other than H2O. But you know I feel like that when I talk to many people, that's the sentiment that I get that, you know, although we are here talking about ideas, that it will remain in military use. And how can we repair that relationship for any potential use of the facility? I think it goes. It's very agreeable to most conversations that I've had. But very, very, very important to the Native Hawaiians that I speak with.”

“To be honest, I haven't talked to anyone about repurposing it. At least in my circle, that hasn't been a topic that really has come up much. I mean, it's been trying to manage the defueling of Red Hill. But I don't think I haven't spoken to many people who have talked about options for repurposing. So no.”

“Yes, I have, and it's been primarily within the DOD kind of network at the more senior level. ... The discussions have been around that specifically what I just talked about that it really ought to look at how do we do something that benefits the people of Hawaii, and that we can turn this into something that of course, not in the short term, but in long term, people look at said, oh, yeah, you know, Red Hill is where X is done, and it's a good, and there's a good connection to that versus what is now. Like, if you say Red Hill now, immediately, everyone, regardless of who you are, has to kind of go, you know it's not a good thing right. How do you change that right now? Of course that would be a long-term thing. But the folks that I've talked to it's been primarily military folks or people connected with the military in some fashion right? All kind of are leaning towards that, I think, yeah, how can we? How can we change this? How can we change the story? The narrative? Right?”

“So the short answer is, no. I haven't had any discussions, even at like a family level. There's a lot going on, and so especially in my professional work it also hasn't afforded me much time to have outside conversations about this topic, so none that I can share.”

“I would say, I have not had discussions about possible reuse with anyone in particular or in depth. Yeah, I can't think of that. I think, for the in the circles that I'm in we're more just concerned about the oil and the PFAS, and the potential impact on our aquifer.”

“Yeah. I mean just in conversations with friends and family when the issue does come up, and it's just you know it's just dumbfounding to a lot of people that we would take such unnecessary, that we would take some, that there are things that are just, you know posing such a real risk. You know, even if it's a small probability of those things happening, the chances of it happening can happen. And why do we take, why do we put something that is so important to us, even at the slightest risk? And so it's just. You know people are just dumbfounded that you know this is not common sense that we should not be doing these types of activities with chemicals near our water.”

“The last time I had a discussion, a real discussion, I was I was probably 8 years old, in my grandfather's car driving by, and my grandpa said, hey, you know, there, there's a whole bunch of tanks under there. One day they're gonna to leak into the water.”

“I only talked with Admiral Bennett about it – Barnett, Barnett – briefly. He seems very receptive to ideas that we might have. He seems eager to hear what the general community's comments were to see what best-case analyses would be for repurposing in some way. He was very open. I talk informally with my colleagues in the Hawaiian community. I haven't spoken about it with the Hawaiian Civic Club, but I will bring it up at the upcoming meetings, general membership meeting to talk to them about it because I think the more the community talks about it, the more ideas will come about for what to do with the facility after it's been empty. I talk informally with my colleagues, people, friends I work with all the time. Native Hawaiians mainly. We didn't get that deep into the details we just talked about, I just talked about, it would be a waste to just leave it empty or even to demolish it would cost millions, if not billions of dollars to demolish it. Again, is that the best option?”

“I've had general discussions with people about Red Hill and the fact that it has chipped away at the goodwill the people in this community felt, feel towards the military. And it has generated a feeling of great mistrust that has extended beyond Red Hill to the military in general. And in all those discussions, everybody agrees that whatever happens to Red Hill, it has to be repurposed. What that repurposing is, we didn't talk about.”

“No, I haven't had any discussions on repurposing Red Hill with anyone. I've had conversations about what I first started with, which was the intention of this, the space and the land that is there with the Kahu, the

actual high priest, the guardian of that entire ahupua'a. There is a kahuna la'au lapa'au that is the steward of Moanalua and Red Hill is within his sort of like area that he protects. And so we've had conversations about what the energy is like in those spaces. Things happen right for a reason that the storm that occurred around the spill all of those were messages, and were also symptoms of larger issues that we face in our hearts and in our communities. Yeah, he talks more about the water, like what it means to be a water guardian in that space. And who those water guardians are, and I don't know that it couldn't be the Department of Defense. I just know that they didn't do a good job previously, perhaps because they thought of it as a place where they store fuel and not a place where they are part of a system of people that needs to guard the water and protect it."

"No. I haven't in any like formal capacity had those conversations until now, I would say mostly it's just been conversations in passing, or kind of like people throwing ideas at the wall, which is, I think the phase we're basically still in. So I don't know exactly what the process would be. I guess the DOD would have to assess if they have a use for it, and if they want to open it up to other proposals, and they put out some kind of RFI or RFP, and then you'd have to see what actually has legs. Right? I mean, of course, because I work in the energy stuff a lot the idea of oh, maybe this has potential for some kind of energy storage. Well, that's like all sounds great like, but you know what's it gonna cost to build it? What will the cost of the energy it's able to provide or stored be to rate payers? It would have to go through the whole regulatory process, so it's sort of like. I'm always hesitant to say I support or oppose something until I even I haven't even seen the proposal."

"I have not expressed any ideas to anybody. This has been something I've been pondering just solo."

"So I haven't had discussions with groups per se. There was one group where I did have a discussion about this. The repurposing of it. It's like a Democratic precinct district group over in Newtown, and so they had brought it up. They had asked me to be a guest speaker there. Then one of the members of the group brought it up, and then the group joined in kind of thing. I would say, there's like a handful that mentioned just close it down completely. Fill it in right. And then there was a couple of other guys that agreed with what I was saying, one constituent, though that was just a regular homeowner in the area that mentioned that to me. ... So I think, outside of the ones I've already mentioned, the only other option was to fill it in honestly. So that's the only other thing that's been expressed to me."

"I mean other people I've talked to have likewise been very concerned, especially those who have been arguing for years that this facility's inherent dangers, you know, outweighs any kind of purported national security benefit it provides. They likewise are very concerned that even with the best of intentions now, any kind of repurposing action that could leave the tanks open for reuse for fuel storage, or you know other kinds of hazmat storage is a potential liability because we don't know what's gonna happen in 10 years, you know, like the political landscape. Someone did mention pump hydro early on, but I don't think they were familiar with all the issues, the structural issues with the tanks as well. There has been mention of using it as a tourist attraction, or maybe some kind of command center, but others, and you might want to talk to the fire department, but there are fire safety OSHA issues with the layout of the facility, because it was built so long ago, and it would probably take a significant amount of retrofitting to get into compliance and modern safety standards."

"I've had the conversation with friends. I've not had the conversation in kind of a formal setting with any sort of organization or group. I will say that my perspective from a military family standpoint, I don't think this is of concern to our military families. ... Our military families worry about three things. One, they want to make sure that their drinking water's clean, you know they don't want to go through that again. Two, if they need health care, they want to make sure they have access to that. I think they're feeling for the most part pretty good about one and two. And then, thirdly, they want to make sure that their military member

has access to fuel needed, if they have to fight tonight. You know it's that kind of thing, and I think it's that third one that is still somewhat ambiguous and not really discussed. And so I think there's a lot of feelings around that like, where is this going? And my husband who flies this, or my husband, who's a crew chief on this, or my husband, who's a sailor over here, where are they going to get their fuel to fight? So there's that. In talking with friends, I think there's a sense, let's just leave well enough alone, and let's not repurpose these. Let's fix them, let's drain them, let's fix them, and let's not repurpose them. What I have heard time and time again is probably not, and I understand it can be done safely. I mean, these can be relined multiple times, etc., etc. But the idea of holding drinking water, and I know that's been discussed holding drinking water in these. While that could be very important, I don't think people have a lot of trust in that idea or proposal with fair reason. So you know again, in talking with the groups that I work with, this is really not of concern to them, and talking with friends, family that live here, it's more about let's not use it for drinking water, and it's more, what not to do as opposed to perhaps what to do, if that makes sense."

**9. Of all the ideas that you have considered, discussed with others, or heard about, which do you think would have the most public support?**

"So given the folks we work with, and just seeing the groundswell of voices when the spills happened, and again, not only the spills, but just the lack of accountability and supportive action by the Navy and the DOD, I would say, a groundswell of folks across ethnicities, and even military folks, who are not happy with the Navy and the DOD would prefer first and foremost, which is great, defueling and closed of the facility. And then second again given the Navy's actions to date, covering things up and not taking care of their own service people, the distrust of them as steward of the place and the people as well, so it's the majority of folks you talk with. I would rather have the DOD out. And then again, I think from the conversations we're a part of there's a lot of questions about the feasibility of the facility to even function given how old it is, from the World War II era. So a lot of, from what we've been able to gather in our discussions that a lot of the facilities are deteriorating and it doesn't make sense, I guess, to keep the facility around."

"Well, I think public support of the idea of it holding water, I think that's something, you know, when we talk about the importance of our wai, of the importance of water, that if it was to hold water, I think that nobody would have a problem with that right. If you have 12 million gallons, I think it's four and a half million gallons of water per tank, or space per tank. If you were to have 18 tanks at 12 million gallon each in the tank above an aquifer, I don't see, I don't think that would be a problem with that water being above an aquifer. But when you put other things above the aquifer, you know, I mean, we're all we, me and you, wherever we are we're above the aquifer today, so that's something we also have to think is, we're above the water table ourselves, wherever we are sitting on the island so that's something to keep in mind. ... When I speak, I take into account the community that I represent and I think that it would be an easier pill to swallow if you had water there versus the variables that you get in putting a facility such as like office spaces or a housing space. There's also variables that you have to think about. If the variables can be controllable or controlled, potentially, it may be a good idea. But I think right now water, storage of water would be the main thing that I think would be would get the most community support going forward."

"For sure, some conversion into a clean energy facility, whatever that might be. I'm certain that would have the most public support, although I don't think that a clean and responsibly managed DOD facility would, I think, that would still have reasonable public support. I think people are very angry about Red Hill, but, as you know people in Hawaii have very nuanced views of the military, and so it's not universally negative, and I think you know, I suspect that the Navy explaining why this is crucial to their operations and crucial to keeping jobs in Hawaii. I think that would probably find a fairly, you know, if not warm, reception, at least an understanding reception."

“I think that the highest public support it would be, I guess going back to one of the things I spoke about earlier, allowing it to just be put back into sort of this natural use, which is not really feeling like you need to use it and allow it to kind of go back to being above the aquifer and cleaning it up and eliminating it completely. I do think that's probably the most public support because I think if the concern is for the aquifer anything you put over the aquifer is going to make us continue to lose some trust. I think all the things we talked about in some of the choices that you'd take if there was a way to think about energy, and if there was an efficient way to do it, and a safe way to do it for people to trust that maybe we could turn, you know lemons into lemonade and be able to create a place where you can create energy in a clean way and solve another problem. I just I'm worried that's a long ride down, because I don't know it's going to be you that are completely free of all chemicals and possible risk. But again being over an aquifer is something that everybody's uniquely alert to right now.”

“I think it would have to galvanize the public. There's a tendency, right, we want to say something that provides jobs and opportunity for folks, but that doesn't necessarily galvanize the public right? Because this is an emotional issue right? And so when that happens and you start to throw out economics, people go, we don't care about the money. We care about the health, and we care about the aina, we care about the wai, the land and whatnot and so I think it has to, if it's to galvanize the public, it has to be something that addresses that. It has to be something that addresses how important you know the land is to the Native Hawaiians and to the people of Hawaii. Right? So not just the Native Hawaiians but people who also live here in Hawaii. How important that is? Now as secondary to that, if it's something that stimulates economic opportunity, economic growth that would be great. But I think if you really want to galvanize people right, it has to go, it has to get back to that core emotional part in there which may be difficult, because a lot of that emotion is wrapped up in this distrust now for the military right. So how do you do something that actually demonstrates, if you could right, that no, the military is trying to do the right thing, they are going to do the right thing. And oh, by the way, what this repurposing is for the benefit long term for the people of Hawaii and for the land.”

“Putting water in the towers.”

“It would be the easiest one to understand, I think, and fresh water, or captured rainwater, or storing it for agricultural crop use, I think, on this particular issue, the public would support something that it can comprehend. When I think about how the determination was made to even house the fuel tanks there over an aquifer boggles my mind, number one. And then I know very little about the place names there, but the few place names I've seen that are Hawaiian would have piqued my curiosity enough to go seek some insight and advice from kupuna about what those names actually represent or mean. And I think we're at a point now in modern society where those names carry a lot of information that could have helped in better planning, or even be able to dissuade somebody from putting a system like that in that particular place. So I would say, and that's a long-winded answer. I would say that the public would support something that's safe, nontoxic, and easy to understand, and has a public benefit.”

“I would have to say that I think what would have the most public support, and I don't agree with it, would be some kind of energy, you know, moving toward energy self-sufficiency use for that hillside. And, as I said before, I mean I don't know what you could use those caverns for. I don't think that there would be widespread public support for the storage of fuel.”

“Again, I think I go back to my initial response, and it's really a use that doesn't put us back at risk of, you know, repeating past mistakes and I think for me the bar, the standard, the piece that's most important, at least from what I can tell, is that we preserve the integrity of our aquifer and we preserve the integrity of our water source for Oahu.”

“Would have the most public support? Probably the decommissioning removal of the tanks and the lines, returning to its natural state.”

“The most public support? I think you know whatever it is used for as long as the process involves some kind of remediation, I think that would be popular. ... You know aren't there fuel-eating bacterias, or you know these kinds of remedial processes that can clean up oil contamination, or toxic spills of various kinds. I don't know exactly what those are. but I think anything that incorporates that cleaning up of the soil would be popular.”

“I would say energy. I think you know the Department of Defense use, I mean, I think people are really starting to question the relationship between the Department of Defense and our communities. You know this Red Hill thing, this Red Hill issue, you know, putting things very, very front and center, you know, I think we've got a really question the net positive or negative. What is the net impact of so much Department of Defense presence here in Hawaii? There is some economic gain, obviously, but then there are a lot of things that are coming along with the Department of Defense that are, that make our community question right? You know our people, local people who are not employed by the federal government, who are not getting COLA, who are not getting the benefits of a Department of Defense job, with respect to housing and things like that, like and being able to purchase at a commissary. And you know the tax benefits like that allows people to live in Hawaii at a subsidized rate that is putting pressure on our local families who don't get those benefits. It takes up the local rental market for housing you know. There's a lot of things that you know the downsides of the DOD is becoming more and more evident, and I think we really have to ask ourselves about that relationship and the net benefit or impact to our communities. I don't want to see any more Department of Defense expansion quite honestly. We need to have some real conversations with leadership around what our relationship with the Department of Defense and U.S. military is because, you know, if national security is gonna continuously like be the excuse for the reason or the justification for polluting our environment, our natural resources for putting pressure on our local families, we need to evaluate this relationship and have conversations with leadership on both sides to really look at what the impacts are in our community because it's questionable at this point.”

“Well, I would think non-DOD uses would be more supportive. Given the way, I think the Department of Defense has sort of not told its own people what was going on. You know, I coach football at Aiea High School. Some of my kids who are Army kids you know, not just local kids, Army kids who lived in the housing there where the water became poison, had a real hard time kind of being there, you know. They luckily they didn't end up in the hospital so I think non-DOD seems to be better, simply because ... well, they haven't been open about what they're doing, even to their own troops.”

“So the greatest public support, I think, is for clean and safe water, and ultimately everyone wants clean and safe water. And so whatever leads us to that is what people are going to rally behind and be most supportive of. If you make that basic goal of clean and safe water, anything that falls under that umbrella, I think, could work theoretically, and then it's really a matter of what are the other benefits? Are there other outcomes that could also provide benefit to our communities. And I think alternative fuel development is an exciting one, if it could be done in a way that provides clean and safe water, right? Or I of course, like historic interpretation, because that's what we're all about, but only if it can lead to clean and safe water. So I think it's always about that clean and safe water, and then anything else that could be sort of collateral benefits would be great. That finally and ultimately, it's got to be about the water right?”

“Probably the dry waste. I mean, and that I haven't really talked about a lot with anybody until I talked to you this morning. It's causing me to kind of deep, I think more deeply into what I'm considering, and I'm thinking of the community might be really open to something like that because of the landfill issue. Landfills

tend to fill up too fast. So it has to be stuff that can't contaminate the aquifer, you know. So that's another issue. They would have to screen the dry waste. So you don't have batteries and things like that in there that could see down into the aquifer. ... And even, you know, like construction material if it can be properly green by the construction companies or inspectors, or something like that. There's a lot of need for construction material, you know, disposal. I think the disposal of dry waste that benefits both the Defense Department and the community, because the military bases all have dry waste as well. They all have garbage. They all have to find places to take their waste, and they probably all have landfills on their bases, which is not a good use of land. So this is a common need."

"Something that benefits the community. I think there's a general sense in Hawaii now that the military is about the military. The military takes care of the military. The military doesn't really care about the larger community. That is an absolutely strong sentiment in the Hawaiian community who are very resentful of the military being on some of the most choice land on the island. And also there's a progressive element in Hawaii that resents the fact that the military does their trainings here and all those kind of things. And I think anything that the military does, whether it be with Red Hill repurpose or anything else, has to first and foremost be able to benefit the larger community, not the military, not what's best for the military, but what's best for Hawaii. I don't have any specifics beyond that."

"I would think something that creates jobs is what most people would want ... I guess I still come from a space where the amount of reparations and fines and funds that were provided by the Navy for the Kaho'olawe restoration, and 40 years later it's like the needle is barely moved. So I don't know what that timeline is like, and what people think happens with the money or with the opportunity. It's a similar (to Red Hill). So the Navy gave 40 million dollars of this and that, like it, 4% of the island is cleared. 96% is not. And so and it's not like the money just was like bled out. It went to do something, but it's not only money, it's also intention, and it's also partnership and commitment, and having a vision for what the restored site looks like that resonates with not just a small community like the Kaho'olawe stewards. Right? It has to resonate with everyone or people forget about it."

"I think that a variety of things could have public support, just assuming that there was no sort of environmental risk to just, generally speaking, or to the aquifer."

"Energy use."

"Anything that supports food growth ... I think, in different segments of our communities each of those will have supporters for it, and we'll have those who will advocate against it. Now the opportunity exists to have these conversations now and to bring like possible solutions right. ... So when I mentioned earlier about things that don't affect the water or their natural resources, and that will help to address our current glaringly obvious needs. .... Initially, we're gonna get a mix. I think housing even though it's a good idea, right?"

"I mean at this moment in time? Quite frankly, non-DOD usage of it, just because Red Hill has affected directly, indirectly people on this island, and so I think to have DOD continue to have use of it, in control of it, I think may or may not be the right direction at this moment, unless the DOD is able to engage the community and earn this trust. We are in the trust of the community, and to determine what that use is. But that's my feeling at this moment."

"I feel like you kind of roll the dice on any of the ones I've proposed honestly. I think they all have a reasonable chance of actually being accepted by the public. I think the public's biggest concern is the water table right? And it's about a 100 feet above the water table. So anything that doesn't contaminate that would be acceptable. I think there would be a level of acceptability if we converted one or two of them to a shelter

system or something like that or more. I think the water battery thing would probably be acceptable, because it's just water. It's not like fuel, and the gray water thing. I don't know if, you know, because then they would be like, okay, well, you're holding gray water there without leaching into the, you know, potable water in the aquifer or whatever. So I don't know. So you know, if that would get as much support and then create another, a visitor center, or you know, that would probably be out of the other two I mentioned. I think that probably we'd be doing an injustice by not doing that.”

“Not repurposing, shutting down and not repurposing.”

“Public support? I don’t know. Getting public support for anything nowadays is real hard. We live in a society where everyone, you know, everything is, everybody’s, I don’t even know what public means anymore sometimes. But I will say, I assume the renewable energy might be the least controversial. But I don’t know, on the entertainment side. I don’t know. Maybe that would, if done correctly, especially if it allowed us to free up space elsewhere. And I guess it should have added that. But if there’s certain activities or you know things that are taking up space, valuable real estate some place that could be moved here (Red Hill), and it opened up space, someplace else that might be attractive. Even for the military right, like if the military said, you know what we’re going to relocate all of this stuff here, and we're going to give this land back to the public or to the state of Hawaii or to the city and county. Yeah, to move certain facilities or activities into this huge underground area, or non-DOD, too. That might be a way to incentivize. But yeah, hard to judge. Casino. You could do a casino. Guarantee you’ll have funders, you’ll get funding, you’ll find funders for sure you’ll find funders for a casino.”

#### **10. Which idea would be the best for the people of Hawaii?**

“So again we want to thank the Navy and the DOD for already, for finally just agreeing to shut down and defuel the facility. I mean, that's the first step. The second is to permit long-term remediation of whatever might need to happen to clean up our water source, and that might be for generations, that might be funding for the families, funding for the aina for ongoing remediation. And then in terms of the facility itself again acknowledge mistakes made, and let go of it, and allow folks in whether it's the State or for the community to take kuleana back, because it's clear that the Navy today have not been good stewards of the other place and the people. But you know the service people on the communities affected areas, a true apology by the Navy that's backed up with action would be would help them, maybe shield some of hewa (mistakes) that they've created. Those are some of the steps, again stepping out as the current stewards of the facility would be ideal.”

“Well, I don't think, I know I mean the best for the people of Hawaii, I would say it would be, return the facility with back to its nature. Return the facility back to its nature. Don't use it to repurpose. Repurpose it back to nature. I would say that would be the best thing for us and then we wash our hands, and we move on with our lives. You know. I think that would be the best for the people.”

“Well, I mean, I think, what they would like, which is an opportunity to generate more clean energy at lower rates, to keep us, to shift our energy dependence away from petroleum would be great for Hawaii. And so that's the one I'd love to see, and I think that'd be the one that's best for the state. Assuming we could have both. I mean assuming it doesn't mean that the Navy relocates huge parts of its repair and maintenance operations to San Diego.”

“The DOD including the Navy and the DLA anybody responsible needs to clean up our environment and our water resources for the people of Hawaii. Ola i ka wai. And they also should foot the bill for all of this, near term and long term until this matter is completely resolved – whether it takes a decade, two decades,

half century, a century, whatever it is, the federal government should be on the hook to pay for all of this and be kept accountable to continue these efforts until the water resources are pure again.”

“I do think an energy use would be the best. But you know I continue to believe that what’s best for the people of Hawaii is what's best for our aina and I do think that we allow, I guess the aina to you know, be rebuilt and restored to its natural state is the best thing for our people, because people not only have to have trust that they have places where they feel like their water supply is clean, but also that the uses, you know, are consistent with traditional uses. So I do think that probably would be the best in the long run.”

“You know the one that I know we've I've talked with someone about, but you know it doesn't kind of work because you're in the same situation where it would be, you know, if you look at some type of sustainable fuel type of capability, right? Because you have such a large capacity for storage to be able to do that. But then you would still have, you know, some type of potential contaminant right over the aquifer, so that doesn't seem like that would really work or be a really viable course of action to be able to do. So you know that doesn't work. ... I know there's been discussions ... about using it for like experimentation for different things, you know, to look at it and say, okay, you know, could you use it to do some type of experimentation that would generate, you know, kind of like some innovation and technology to do something like that. But I don't know if that would have enough far-reaching impact. And definitely would not directly appeal to the kind of the emotional challenge that Red Hill emotes right now.”

“Putting water in the towers.”

“Anything that was not toxic, not a threat to the aquifer that would contribute in a meaningful way to sustainable living on Oahu would be kind of my general framework, or a description of where I think the future use might be.”

“I think the idea that would be best for the people of Hawaii is for that the aina is to be allowed to have absolutely no development or no use assigned to it, except to grow back to its own natural state, or, you know, given, allowed to grow again, allowed to thrive. I think, to the extent that certain kinds of traditional practices on kula lands, growing certain kinds of food crops, perhaps on the surface of that of those hillsides, I think, would be would really, really be beneficial to the State of Hawaii for a lot of reasons, and one reason for me is that it drives home the notion that even when we have, even when we have operations and construction and certain kinds of uses on our lands that are either inimical to public safety and health or to the environment that those things do not have to be permanent that we do not have to put this through another generation of the military, using or misusing lands, we can put a stop to it. And we can return this basically to the care of our people, and as a symbolic end to this, which is to take those tanks out, figure out the best way to allow that land to heal, and then letting it heal is a tremendously important message to people who live on an island like ours where we have seen the ravages of over development, and it's not just the military, but over development over urbanization. So I think the best use is to leave the land alone.”

“You know, without having expertise and other things that I'm not even thinking about. And maybe this is pure ego, but the water one makes a lot of sense for me. Again, like I said, it's something that we're all gonna need. It may be something that's in short supply. We've seen Hawaii and drought scenario already. And so yeah, water to me makes the most sense.”

“Returning things back to its natural state. Like even in work with the Department of the Clean Water and Natural Lands, in Hawaii, there so much it's like over development over development over development. And so what it is, is we take a portion of those monies in which to purchase land, so people can have more park space, more hiking trails, more green space. ... Part of it is returning back to its natural state, and letting nature take its course, so it's just healthy for the environment. It's healthy for Hawaii. It's healthy for

its people. And yeah, I'm just a big proponent of clean waters and natural lands. A natural state between the two, between a park and a natural state, and parks will be probably better in areas where there's like a lot of development. And so it'd be if it's possible to remove some buildings to make a park area that would be beneficial. But in this particular area. I think it's more beneficial just to return it to its natural state rather than having a park there.”

“Well, I'm going to say the best is a conditional answer, right? Because I don't know the infrastructure again, and it sounds to me like eventually the tanks, I mean I'm assuming the tanks will not last forever, right? ... I think the best idea is if they were no longer there because ultimately they will no longer be there right? We've just gonna. If we really went to be concerned about the future generations, we would say, how much more lifespan do these tanks have, right? What is, how much longer will they be usable? And then what happens after they're no longer usable. ... I think that in the interim, if we can use it for what I said for some kind of beneficial purpose, such as growing coral or raising hihiwai (snail), or opai (shrimp) or any kind of organism or plant that is beneficial to our islands and our ecosystems, that is a good intermediate step or immediate step. But then recognize, and in longer term there may have to be another use if they start to erode, if they start to collapse. To add to that, though if they do collapse, then, if it's possible to use them for cultural purpose, like growing food or something like that, then that would be good.”

“What would be best for the people of Hawaii? I think it would be best to defuel and close the facility, do as much as we can with the best science right now to sort of remediate the soil and the aina around that facility that may have been exposed to any number of things. And then yeah, make sure that I don't know, that it's filled in or made safe somehow, so that nobody can into it, or you know, more accidents can't occur.”

“Yeah, I think you know anything that's gonna help us with our renewable energy goals. I think it's gonna be a good thing, so that we have less dependency on oil. And you know we're able to keep some of those billions of dollars that we spend on importing oil here in our local economy. Yeah, I mean anything that's gonna really help with stimulating our local economy in positive ways that come with less negative impacts associated with them the better. And I just appreciate this opportunity, that you know, like for you folks going out and seeking opinion about what this is, and what how this can be handled in a better way, or what the opinions are from our community about these issues, because you know, it feels like a lot of decisions in the past have been made in silos, and, you know, getting ahead of it and asking the community questions about what's possible, what's good, what's not, it's a good approach. It's a necessary approach, and I appreciate the opportunity to share an opinion.”

“I feel like I can't answer that without knowing what the use would be, or what this potential energy use would be.”

“I always think of these kinds of planning activities and alternatives as kind of a matrix, you know, on one axis you have here all the ideas, and on the other axis you have. Here's all the criteria for assessing those ideas right? And then you'd say on some kind of ranking system, a scoring system, high, medium, low. Yes, no, never. You know whatever, and it kind of ends up with. I know a few things that rank really highly on all the things we want, and a few things you would say, never no how, take that off the table right now. Whatever. I don't want to prejudge which ideas are on which parts of that matrix, because I simply don't have the subject matter expertise to know. I don't know what all the ideas are, and I don't know how well different ideas stack up against those criteria. So it would just seem kind of presumptuous to say, oh, well, these are the ideas right because I just don't have the depth of knowledge to be qualified, say, at this point. But I really do want to see that matrix. I really want to see the matrix, though.”

“It'll almost have to be like a unicorn, you know, scenario. It will have to be one of those that can be an idea that has buy-in from those from the complex institutions of the federal government, you know, so that there is support right? So there is monetary support, that there is just you know, just working together all down to the state, which is very bureaucratic right, and has to move through so many different steps in order to get things done all the way down to the NGOs and nonprofits that are working at a community level, but are very skeptical of those other bodies. So the best thing for Hawaii would be would be a future scenario that those different elements, almost like a Venn diagram, where they all overlap. That part in the middle, that sweet spot would be the best case scenario.”

“We need to ensure that our drinking water resources are secure and safe. That's just like the fundamental that's absolutely important, and the public needs to have that for health and safety, and also just reassurance about that. I also think there's this element of again, rebuilding trust, because it does feel like beyond just kind of the use of it, it's like broken trust with the community, and how the military interacts with the local community.”

“So you're going to laugh at this because it is absurd. But if the military was to give back a piece of land, and just say, you know what we really reflected on this and we didn't get this land in a legal way and we're going to give it back to Hawaii. And I feel the same way about missionaries. You know I'm still waiting for a missionary to hold a press conference and say, you know what my family's thought about it, we're not comfortable with 14 million dollars that we have. We're giving X back to this Native Hawaiian cause, because the way we got this money we don't feel good about and we're gonna try to make up for that by making this contribution. If the military was to do something like that, I think their reputation and their goodwill in the community would go from where I think it is now, which is very low to incredibly high, recognizing that that's probably never gonna happen.”

“I remember in one of our designs from a long time ago, when I was first starting to do like environmental problem-solving work with kids, one of the questions that was posed as a design question was, what would it take to restore Kaneohe Bay to pre-development conditions? Maybe almost even pre-contact pre-contact yeah pre-contact, because it was when it was fish, ponds and loi, but no housing, no right. And I was like, what would it take like? It would take generations right of committed people who see the vision of why it's important. And so I would want, I mean, I would think that what we would want for Red Hill would be for that area to be healthy. Whatever healthy means. Does it mean that the facilities are not there? Does it mean that it's a farm. Does that mean that it's, you know, I don't know, but healthy for the people and healthy for the place. And I hope that the military can be part of that because if we keep treating the military as if they are not part of our community then they keep acting like they're not right, like I don't know. I don't know how to see any other way, because I'm conflicted about that, too, right like.”

“They could be DOD. So that they're willing to do the work to prevent those things from happening, or to help provide a help in case something that again happens from anybody else.”

“I don't know what would have the most public support. I don't have a good feel for that right now. I think what would be best for the future of Hawaii would be to ensure that there's no threat to our aquifer and that we can ensure fresh, safe drinking water for future generations.”

“I don't know if there's resistance to the idea of using it for anything for culture. Reasons like it should just be restored, the land should just be restored and left, as is, or something. Maybe there's a sentiment like that I haven't. I don't know. But to me, it's like well, the tanks are there. This whole facility is there. If it could be used for something useful, I wouldn't have any opposition to that as long as it didn't pose any, you know, threats to the aquifer. From the background of being someone who works in the field of energy, you know, with my committee and that stuff a lot, I think the idea of energy storage is interesting because there's

certainly a need for like longer duration storage that we can really provide with, like most of our energy storage is like four-hour batteries. I don't know. I don't have any idea. I mean this would probably be like engineering something that's never been done before to those specific specifications like, how do you build some kind of pump storage facility in like 16 or 20, or however many like underground tanks there are. How do you, engineer that? What's the cost to build it? You know all of that, whether it's like remotely feasible or not. It's like zero idea. So I guess maybe this is just my personality. It's like throwing, giving throwing ideas at you when I'm not a technical expert to even say if it's feasible doesn't like, I feel like I shouldn't do that, because who am I to say you know. And barring anything sort of technical, it being used for anything technical. I mean, I think it would have some kind of potential in my mind as a tourist site. Maybe that's just. Maybe I just found it fascinating to visit. I mean, I don't like what happened there, you know. Their people should be more careful. But just the actual facility it to me is pretty fascinating. So you could see people being interested in visiting it, you know."

"I have a difficult time answering an either or question right? Because when I look at our issues, even though we tend to approach solutions in silos, they're not silos right? You've got 20 tanks up there. Yeah, I want to. I want to say food. But like I mentioned earlier in the segments of our community, there's gonna be a whole bunch of like those types of use for fuel. How are you gonna grow food in there right? Housing? Because we are? We need really, truly affordable housing, because we're seeing this out migration of our people right? Energy because we are, we stopped our fossil fuel imports for our energy needs, right, and we have this huge goal for the State to transition. But honestly, we don't have all the pieces in place to figure out how to do that, and we do need opportunities for our younger generation. Even our current ones are our parent-age ones who have to cross over to a different job or industry. We need some of these diversification and industries that are appropriate for Hawaii."

"I mean, there's a lot of ideas and ways to use that space, we know the pressing issue is housing, but again I don't know if that area is capable of doing more housing, energy. But just going down the list as to what is the most pressing issues that we need to address now that we can use that space for alternative ideas other than what it was used for. The thing is, you know those tanks, though I don't know how long it's gonna take to remove them. So that's an obstacle right there. So you know, if it's gonna take decades, then you know we need to determine the alternative uses for the tanks itself. And what does that look like? But I don't know. I'm not the expert in that area."

"I think again, it goes back to who's willing to invest in these, and how much is willing to be invested. I personally believe that it could be done safely to store drinking water. You know, we're very fortunate in that we've had wet years, and climate change has not affected us, and so we have the water that we need. I don't think like from a perspective of what is best for our island in particular ... you know. I think storing water would be very akamai, and perhaps very forward thinking, because things may not always be the way they are. But I recognize that that is wrought with a lot of concern, I think, and a lot of distrust. Short of that, I think that this is such a sensitive issue and there are so many negative feelings around Red Hill and those fuel tanks that, let's shut them down. Let's make sure they're safe, let's make sure they're sealed, let's make sure there's nothing left to leak, and you know, let's close them down. The part that concerns me the most is by doing that, do we then kick the can down the road to our grandchildren, our great-grandchildren, and that you know, 100 years from now, they're dealing with decomposing fuel tanks that are crumbling, and again, somehow getting into the water source. And so I think, not knowing what does it look like for future generations, you know that's an argument right there. I understand it's very risky to remove those, but are we just kicking the can down the road by not addressing removal? And I think that's concerning. And maybe technology will be very, very different in 50 years, you know, and we can safely remove them at that time. But that's always in the back of my head. And I guess we can only deal with what we know now, and what we have the technology to do now. But it is a concern because we know those tanks aren't gonna last forever. We know they sit over our water source. And what does that mean for our future?"

“For me, personally, I don’t know enough about the renewable energy projects how far along they are, if it could be done in that space, but renewable energy for sure. I mean reducing our dependence on fossil fuels, it’s just good all around. So if there is a renewable energy play I think renewable energy would be kind of best overall, and closely followed by if there’s some model here for a regenerative tourism model where we put certain activities in recreation, and so on and so forth underground. Maybe it doesn’t need air conditioning, or you know, there might be some benefits of being underground. That would maybe be a close second. ... That term (regenerative tourism) is being tossed around a lot without very clear, clear definition. In general it’s a form of tourism that is, you know, kind of aligns with the natural and community and cultural norms of a place. So in regards to Red Hill, I guess the thought would be, again, if there’s certain activities that can be done underground in a more environmentally friendly way, to use less real estate, potentially free up real estate, or you know, and create a destination that is not detracting from our natural landscapes or affecting communities in a really negative way. So it’s kind of more a creative value to a community rather than being seen as taking away or having negative impacts on community from a visitor standpoint.”

**11. Of all the discussions you may have heard regarding the repurposing of Red Hill, do you think anything is missing from the conversation? If so, what?**

“I think what's missing is a transparent process, and then the opportunity to build relationships with the decision-makers tied to this issue in the DOD and the Navy. From observation, it's been folks who, especially at the beginning, were tone deaf at the very least if not uncaring of the people and place. And I think flow by flow there have been others who have come in from the Navy and the DOD that were seemingly smart, emotionally intelligent, and I don't mean to sound like talking down, like just some of the responses at the early on was not very thoughtful or caring of their own people. So I think it'd be ideal if the Navy...what's been missing is true, open authentic conversations between Navy leadership and the impacted community and then by extension all of us who are impacted by potentially contaminated water and having a commitment to regular ongoing, transparent conversation, and then related action that defueling and check on is happening, beyond timely, but in an urgent fashion. And by extension for this process specifically is a commitment to clarity on how our voices will be used. What exactly, how exactly will the process tied to what happens with the facility, how that will happen? And then again, the Navy and the DOD holding themselves accountable to that. To date it doesn't feel like there has been a lot of accountability. I think that's what's missing, accountability, trust, and then clear, transparent process.”

“Well. I think this is an important piece of what we're doing today is the conversation having with community leaders and those in the community. I think what's missing is public hearings. You know, I understand we're doing surveys, you know, we're doing surveys and we're sending surveys out and survey responses are coming in. I think that it's important that the organization like Nakupuna or Red Hill, the military, the U.S. government is out there in front of the news in front of the people leading a discussion. We have to, and I think, having a moderator at these public hearings to remind folks that, hey, we're not talking about the defueling anymore. No, it's being defueled. Now, how do we move forward? And I think for a few, you know I don't want the military to get discouraged or Nakupuna to get discouraged that you know we hold these public hearings, if you do that, you continue because you're gonna probably hear a lot of negativity in the beginning. But I think that's something that the military is deserving of because of their previous years course of action since the first spill or the first large spill, communicated large spill. But I think that piece is missing, getting the community more involved. I appreciate this conversation that we're having today. But I don't think it's enough. I think that you need to be, your organization on behalf of the military, should be out there really communicating with the people of the state because this facility doesn't affect only one community, although it may live in my community, it affects every community on the island.

... So I think, repairing the relationship with the community starts with the little things repairing the relationship with the people. ... And that's the missing stakeholder, I feel, is the people of Hawaii."

"I think, I think that just what's missing is more effort to have a conversation about it. I don't think that this conversation has really even reached kind of the more attentive people in the state, let alone the general population. So I think that the military needs to make more of it. I mean, if this is a conversation that they would like to have, they need to make much more of an effort to explain the options and to get community feedback and input and just let people know that this is even a conversation they are interested in having, because I don't think that's been made clear to most folks."

"I don't know enough about the full processes being used. I think this is one where to me the process is really important, and it's just as important as the answer because the community voice needs to be heard. Not just, you know, in five-minute increments in a hearing, but I think truly really listened to and heard before decisions are made. So I don't know enough about all the different alternatives, but I hope the process lends itself to genuine listening and discussion, and I think without that I think any solution's going to be a struggle."

"I'm not. I mean to be honest. I haven't been following the repurposing of Red Hill that much. I've been more focused kind of on the immediate in terms of how the Navy is actually doing the defueling and how the bigger Department of Defense is trying to get their narrative right and really start to address the larger challenge, because I think as they've looked at the challenge of Red Hill, I think they've looked at it almost like from a what I would call, and it's very military, and I am, and I'm former military, a very pragmatic factual perspective, but almost like very engineering type. Right? Okay, here's a problem, here's what we got to solve. ... So they set up a joint task force Red Hill to do this. But for most people in Hawaii, I think, like, if you ask the average person, you know for them, it's a generational thing, right? It's not a one- to two-year thing that you've created. This task force is going to do the defueling it's what about what after you feel? What about, you know who's going to be testing the water? Who's going to be testing the land, the poisoned land? Who's going to be testing to make sure that you know our children are impacted by this, for you know generations to come. That is what I think is you could argue is probably the bigger mission that the military should be trying to address. Yes, you got it, you know it's like a wound, right? You've got a, you've got someone's arteries bleeding right. Now you got to stop the bleeding and do that. But you gotta look at the long term, you know, care and long-term plan in terms of okay, how do we do the rehab? How do we do you know this? You know, physical therapy, how do we do all this other type of stuff that needs to be addressed? So I think that's something that I think as they start to look at this, I hope they do that from a very strategic view as well versus this kind of immediate, hey, let's go get a couple of census, or polls out there to figure out what people want to do, and then we'll just go with the majority you know, versus taking a long-term strategic. Not that we can really take time on this right, but and then be transparent as you're doing that process so people understand, maybe, why you're taking an extra month or something to deliberate on ultimately what you want to do, and then it has to be in conjunction with the other key stakeholders right. If it's viewed as something that's being independently done by the Department of Defense then it's just gonna look like, well, you know, the military is just saying what the military does, because that's how they always operate."

"I think, what's missing is when they defuel, they could also probably take the towers down. And they could also untangle all the miles and miles of miles of pipelines, and maybe some of that space we could use for housing. In other words, if they wanted to take everything down you, you would have acres and acres of great land for homes and housing, and that is always interesting on an island, right? So that's another thought. If they weren't going to reuse them, what could they do? And they could do that whole area hundreds of acres could be used for housing."

“You know, I actually think it's a discussion that has transcended. It's a transcendent issue, because it's a common threat to life. And I think what made it extremely special or of a special class is when the City and County's water chief and engineer Ernie Lau began to speak about this in a non-technical, non-scientific way, and he, basically in my opinion, and I didn't know Ernie at the time. I've become a big Ernie Lau fan. But to hear an engineer and a scientist speak about it in terms of in Hawaiian cultural terms, I thought, opened the doorway for the community to, he made it understandable that this was essentially a violation of things that Native Hawaiians hold sacred and in many ways it became kind of a catalytic force to calling our immediate attention to it, and I didn't anticipate that coming from somebody who has such a strong technical background and discipline to be able to open his heart in that way, I thought, shifted the whole conversation. ... And in contrast to the Navy who has put up experts in front of the community who are just talking right past each other. And I thought Ernie made a very heartfelt connection on a topic that's very important and he did it in a way that that inspired people and continues to inspire people. ... I guess my point my point being that in this case I thought something deep, of depth was added, and not missing from it. And had that discussion only been done with the Navy, the missing element would have been the heart of Hawaii's people. And Ernie's kind of the space for the community to rally, whether you're Native Hawaiian or not. I mean it's our survival, and from an economic standpoint, I being in tourism, that aquifer and that system of water is critical to our economic engine here in Waikiki. So I thought that the real gift was Ernie, adding that early kind of depth to it that was not just culturally Hawaiian, it was that there's a certain humanity about it, and a certain universality about it, why we should be concerned about this and it immediately you know, created a force of community sentiment that now had shining a light on holding the Navy accountable. And so yeah, this, this will be the, this is a defining moment in Hawaii's history. So this is no ordinary situation.”

“I think what is missing at this point is a really detailed understanding of what that land was historically basically looking at the timeline from you know before contact through the kingdom and into the territory, and why it is ... what we have today. I think a study on that really conducted by people who can do more than simply plumb the English language resources. But to give us a really good understanding of what that aina was used for, and who it was sacred to, and who controlled it, how it was sort of seen right in that ahupua'a system really an understanding of it. I think that that has to happen so that we can see its value if it's left to heal and how it might be incorporated into a more sustainable usefulness right to the people here.”

“I think, in the broader context, and I don't mean to rehash, because I suppose that this study is looking forward. What I would say also that whatever decision is made with repurposing of the tanks needs to keep in mind that it's gonna have a significant impact on our brand as Hawaii and the Hawaiian Islands from a tourism perspective, because that's the profession that I'm in. ... A water scare is something that can completely derail our entire, not only just ability to function as an Island community on Oahu, but also the reputation that we have as a tourism-based economy. And so, when visitors perceive that the water that they're drinking could have been, you know, tainted whatever the words I don't want to get into that political stuff. But at the end of the day what is decided next is probably just as important as the actual incident itself. And so, when we think about the reputation that we have in Hawaii and on Oahu, our ability to maintain our economic engine is a really important part of this. And if you were to say that the next repurposing, and then this is completely hypothetical, that you would put liquid natural gas as another energy source and store it above 100 feet above the aquifer again, that the threat of our aquifer and our water that services the 10 million visitors, in addition to the 1.4 million, well, 1 million-ish on Oahu in particular residents, that's a really important part. So I'll actually take that visitor number down to just Oahu numbers, but that branding the strength of our brand, that we're an inviting place that is full of Aloha that has beautiful natural beauty and clean water to host, not only our residents and ourselves, but our visitors, is really important. So I urge whoever gets to make that decision about repurposing, but they also consider the impact to the overall brand of the Hawaiian Islands, and our ability to keep our economic engine running.”

“I think I’m coming at this, maybe a little bit cold, because I’m not aware of all of these conversations that are happening. And so I guess more input from the community. Like what everything that you’re doing right now, I think, is what’s missing. And I get it too, the more people ... you want to consult and get in as much opinions from people as possible, but at the end of the day you’re not going to make everybody happy, and everybody’s going to say you didn’t do enough, you didn’t do enough. So I would just keep consulting with the local populations, the local people and implementing what the people of Hawaii really want. If the people of Hawaii, if during the course of your fact finding if there are other people out there who disagree with me, and it’s the majority of the people, hey, have at it. But for me, it always goes back, I’m going to be a broken record, I think this because it’s always going back to the natural lands, natural lands, natural state. Removal of the tanks, filling in the area.”

“Aloha. I think Aloha. And the reason I say that is because, as I mentioned earlier, this became an issue because everybody was a participant in its origin, right. When they were first built, everyone was involved in it, everyone meaning federal government, local governments, people, all of that, residents, everybody. You had people who were civilians working on it. You had government, came from private industry, so it wasn’t just one entity. But then, now you come to today, and then the burden is on one entity. But what we should do is be getting to where we’re unified again. I guess, so that I would say that the Aloha is the ability to forgive, and then to try to work together to find a resolution that will make us good ancestors.”

“What is missing from the conversation? And what do I think that is? Well, you know my honest feeling about it, and I like to dwell in a place of being a little bit more constructive or positive or creative ... But my honest feeling about it is just frustration and kind of fear and an urgency around, shutting it down and defueling it. And so it’s quite frustrating, actually, that you know wonderful to seek public comment, but to be dwelling on the repurposing, and what are we gonna do with it? I think the immediate response needs to be to cease the harm. And to me that hasn’t happened until it’s defueled and closed so that would be what I feel like is missing is a sense of urgency around that, you know. As long as there’s still fuel in there, it can still leak. It could end up in my aquifer. It could end up in my child’s bathtub. So yeah, I have some. That’s why I figured I would do this interview. Because if there’s any way to go on the record saying that I would be happy to put my name next to that statement, my answer to this one. I think we need urgency to defuel it and shut it down, and we can talk about what we’re going to do with it afterward. This is my feeling.”

“Hmm anything missing from the conversation? Well, I don’t know if anything is missing. But I do want to see like what what’s going on here, but a lot more meaningful stakeholder engagement. It’s a complicated issue. There’s a lot of pain. There’s a lot of like anger, a lot of frustration, a lot of you know, I don’t know if it’s misinformation, but lack of transparency kind of sometimes feels like as the from the public perspective. So you know, ensuring that all of the voices are at the table being, you know, in conversation with each other like. If this is just a decision that is made in a box by the Department of Defense, it’s just gonna to further add to the trust issues, and the questioning around what they’re like. Obviously national security is their number one security. But at what cost? To citizens of the United States, especially citizens of Hawaii. So you know, to the extent that they can make these decisions, not in a bubble and really have true stakeholder engagement. I think it will go a long way to helping them improve their relationship with our community.”

“Well, one thing to be aware of anytime a federal agency is taking an action that has the potential to affect the historic property, that agency is subject to the National Historic Preservation Act. So for Red Hill, there has not been a lot of discussion about the National Historic Preservation Act. They’ve talked a lot about, you know, Clean Water Act, about National Environmental Policy Act, about different environmental and health regulations. I have not seen a lot of discussion around compliance around preservation of statutes and regulations, and we have a group of historic preservation consulting parties that meets with the Navy on a regular basis because it’s a national historic landmark, it’s Pearl Harbor. And basically on all of their

projects. And a few times we've brought up Red Hill and said, what is your plan? What's going on? When are you going to start consultation? When are we going to start? Be engaged in this? And the local Navy staff are not responsible for Red Hill. You know this is above their pay grade. It's outside of their area of command. And so everything they've said to us is when the time is right, the people in charge of this will initiate consultation, and we will start talking about it. ... But occasionally we'll (members of the preservation group) just say you know what's going on, and what are some of our ideas, and what do we want to say? And all of them, all of those parties have consistently said, what I said earlier, which is the documentation first, let's make sure we know what we have before it's gone and then look at ways for public interpretation and telling the historic story, even if the resources changed. And then, beyond that, there hasn't been a lot of discussion about what actually physically happens to the, to Red Hill or the resource itself."

"I'm trying to think. I mean lot of things have been brought up by complainers. Defense has apologized and attempted to express their sincerity. I think that the trust issue still needs building. You know they still need to restore their, the trust, the relationship with the community, because they own, they control so much of Hawaii's land. And so what's missing is the need to re-verify or reconfirm why they need as much land as they have, number one. And number two, they need to answer the other questions, the elephants in the room that are not about Red Hill, but are about the military's behavior on Hawaii land, such as when you use live-fire training. Once you use live-fire training, the community cannot use that land again because of the ordnance that gets buried in the soil. So that's a really sore point with many, many people in the community, the live-fire training. I would not allow live-fire training on any island where people live because that people might stumble into it. You know, digging a hole for a tree to plant a tree. You know things like that could happen. People are really resentful, and you know it's a hard issue for the Department of Defense to respond to when the question isn't even asked, although there's complaints in the community about it. They need a more holistic approach to restoring their healthy, a healthy relationship with the community. I mean the community's even mad about what they did during martial law in the 1940s. And you know, allowing a family that killed the Hawaiian man to go free after one hour. I mean things like that are still hurting even generations later. The people of that time are all passed away, but the story still lives, and the community is still hurting. You need to rebuild something or maybe we need to re-establish, we have to establish a healthy holistic positive relationship between the community and the military, and vice versa. Understanding why we need each other. We don't. If we removed every bit of military from the islands, what would happen to us? And if we allowed the military to have unrestrained control over whatever they wanted in the island, what would happen to us? So I mean, that's as a community person, that's what I think about."

"I don't see an effort being made to build a healthier, respectful relationship with the department of Board of Water Supply. That's missing. It actually more than irks me, it angers me that they're refusing to recognize that the Board of Water Supply is well respected and even more so because their manager, Mr. Lau, has come on so strongly as an advocate for protection of the aquifer. And why doesn't DOD understand this? Why, don't they recognize that? Why, don't they capitalize on his goodwill by showing them, by showing him more respect and showing him more goodwill? I don't. I think, that's missing. I know all the parties at the Board of Water Supply that are involved in this, and I have great respect for them. They are straight arrows, they don't have hidden agendas. They tell you straight, whatever they think. We don't have the same feeling about some DOD people. We feel like they're not always that honest."

"What's really missing is a, well, one is a community connection right to the process right there still a lot of mistrust so, and the Navy in particular has been very, you know, distant. They they've tried to create, you know they've created these different bodies. They created the one, they pulled a bunch of Native Hawaiian organizations together, right but to discuss like information. But one of the challenges with that is that by the time that group convenes and the information that they're giving, it's showing up on a 5 o'clock

news. So it's just like, okay? Well, it's already happening, and it's already being communicated, you know, like, what is this? A check off right? Are you just checking a box? So there's still that, there's still not a meaningful connection between the military right and in this case it's the Navy, but really all the military branches, because you know, one military person now looks just like the other one, you know, like and they each kind of overlap in having an impact on Hawaii that has accumulated over the years into the narrative that even our children understand today. Kahoolawe, Pohakuloa, Makua Valley and now you add on Red Hill to that. So there's one that's missing meaningful discussion and connection with the U.S. military right. They don't see community leaders being taken seriously, and having you know, kind of engagement. And the second is having a really kind of more robust, before decisions are made, a really robust discussion ... like really trying to think through how is it that Red Hill we can either lessen the impact or find out what's going on, so that we can make really meaningful action, you know, happen in those places. And what I mean by meaningful is something that is a lot of ideas that are being put out there for the long-term well-being of people who live here on Oahu right like people right now are like discussing in their own little ways. But there hasn't been a pulling together of you know, those people who are specific, not just the people who are living with the results of that, right? Like citizens, like I actually live in that area. You know I live in Aliamanu. So even outside of the people who are being directly impacted, that there's a you know, a network of people who are actively trying to discuss, to think about, you know all the different ramifications that are happening, and I don't think there's meaningful engagement with them in the DOD and the state and the federal government about how to actually handle all of this. ... It's not, you know, thought leaders, and also experts in the field to say, hey, these ideas that are being thrown out, these are the consequences of any of those right. This is what would happen, and you know these are the scenarios that could happen, and I know that has probably happened already in small you know, in in smaller, more hidden conversations. But and I don't necessarily, I'm not saying that it should just be a free-for-all town hall type of everybody gets to throw in their opinions about stuff, but some really intensive engagement where then that group becomes like kind of spearheads efforts to get community buy-in, but also community education right on what's happening out there.”

“I think, probably by design, the conversation, as I read it now is very divergent. So let's get all of the ideas and generate as much kind of community and expert input on possible options. But it's not clear to me which of these options are actually feasible? Just thinking about, oh, can it be used for storing safe drinking water? Is that possible with the level of contamination with the type of with these types of tanks I just don't, I don't have enough, I guess, scientific or engineering expertise to understand which of the possibilities are truly feasible.”

“Well, I don't know whether, in looking at repurposing, they, the military has gone out to the community, like you're doing right now. But you know, hold town hall meetings in in elementary school cafeterias and ask people, what do you, what do you think we should? What should our repurposing efforts focus on? You know, I think there is a sense that the military makes decisions in a vacuum, and to that the military was to include the larger community in making a decision about repurposing, I think that'll go a long way. Got it, and that's different, then that's different than identifying 50 community leaders. That's not what I'm talking about. I'm talking about going out and taking the risk of having 300 people in an auditorium that can only fit 200 people hanging from the rafters. The anger is palatable in the auditorium, but somebody from the military is there to take the arrows and to say, we want to know your ideas about repurposing. That's what I think is needed.”

“Maybe some humility that you know mistakes did happen, and you know it's, those are among many events throughout the history of human error. Yeah, there may have been significant impacts, but they are never intentional. So I can, I can think that's really the thing a lot of people may be thinking about, and then support for those who have been affected, and that may be coming to the I don't know, like the urgent needs of those who have more concerns especially if they've been affected. ... And maybe some display of more

urgent actions and responses to ensure that these substances aren't present elsewhere and various facilities. You know the immediate surroundings throughout the ecosystem of Hawaii, and then in the ocean nearby, just to make sure there is no other substance present, and if it was you know just the response to it, you know."

"I think so. I cannot put my finger on it, though I don't have anything specific. I will. I will say tied to this. I mean it's not, and I know it's gonna be outside of our conversation. But when I think about it right, it's just all the conversations around DOD having used lands right on that, because this is very unique, that it is underground, and doesn't have a whole lot of outside land, besides, whatever the buffer zone is. Wait, you know. I will take that back. Because going down, where the pipelines are all that landed area. I think that might be it right, is looking at both the underground and the on above ground capacity and potential, because when people are thinking about Red Hill facility, they always everybody I've talked to, I've always gone straight to the tanks and the you know the control. I forget what they call it, for all of like the tech and the computers are right. That that's the first thing that comes to mind. But there is land area in the land space. I forget what it's zoned. So perhaps what's missing from the conversation is a dual use of the property."

"I can't think of anything off hand. I think if anything, the conversation has to continue and continue fast, but more importantly, restore the trust between the military and the community. If the military is gonna be part of its repurposing, then that's where we need to rebuild the trust, and I don't know if it's quite there yet."

"I would like to see the public in general, probably voice more of their concerns. It seems like they voice ideas or voice support for certain aspects of things, because it seems like you get these pockets right, and it might not necessarily represent the general view of everybody. Right? Sometimes the squeak is squeaky as well gets to grease right, and so sometimes you, you're the loudest people, and that might not necessarily be what everybody else is thinking, right? So I think if there's a way we could get more participation from the public, that would be a good thing."

"Oh, my gosh, no! I think every person has thrown out ideas and thinks they know the answers to this. I think you know, to the military's credit, I think they're doing the best they know how to do in terms of gathering opinion and listening. You know they're not great at their PR. And they're not always great at community relations, and I think they are trying really, really hard to be good at that. With that said, you know, just because you're asking for opinions, and just because you're asking, hey, what do you think should be done with these fuel tanks? My concern is that this could resonate in a way that's very hollow to other groups, and you know, I mean in my business I do a lot of survey taking. We do a lot of data collection, and that's always taken into consideration. But there are times that it comes down to, you have to do what you know has to be done, if that makes sense. And while all these other people may have provided input, and that's great, you also have the 360, the high-level view that, hey that's not going to work, that's not going to work, and this is what we gotta do. And so I wonder, by asking for opinions and asking for input if the military is not, quite frankly, just kind of setting themselves up for a whole nother issue. Right? Hey, I said it should have been this, and this group said it should have been this, and you guys chose to do this. So I think, I recognize they're in a kind of between a rock and a hard place, though if they hadn't asked the question, hey, you never asked us what we wanted to do. So I don't envy them in this particular case at all. But yes, that's my thoughts on that."

"I wish I knew a little bit more detail of elevations, and access points, and that all kind of matters, at least for me, like I for me to have a visual, so I don't have a really good visual, but that would play into some of the options, kind of how it is in relation to other, anyway. Anything else missing? Hmm. I guess you know, maybe around, this is kind of way more out of the box from a food and a native, both native and non-native food perspective. There are certain native species like Opai (red Hawaiian shrimp) and others that you know

more underground, I mean, I mean, I don't know if there's anything related to more ecosystem than food, production, or even kind of crops, like certain kinds of, I don't know if anything can really be grown underground like that in tanks. But there. I haven't thought about that much at all of what food aside from maybe mushrooms can be grown on the ground."

**12. Do you have any other comments you would like to add or issues regarding the repurposing of Red Hill you would like to address?**

"Where do we go now? I guess that all that being said, I do want to highlight the importance of this process in the sense of like having the opportunity to share. And also though to say that I'm very still distrustful of the process given what happened to date and for juggling that kuleana. To voice what I'm hearing from our communities, the communities we work with, we support again, defueling, closing, and then the DOD not involved in the repurposing. And actually there'd be no repurposing because the facility should be fully shut down. And then, if any communities in the area have a say for what happens. I just want to say I almost didn't participate in this because of that, that deep distrust of what's happened to date and the skepticism I have of what's going to come out of this. And though I chose to participate ... if we don't speak up, unclear, what will happen. But there's such distrust for me that the Navy will cherry pick what they want out of this and then use the report and the themes that come out and say all these orgs all support. So, major distrust I have of the current process that almost look to non-participation. So I just want to say that that others may not participate who felt that strongly as I did given that they have not felt heard or have been impacted negatively by the Navy's actions or non-action."

"I know I talked previously about the community, I'd like to extend the invitation to Nakupuna to report to the board. Get the board's opinion as well, and I know your office has been involved at the neighborhood board every single meeting the last, I think the last two or three meetings you've been, you've had a representative at my meeting, and I think that's important to continue. So I'm hoping that you know we can continue that, and you know at the right time you provide, I would say you provide, I know you provided your organization provided the kind of an overview of what you're going to be doing. But it was just an overview, you know it didn't take in like today, and I think this would be a great opportunity to discuss with the neighborhood board and the board itself. You know the board is made up of elected officials, or like elected board members, who are elected by their constituencies or our neighborhood to represent the neighborhood, and I think it would be a good idea to potentially have this conversation of these questions. Maybe not all of these questions. But I mean a generalized question of hey, what do you want? What do you want there, or what are your thoughts on that? And we can provide a discussion of the board because not everybody has the time to fill out a questionnaire or a survey, and you know, and I think that's where I would leave it there and just say, you know. involve the community during this process before you close, and report about the process."

"Nothing, nothing that I can think of specifically, I mean, I think it's just a matter of having a more robust conversation getting deeper into the community, I mean, when it comes time to make those decisions, and I think that would, that's gonna take a little more of an effort to show up at community events and fairs and other things, and get that kind of deep penetration into the community. I think that would be good knowledge for the military to know, and also just a sense, give people a sense that they're trying to be responsive. And you know, really take community input seriously. So, if anyone in the U.S. Navy sees this interview, that's my best advice."

"I think we're clear on where we stand, that we cannot risk this facility being able to operate ever again. Complete removal and disabling of the facility permanently so it can never be used again. I think this

(repurposing) is just ... a way for it to keep it intact so they can repurpose it in the event of an emergency for using it for fuel – and as long as it is there, our aquifer is in dire straits, it has to be shut down.”

“I appreciate your efforts and Nakupuna's efforts to work and try to find solutions. These are not easy things, and I think, as we try to find alternative uses for the place, I think the process of gathering input as you guys are doing is really, really critical. So I appreciate the opportunity to speak and I'm hoping that you can give many people the same opportunity.”

“I think the only thing I would say is you know to, I guess, emphasize, you know the importance I think of trying to find something right that would benefit the people of Hawaii and kind of address, you know the emotion that this, that the Red Hill has kind of stirred, regardless of who ultimately is the primary agency that makes that decision. Hopefully it is one that is in conjunction with multiple stakeholders. So it's kind of viewed as this is how we are moving forward with the Red Hill issue and that a much more strategic, long-term view is looked at this so that it can start to do a number of things right, not only start to be more, have a positive connotation when people think about Red Hill in terms of what it is doing now, since it has been defueled and shut down in terms of the holding fuel and hopefully allow, you know, the Department of Defense to try to start to regain some of their connection back to the community, and some of the trust.”

“I really don't think so. I think that there, I mean it's had a great purpose for a lot of years. Unfortunately, some of the tanks got old. Unfortunately, we had some leaks, or we had some type of integrity problems and living on an island we can't afford to have those kind of leaks. It just destroys the ecosystem.”

“Yeah, I would say that the very fact that we are having this interview means that there are, that your client (Navy) is committed, and it takes that level of civic responsibility and cultural integrity and civility to be able to cause the change that needs to be done at Red Hill. So if I have anything to say is, you know, mahalo to the leaders at Nakupuna and I wish them well moving forward.”

“No, I. What I'll say is that I want to congratulate organizations like Aina Aloha and Sierra Club, Ernie Lau, not as an organization, but as an individual. Kahea, all of those people who have actually been calling attention to this for a very, very long time. Kahea goes back to 2011. This is an old issue for some of our organizations. Sierra Club is really really a stalwart warrior on this. And you know, I want to make sure that people understand that these kinds of organizations, they can seem like a pain in the neck, you know, if you are a developer or a business person, and you think that they're simply interfering. But honestly, I think the fact that there was some attention and some focus on the Navy's use of Red Hill all of these years was maybe one of the reasons why action happens so quickly, and I know that it took some military families getting very, very ill for it really to spur military action, but I also think that they have been looking at this for a while, and that they have anticipated that this was an issue that we're going to have to deal with. So again to all those organizations, to Ernie, to everybody who followed this, I just, I feel we all owe these organizations and these individuals a debt.”

“I guess probably more questions than advice, and I think it really goes back to another response that I gave that there's a gap in trust, and so, whether it's DOD use or non-DOD use, it's a really big thing for me personally that whatever repurposing looks like, trust has to be repaired with DOD, no matter what right. I think, at the end of the day we all have to live here, and if DOD and the military are going to be here in these islands they have a responsibility to the communities that they serve and protect. And so for me, at the end of the day that that's a really important part of whatever happens next. That trust is the only thing that's gonna allow them to be successful, and whatever repurposing looks like. I'm curious about what the broader community outreach is for this project, and I'm sure there is some. But I would encourage DOD to make sure that they're taking a broader community input for this. I have one last thought. The other thing, too, is anything that can help us be more resilient to natural disasters, right, hurricanes, climate change is

anticipating that the strength of hurricanes may increase. And so, if these tanks can be repurposed as a means by which to store food, water, and things that can help us be resilient to adverse weather, that may be another use, too.”

“Well, I think the concerns that we have is not so much the repurposing after, it’s the current state. I think that’s where everybody’s mind is wrapped around, its current state because what in fact, they had told us, which like when I first heard of Red Hill, I really didn’t quite grasp the seriousness of it. And then, when it was described to me, where it’s almost like, there’s an underground lake under Oahu, and there’s the aquifer and the jet fuel went into the aquifer, and then it and then it went into the underground lake, and it’s just tracking to see it’s moving more towards Kaneohe, towards Waianae towards Hawaii Kai. Yeah, when that came out it was, it was really, really shocking. The fact that it was not just over Red Hill, that it polluted the whole water system. I think part of it is as a citizen of Hawaii is just having some reassurance that our entire water system isn’t polluted. Is there any way to filter out the jet fuel? How do we clean up what’s there? So that’s where I’m all wrapped around. When we get to that level of what to do, how we repurpose it. Afterwards I think we’ll be in good, I think everybody will be just in like a sigh of relief at that point, but it’s getting there, and I think is what the majority of people’s concerns. And yeah, I think that’s what my concern is. It is basically the current state. And how do we get the fuel out? Where can we put the fuel? How can we minimize the damage to our water table our water drinking water? Where is this jet fuel going towards? Is it going more towards Hawaii Kai, towards Waianae and what kind of dangers are we looking at? So yeah, that’s where my focus is.”

“I would just like to see it shut down as soon as possible, and defueled as soon as possible, and I feel like after that, then we can have a sane discussion around what if any value the facility might have going forward to Hawaii. Right now you know it’s negative value. So I would, I would prefer to deal with that first.”

“I’ve been following this issue for a long time. You know we actually covered some of the community meetings, starting like 2014 when their first leak happened. And so you know, it’s unfortunate where we are today. It’s unfortunate that additional spills have happened, and we really have to like hold ourselves accountable to you know, making better decisions, so I’m glad they’re going through this process. And again, just make sure that all the stakeholders are at the table, not just the ones that you need to check off the box, that get the community really at the table and helping to figure out the decisions. And you know if they’re angry, let them be angry, and you gotta take it, and you know, let that, think about healing. Think about healing with our community. So that’s all. I mean, there’s been a lot of trauma. There’s a lot of history so let people heal. And it’s a process. And then co-existing will be a lot better in the future. Hopefully.”

“I think it’s good that you guys are trying to get some individual input. Well, I would hope that just as the hearings they have had over the past year about the defueling that there will be a greater input beyond just these kind of calls eventually.”

“Well, I think just to repeat one idea from earlier, which is to look at it as an entire system, and not just a kind of tight footprint of the tanks themselves. I really think we need to look at the entire distribution system as part of the overall decision that needs to be made. .... Everyone just kind of talks about it in a shorthand is the tanks, and I think it really needs to be the system of the fuel, distribution and storage system as a whole. So that’s really the only other thing that I wanted to hit.”

“I brought this up in other public spaces. You know, repurposing is being handled as its own question, you know, as its own thing. The challenge there is that there’s this whole other process that’s happening before that right, and it’s like each of the bodies that are handling those, I don’t know if they’re all talking to each other, right? I don’t know how each of the other steps to the end result is a water supply that’s clean and drinkable for the population that’s here in Hawaii, right? And no further damage to the environment or to

the well-being of the of the citizens living here in Hawaii, right? I think that's a long, that's the goal that we're all shooting for. The repurposing of Red Hill is one step in that right? The other step is the defueling part right? That and I think the conversations about the safety and the welfare of the drinking supply is a common goal. But those conversations are all happening separately. They're not, we don't have a holistic discussion about that. Now I can understand. I'm a process person too, so I can see that you know, to have all of that in one discussion can get very convoluted. It deals with multiple layers of complexities that it's just easier to chunk them out this way, right, to compartmentalize them and then have them kind of start on their own paths. But I think that's one thing that's kind of out of the out of the mix, even if there were some effort to explain the chunking out of the pieces that all get us to safe drinking water, you know, and an environment like, even if there was some vision. ... Because right now, chunking it out does feel like checking off boxes, right, that the actual decisions, the actual work will happen in the silo, no pun intended, by happening in a silo somewhere else. And all of this would have been just to, you know get people's thoughts and ideas, so that we can say that we asked people right? Okay. But yeah, that's about it. I hope and desire for this process all the processes that lead us to healthy and safe drinking water, you know, drinking water works all out for the best, you know. I have the best hope for that, you know, and we, you know, at our organization we do. You know we have the best hopes for it. ... We hope for the best, and we're ready to contribute to that movement in any way that we can."

"I work in a world of kind of environmental advocacy. And so I hear and I appreciate those concerns. I'm also married to a man who served 21 years in the military and experience directly through my connection with him just how the role that the military, it's the Army not Navy, and the role that that played in his life. And I think that the conversations that I hear in the environmental advocacy space don't, aren't necessarily reflective of how everyone feels and interacts with the military. So the issue feels very complex to me, which is probably why I don't have a lot of clarity on this is absolutely what we should do, here's the project, you know, here's my recommendation, because it feels very like tangled. I think too, because my interaction with the military is through my husband, who was in the reserves, so he was kind of like part-time military. That's not his kind of sole identity, you know. But I think, too, about when you hear nationally about tensions with China, and so I know kind of foreign, there's like this layer that I don't really understand, of like foreign relations that influences the decisions that the military makes here. So it's also like we're part of this national conversation, and as the federal government sees Hawaii as a strategic location for these other kind of larger global concerns. It feels tangled for that reason, too. And we don't, at least from a public standpoint, we don't always, probably intentionally, know how all that looks, or what that means kind of high-up military decision-making."

"When you set up a mechanism (the online survey and interviews), the worst thing you can do is to completely ignore the inputs you get. It would have been better not to even set up the mechanism and to set it up and then ignore the input. So now that the military has established this way for people to communicate, I think it's really imperative that they seriously consider the input they receive. I just think that the level of distrust now towards the military in general is the highest it's been in the 37 years I've lived here, and I think that it, there will always be a segment of our community that will support the military. But I think that segment is getting less and less and less in a large part driven by what's happened at Red Hill and the lack of trust that it's generated."

"It'd be interesting just to put it out there like a engineering challenge, like what any technology, what can you dream up to use this very unusual configuration of structures for? And I bet there'd be some really cool ideas, you know. Who's gonna develop it? Who's going to pay for it? Is there anyone at the table that's serious? You know? Those are the questions that we all have, I guess."

"It's very apparent that the Native Hawaiian community are upset based on just like the memories that they have of the past, and how they see things repeated. And for them, they want to see some breakthrough

happen in terms of their status. And that they often are seeing that things intervene in that status for them to be in better status. So I think that's definitely a large public outrage that's out there is just the perception of the events that have happened and how that's then internalized in the community.”

“I know a lot of times you folks have targeted interviews, and I think there are still ongoing opportunity for general community input on this. I hope they continue to do those, and that you can go out to like, you know, general communities, especially if you come up to 96792, 96707. Well, I will say 96792, that's my area. If you folks are open and willing to facilitate out here. I know at times you folks can work with our elected officials. But I would love to help get the word out, share that, create that, make that happen. And in in other communities, too, you know, I can help support some of those as well. ... But yeah, as much opportunity as my community can participate in these I try to encourage. I want to help make it happen. That reminded me. One of the things that we had talked about before is that online is great. I know it makes things convenient, and most people can access. But even in our communities and others, not everybody has that capacity or capability. ... So I think it's our job, this community and those advocate for our communities, to not forget about certain segments, right? And sometimes our inability to access online like our kupuna, and not just our homeless, or even some that live in homes but are struggling right. They don't have Internet. ... But I think that's another thing to think about and consider.”

“I don't have much to provide. I haven't really been following intently on this issue. ... I just see that the most important thing is just rebuild that trust between the DOD and the community and see what's best to use that space.”

“I think that we shouldn't fill it in, that we should repurpose it, and use it for some other, either educational or some other, you know, like I said, an energy source, or even a shelter for our emergency actions. I think that any of those would be a viable way of not only, you know, honoring the men, it wasn't women, I don't think, the men that built that thing and died building it, but I just hate seeing things get wasted, you know. So, especially when we have the option of repurposing it.”

“The Navy's own investigation report after the incident in November identified some cultural issues in terms of lack of communication and lack of people taking responsibility in charge. But one thing that really stuck out was a tendency, and I don't remember the exact words, but it was basically a tendency among leadership to assume the best possible scenario, the best-case scenario, and really that's what contributed to so many people getting harmed. They assumed that there's no evidence that there's PFAS in the water, so we're not acting on that basis. And we can't continue to approach things from that, we can't continue to take that approach. We actually have to, I think, plan for the worst, and the worst-case scenario, the worst thing that can happen. We need to apply Murphy's Law, because we're still in a very precarious situation. And you know, if we have a spill or something happens, there's really no coming back from that. There's no way to remediate the fuel that's in the aquifer other than that natural attenuation, which is just letting like the decades and some stuff won't break down. And you know we don't have enough monitoring wells to get a good idea of contamination or a trans model to have a good idea of where any contamination plume may go, which is what's keeping us kind of in limbo. The Halawa shaft shut down, and with the Navy's well shut down as well. If the worst happens, we gotta start planning. I mean the nightmare for me is that it gets in the system in the municipal system, right? And there's not enough, this isn't on enough people's radar so, and I don't know if there's any plan about outreach or precautionary actions that prevents a potential mass casualty event where we're gonna have people who don't speak English, who aren't paying attention, who don't know, have social media or watch the news, or working multiple jobs, if our health infrastructure gets slammed with acute cases, assuming it's still, you know, operational, then then that has ramifications. That in itself will have ramifications, immediate impacts to everyone here and across the Islands. And so, you know, things like that. We just have to start thinking about how we're gonna warn people. How are we gonna provide for you know, emergency relief. You know there's lots of vague plans that have come up in

terms of installing filters at the pumping stations, but how long is that going to take, how much is it going to cost, is the technology even there to do that that would meet drinking water standards? There's just so much unknowns that we're still ... But, to the point that if you do want to focus on repurposing, yeah, you should absolutely account for the worst-case scenario that may occur in over the next 100 years, right? And then how can you actually mitigate for, or can you actually, you know, quell those concerns? And if you can, then maybe that whatever course would be, you know, people get comfortable with. Well, and then, aside from that, though, is a potential, for you know, people 2,000 miles away who don't drink water to decide that we need to mobilize against China.”

“Again, this is not my area of expertise, and not an area that I'm super comfortable in even offering my opinion because I don't feel that I, ... I don't know what I don't know, and I certainly don't know enough in this area, and so very, I think layman's terms in terms of what I can share with you and ideas. It's a very tricky situation.”

“I think for a space like this, it's a challenge, but an opportunity, I think. Having non-DOD players and looking globally for other examples to at least think about, I think is a healthy exercise to do, to globally look at how people have repurposed underground bunkers and other things that I know has been done in other places.”

## Figures

**Figure 1: Interview Summary**

