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INTRODUCTION

The Hanalei Excursion Boat Staging Operations Draft Environmental Impact Statement was filed on October 1990 with the County of Kauai Planning Department in conjunction with a Special Management Area Permit application.

This Addendum to the October 1990 Draft EIS contains a corrected table and comments received after the EIS Preparation Notice for the proposed action was published in the April 23, 1991 issue of the OEQC Bulletin. Responses to these comments are also reproduced herein along with a revised consultation list for the Draft EIS including names of parties responding to the EIS Preparation Notice.
REVISED TABLE

Table 1 of the Draft EIS was revised to correct minor errors in boat counts. The following is a copy of a letter to Mr. Peter Nakamura, Director of the Planning Department for the County of Kauai dated January 30, 1991, transmitting the revised table. The revised table also identifies the companies which hold DOT permits. The revisions do not significantly affect the findings of the Draft EIS.
2844-02
January 30, 1991

Mr. Peter Nakamura, Director
Planning Department
County of Kauai
4280 Rice Street
Lihue, Kauai, Hawaii 96766

Subject: Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Hanalei Excursion Boat Staging Operations

Dear Mr. Nakamura:

Based on discussions with Mr. Martin Wolff, esq. representing the North Shore Charter Boat Association, it has been determined that Table 1 of the subject Draft EIS contains some errors. The attached table contains the corrected information and should replace Table 1. The revised table also identifies companies holding DOT permits.

The corrections do not significantly affect the findings of impacts related to the boating operations.

If you have any questions, please call me.

Sincerely,

Earl K. Matsukawa, Project Manager
cc: North Shore Charter Boat Association
    Mr. Martin Wolff, esq.

Attachment
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERMITTEE</th>
<th>PERMIT</th>
<th>NO. OF BOATS</th>
<th>LENGTH IN FEET</th>
<th>BOAT TYPE</th>
<th>LAND./DAY</th>
<th>PASS./DAY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rat Inc.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Zodiac</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rambling Rose Charters</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Zodiac</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Powercat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancient Mariner</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Monohull</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Na Pali Ocean Ventures</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Zodiac</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Hagerty</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Powercat</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Zodiac</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Na Pali Coast Tours</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Zodiac</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Zodiac</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Na Pali Adventures</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Mantacat</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalani Inc.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Mantacat</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Cole</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Mantacat</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paradise Adventures</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Monohull</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paradise Ocean Tours</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Monohull</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fantasy Island</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Inflatable</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Odyssey</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Inflatable</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seascape</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Monohull</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Zodiac</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keel Haul Tours</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Zodiac</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capt. Na Pali Cruises</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Zodiac</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Zodiac</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaiian Z-Boat</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Mantacat</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bubbles Below</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Monohull</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Captain Zodiac</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Zodiac</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zodiac Adventures</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Zodiac</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>104</td>
<td>1225</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONSULTATION

Comments and Responses to the EIS Preparation Notice

Comments were received from the following parties following publication of the EIS Preparation Notice for the Hanalei Excursion Boat Staging Operations Draft Environmental Impact Statement in the OEQC Bulletin on April 23, 1991. The comments and responses to those comments are reproduced in this section.

1000 Friends of Kauai
Sierra Club, Kaua'i Group
Ms. Carol Wilcox
Jungle Bob's, Inc.
Mr. Kimo Paul Evans
Mr. Arnold T. Phillips II
May 23, 1991

Mr. Peter Nakamura, Director
Planning Department
County of Kauai
4280 Rice Street
Lihue, HI 96766

RE: Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Hanalei Excursion Boat Staging Operations, Hanalei, Kauai at TMK 5-5-01:33, 5-5-01:2 (por.)

Dear Mr. Nakamura:

We appreciate the opportunity to comment on the above-mentioned draft EIS. Our comments are as follows:

On page 41, the applicant refers to the conclusions reached in other studies without naming those studies. We found this to be most annoying and unprofessional. The applicant should either cite studies along with their conclusions, or don't even mention the studies in the first place!

Regarding the AECOS study in Appendix A, we had several concerns:

1) The samples deliberately excluded surface film petrochemicals, and no explanation was given for this exclusion. We feel that there must be some impact caused by surface film petrochemicals on the aquatic fauna of the Hanalei River estuary. Whether or not this is so, it should be addressed in the EIS.

2) The sampling should have been performed during the dry season when the commercial boating operations are normally at their peak. Greater residence times of the water in the rivermouth could also be expected to occur then, which would probably alter the results of the study.
3) Commercial operations had not occurred for several days prior to the sampling. If #2 above had resulted in significantly greater residence times, the sampling should have been performed after at least one or two days of commercial operations.

Regarding the comments by Kelly Archer in Appendix B, we also had some concerns:

1) Archer merely refers to the Kahana Estuary on Oahu and general estimates of "native fish which inhabit or visit estuarine environments in the State." No study was made of aquatic fauna in the Hanalei River estuary.

2) Archer states that "currently, no information is available on the sensitivity to petrochemicals of Hawaii's native stream and estuarine species." It is our opinion that the purpose of an EIS is to **obtain** such information!

3) The EIS also contains an admission that "the potential for impacts of gasoline spillage during in-water fueling has not been assessed." Again, the purpose of an EIS is to **provide** just such assessments.

4) The EIS states that "there conceivably could be unique situations or conditions when impacts on specific species could result, but such conditions and studies on individual species are more difficult to assess." This is the justification given for not performing studies of aquatic fauna in the Hanalei River estuarine environment, which we find to be totally unacceptable.

5) One conclusion reached is that the "chronic effects of the soluble petrochemicals are probably not a major concern since long term repeated exposure of native aquatic fauna is doubtful because the native species tend to avoid areas of stream disturbance such as boating activities." In other words, since commercial boating scares off the native species, there is no reason to worry about the effects of petrochemicals on those species. Of course, there is **no** mention of any possible long-term effects such disturbance would have on these species, such as preventing their "passage to the ocean and back to insure reproductive success."
6) The possible effects on marine species using the estuary as a nursery are not addressed.

Regarding alternative sites, we have the following comments:

1) All other sites are dismissed as "long-term" only, since the Hanalei Excursion Boat Baseyard is "the most readily available site." We find this rationale of dismissing all alternative sites just because they are "long-term" solutions to be quite puzzling.

2) Port Allen is described as "unfeasible" in the EIS, yet other commercial boating ventures find it feasible and are using the harbor successfully.

3) Barking Sands is mentioned as one of the possible "long-term" alternatives. This may become an even more viable option, since the Navy is planning to build a small boat harbor there in the near future.

Again, thank you for the opportunity to offer our comments on this draft EIS.

Sincerely,

James Mishida
President

cc: North Shore Charter Boat Association
June 19, 1991

Mr. James Nishida, President
1000 Friends of Kauai
P.O. Box 99
Hanalei, Hawaii 96714-0099

Subject: Hanalei Excursion Boat Staging Operations, Hanalei, Kauai
Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Dear Mr. Nishida:

Thank you for your comments of May 23, 1991 on the subject EIS. We are, however, puzzled regarding the means by which your organization was offered an opportunity to review and comment on the document. Our understanding was that it had not been distributed for public review by the County of Kauai. The April 23, 1991 OEQC Bulletin only announced that an EIS Preparation Notice had been filed by the County. Although the Draft EIS had previously been submitted to the County, it will not be distributed for public review until the County files it with the OEQC for formal processing. By law, the County may not file the Draft EIS with the OEQC until at least 30 days after the EIS Preparation Notice is published.

Notwithstanding the procedural discrepancy of your review, we offer the following responses to your comments in the respective order presented in your letter.

1. The discussion on page 41 continues a summary of two technical reports supporting the EIS. Both reports are cited on the preceding page and are appended to the EIS document. Full citations of all studies referenced in the technical reports are contained in those reports. In response to your criticism, however, we will revise the text of the Final EIS to provide a brief citation of all studies mentioned.

2. In response to a comment by Dr. John Harrison of the Environmental Center, University of Hawaii, which is contained in the Draft EIS, we provided the rationale for our deliberate omission of a water surface assessment. Basically, floating petrochemicals tend to clump together such that any random sampling may or may not capture them. If they were captured, the analysis would be skewed since the total value would be attributed to the soluble fraction. The surface component is accounted for in the sampling since a portion would dissolve and be
measured in the analysis of soluble petrochemicals. Most of the remainder will evaporate rapidly.

3. As a disclosure document, the Draft EIS acknowledged that petrochemical contamination may be of greater concern during low flow conditions. The water quality study conducted by AECOS demonstrated, however, that even after an exaggerated boating operation simulation, the level of petrochemical contamination is extremely low and highly transitory. Toward assuring that petrochemical contamination is minimized, it was suggested that periodic testing be conducted as a mitigation measure to determine if further modification of boating operations is needed. It should also be noted that, based on the findings of the study, extending the simulated operation over any period of time longer than a few hours prior to the test would not have altered the results.

4. Regarding your comments on the extent of studies required for an EIS, the accepting agency must consider what is reasonable for a proposed activity. The technical studies indicate that boating activities will not have a significant acute and irreversible impact on the aquatic environment, based on data collected and a general understanding of the environment in which it will occur. We feel it would be unreasonable to require a comprehensive study examining all conceivable circumstances under which an adverse impact may result. This limitation was disclosed in the section on "Unresolved Issues." A more reasonable alternative is to permit the boating operations to continue and to periodically monitor water quality.

5. Your comment that because boating activity "scares off native species, there is no reason to worry about the effects of petrochemicals on those species" is taken out of context. Significant boating activities only affect the estuary for a few hours each day; thus the "window" for potential conflict is relatively small. Moreover, the portion of the estuary used by the boaters is small in relation to the size of the estuary which extends beyond the Hanalei Bridge. Thus, avoidance of boats does not mean avoidance of the estuary.
6. The potential release of petrochemicals in the estuary and their impact on aquatic species that may be present was addressed in the Draft EIS. Although attention was focused on gobi species, the Draft EIS also acknowledged that the estuary serves as a nursery for a variety of marine species which may also be exposed to effects of the boating operations. The text of the Final EIS will be revised as necessary to better convey this.

7. Port Allen was considered an unfeasible alternative due to its distance from the Na Pali Coast where the applicants conduct their tours using mostly small craft. Barking Sands is considered a "long-term" alternative if appropriate facilities can be developed into which the boaters could relocate in the future. In the meantime, however, they will need a base to operate from and the Sheehan Boatyard is the most feasible facility approved for such use. It should be recognized that the proposed action assessed by the EIS is the staging of excursion boating operations and not the establishment of a boatyard.

We hope that we have satisfactorily responded to your comments. Your comments, along with our response, will be reproduced in an addendum to the Draft EIS as well as in the Final EIS.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Earl K. Matsukawa, Project Manager

cc: Mr. Peter Nakamura, Planning Director, County of Kauai
County of Kauai
Planning Dept.
4280 Rice St.
Lihue, HI. 96766

Subject: North Shore Excursion Tour Boat Operations

The Kauai Group of the Sierra Club has the following comments about the preparation of the Environmental Impact Statement for the above referenced project:

1. The possible effects of spillage or drainage of fuels into the Hanalei River estuary on freshwater and marine species of fish and crustaceans, and shoreline flora is inadequately addressed. O'au larvae, whose health is essential to the recreational fishery, may be very susceptible to petrochemical pollution in downstream migrations.

2. Baseline studies of marine and freshwater species in the Hanalei River system should be conducted. Only through comprehensive baseline studies will we be able to determine the subsequent environmental effects of boating operations on the river estuary.

3. The suitability of alternate sites on the east and west sides of the island as a base for boating operations is inadequately addressed. There is reason to believe that Port Allen, Kikiaola, and perhaps Darking Sands would provide adequate alternative bases of operations.

4. The social impact of extensive tour boat operations at the river mouth are inadequately addressed. The public "Black Pot" park area has a tendency to be overrun by these tourist operations, and local residents feel that they are squeezed out of the traditional quiet enjoyment of their recreational resources. Cultural conflict between kama'ainas and newcomers, who are sometimes viewed as short term economic exploiters, is a problem without proposed mitigation.

Thank you for considering our concerns.

Sincerely,

Jock Lundgren, Vice Conservation Chair,
Sierra Club, Kauai Group
June 19, 1991

Mr. Jack Lundgren, Vice Conservation Chair
Sierra Club, Kauai Group
P.O. Box 3412
Lihue, HI 96766

Dear Mr. Lundgren:

Subject: Hanalei Excursion Boat Staging Operations, Hanalei, Kauai
Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Thank you for your undated comments on the subject Draft EIS. Your comments were received by FAX on May 13, 1991. We are puzzled, however, regarding the means by which your organization was offered an opportunity to review and comment on the document. Our understanding was that the document had not been distributed for public review by the County of Kauai. The April 23, 1991 OEQC Bulletin only announced that an EIS Preparation Notice had been filed by the County. Although the Draft EIS had previously been submitted to the County, it will not be distributed for public review until the County files it with the OEQC for formal processing. By law, the County may not file the Draft EIS with the OEQC until at least 30 days after the EIS Preparation Notice is published.

Notwithstanding the procedural discrepancy of your review, we offer the following responses to your comments in the respective order presented in your letter.

1. We acknowledge that fuel spills were not addressed. Depending upon the amount spilled, stream conditions at the time of spillage, tide, wind, solar exposure, presence of fauna and their life stage and myriad other factors, there could conceivably be an acute but transitory adverse impact on the estuary. The potential for spills, however, will be fully mitigated by requiring that boats be fueled on land within the boatyard. Only one vessel will be fueled in the water due to its larger size which precludes daily haul-out. In-water fueling of the single boat involves several precautionary measures which will minimize the risk of spillage. If these procedures are deemed inadequate, however, alternative fueling procedures can be required as a condition of approving the Special Management Area permit.
2. Baseline studies sponsored by the State have recently been completed which provide much valuable information on Hanalei River. However, in spite of the high cost of the study and time consumed in research, it only begins to establish the type of information required to assess the various uses affecting the river, including the excursion boating operations.

3. Distance from the Na Pali Coast where the applicants conduct their tours in mostly small craft is the primary limitation to using Port Allen as a base. Your suggestion for considering Kikiaola as an alternative site will be investigated further for discussion in the Final EIS. Barking Sands is close enough to the Na Pali Coast to overcome the distance limitation if a suitable staging facility were available. Thus, it is considered a long-term alternative location where boating operations could be relocated if a facility could be established.

4. As discussed in the Draft EIS, the establishment of the Sheehan Boatyard addressed community concerns regarding use of Black Pot Park for the staging of boating operations. We will, however, provide additional discussion in the Final EIS that the community is divided on the issue of whether any form of commercial boating should be permitted in the Hanalei area.

We hope that we have satisfactorily responded to your comments. Your comments, along with our response, will be reproduced in the addendum to the Draft EIS as well as in the Final EIS.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Earl K. Matsukawa, Project Manager

cc: Mr. Peter Nakamura, Planning Director, County of Kauai
Carol Wilcox  
P.O.Box 869  
Hanaelei, HI 96714  

May 13, 1991  

Peter Nakamura, Director  
County of Kauai Planning Department  
4280 Rice Street  
Lihue, Kauai 96766  

Dear Mr. Nakamura,  


1. I would appreciate a copy of the EIS, which I haven't seen. I requested a copy of the EIS through your office when it first came out, and was informed that they would be distributed at the time it was announced in the OEQC bulletin. Is this the responsibility of the applicant? Will the applicant be able to make one available to me?  

2. There are specific requirement by law for an EIS. Is this technically an EIS? Does the consultant who prepared this document maintain that it is an EIS under HRS Chapter 343? Are all the requisite issues covered (most specifically, environmental, community and cumulative issues) and is the document objective and not self-serving, as required by law? Is the issue of infrastructure support for the level of activity proposed discussed in full? The EIS should be carefully scrutinized for these things by reviewing agencies. The applicant should be prepared for this from the public.  

3. In respect to the 30-day consultation period (deadline May 23, 1991), it is my understanding that the applicant has withdrawn the SMA application and review process has thus come to a halt. I will presume that this is the case, and that notification of a new application will be in the OEQC Bulletin at the appropriate time. (However I would still like to have an EIS.)  

Mahalo,  

[Signature]  

Carol Wilcox  

cc: North Shore Charter Boat Association  
OEQC
2844-02
June 19, 1991

Ms. Carol Wilcox
P.O. Box 869
Hanalei, HI 96714

Dear Ms. Wilcox:

Subject: Hanalei Excursion Boat Staging Operations, Hanalei, Kauai
Environmental Impact Statement Preparation Notice

Thank you for your comments of May 13, 1991 on the subject EIS Preparation Notice. We wish to clarify that although an environmental assessment was filed with the County of Kauai in April 1989, and a Draft EIS was subsequently filed in October 1990, neither document was filed by the County with State Office of Environmental Quality Control (OEQC) for processing, until recently. On April 23, 1991, the EIS Preparation Notice, based on the environmental assessment, was published in the OEQC Bulletin. This initiated the EIS review process. The Draft EIS has yet to be filed by the County and distributed for public review.

In response to your request to review the Draft EIS, you will be included on our distribution list of parties to be consulted.

With respect to your comments regarding the Draft EIS, please be assured that it must comply with the content requirements established by Chapter 343, Hawaii Revised Statutes. We wish to clarify, however, that the EIS addresses the staging of excursion boat operations at the existing Sheehan Boatyard and not the boatyard itself. A separate environmental assessment for the boatyard was previously accepted by the County as a basis for the issuance of an SMA permit for that facility.

Your understanding of the status of the SMA permit is not entirely correct. Because of complex legal circumstances surrounding the permit, we suggest that you contact Mr. Martin Wolff at 245-8938 (Kauai) for a detailed explanation.
We hope that we have satisfactorily responded to your comments. Your comments, along with our response, will be reproduced in the addendum to the Draft EIS as well as in the Final EIS.

Sincerely,

Earl K. Matsukawa, Project Manager

cc: Mr. Peter Nakamura, Planning Director, County of Kauai
JUNGLE BOB'S
HAWAII'S HIKING HEADQUARTERS
MAIN OFFICE: P.O. BOX 1245, HANALEI, KAUAI, HAWAII 96714

May 11, 1991

TO: Mr. Brian Choy, Director Office of Environmental Quality Control
FROM: Robert R. Reed, Resident, Hanalei
RE: North Shore Boaters

Dear Mr. Choy:

In a recent front page article in the Garden Island newspaper I read that this would be a good time to write your office and give input regarding the North Shore boating industry's use of the Hanalei River mouth. I appreciate the opportunity to do so.

I am a retail store owner in Hanalei as you can tell by my letterhead. I have had this store for eight years, and have lived in Hanalei for eight years. We sell shoes, hats, clothing, camping equipment and other outdoor type products. I have also been president of the Ching-Young Village Shopping Center's Merchant's Association for six years.

I feel confident in saying that the vast majority of comments here want the boating industry to continue. The "boaters" bring many tourists into our Center and their passengers shop in our stores and eat in our restaurants. The boaters and the retailers are very interdependent.

My personal opinion is that the EIS is good, and hopefully would prove that the industry has an acceptable impact on the river. I believe no more permits should be issued, and a natural attrition should eventually reduce the number of boats. I agree the environment is fragile but so is our Hanalei economy. We have all built up our businesses over the years and invested a lot of money, blood, sweat, and tears. It has been a struggle for all of us to make ends meet and put food on the table when we are so isolated out here on the North Shore of Kauai. It is not easy to get our share of the tourist market. I think it would be a crime to put these people out of business. I know I would hate it to happen to me. I know that without the boating passengers it would have a very negative impact on my business, much the same as when the Princeville Sheraton closed two years ago.

The boating industry also supplies needed services for the Na Pali Coast. I rent camping equipment to tourists who are dropped off at Kalalau Beach by Captain Zodiac.
Many times these tourists injure themselves hiking, or they simply don't have the strength to hike out once they have hiked in. The Zodiacs basically rescue them at this point. Consequently, there is a public access/safety issue involved here that can't be ignored. They also rescue people along the coast that have misjudged currents, and occasionally recover bodies of people who were less fortunate. We tell people to always pack out what they pack in, and so do the boaters, but people are often lazy. The boaters, as a result, carry out many many bags of garbage for the state each year at no charge.

Regulations are fine, but they should be fair enough as to not eliminate a reasonable profit for the industry. Also, there are other people who use the river with their boats who do not carry commercial passengers. There are other people up stream that might have an effect on the river. It seems that the boaters are the only ones I read about though. I think it is important to look at the "big picture" of all the businesses that the Boaters have an impact on. We need each other, and I hope you and Kauai County officials will take all of this into consideration when you make your decisions. Thank you for your attention in this matter.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Robert R. Reed
President, Jungle Bob's Inc.
2844-02
June 19, 1991

Mr. Robert R. Reed, President
Jungle Bob's Inc.
P.O. Box 1245
Hanalei, Hawaii 96714

Subject: Hanalei Excursion Boat Staging Operations, Hanalei, Kauai
Environmental Impact Statement Preparation Notice

Thank you for your comments of May 11, 1991 on the subject EIS
Preparation Notice. Your comments, along with this response, will be
reproduced in the addendum to the Draft EIS as well as in the Final EIS.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Earl K. Matsukawa, Project Manager

cc: Mr. Peter Nakamura, Planning Director, County of Kauai
Dear Director Brian Choy

This letter is totally in support of the North Shore Boaters who operate out of the Hanalei River.

I think this is clearly a vendetta and part of a conspiracy to put the boaters out of business. I hope the courts will see fit to vindicate them and order the county to issue the permits.

I am a disabled native Hawaiian and do vote. I make less than $100 a month and the law allows me to test my ability to return to the work force. So, seasonally I try to earn to more money operating a small coffee/activity/information booth at the launching site.

However dependent my job is on the outcome of issue, my reasons are:

1. It is a fact that tons of garbage is retired yearly from close offshore in Hanalei Bay.

2. Residents along the Hanalei River have ditches leading from their homes to the river suggest discharge of waste.
3. Why is this river being singled out and not any others - such as Wai'anae River, where boats don't even go out to sail on waters. The mayor has found success here.

4. Why aren't rental cars and helicopters not subject to such harassment by plucky environmental groups?

5. Where does the waste of the buffaloes we see in pastures along the river go to.

This is clearly more than skulking. Please regulate - not destroy.

Kimo Paul Evans
P.O. Box 696
Hawaii HI 96714

Tel 808/826-6815
2844-02
June 19, 1991

Mr. Kimo Paul Evans
P.O. Box 696
Hanalei, HI 96714

Subject: Hanalei Excursion Boat Staging Operations, Hanalei, Kauai Environmental Impact Statement Preparation Notice

Thank you for your comments of May 11, 1991 on the subject EIS Preparation Notice. Your comments, along with this response, will be reproduced in the addendum to the Draft EIS as well as in the Final EIS.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Earl K. Matsukawa, Project Manager

cc: Mr. Peter Nakamura, Planning Director, County of Kauai
Mr. Martin Wolff, Esq.
Post Office Box 751
Lihue, HI 96755

May 22, 1991

RE: EIS/consulted party

Dear Sir;

I am requesting that you list me as a consulted party on the environmental impact statement that is to be filed by the North Shore Charter Boat Association.

Thank you for your courtesy and attention to this matter.

Kind Regards,

Arnold T. Phillips II

ATP/tpg

cc: Environmental Council
   Office of Environmental Quality Control
June 19, 1991

Mr. Arnold Phillips II
P.O. Box 64
Hanalei, HI 96714

Dear Mr. Phillips II:

Subject: Hanalei Excursion Boat Staging Operations, Hanalei, Kauai
         Environmental Impact Statement Preparation Notice

Thank you for your letter of May 22, 1991 requesting to be a consulted
party on the Draft EIS. We shall include you on the distribution list for that
document.

Sincerely,

Earl K. Matsukawa, Project Manager

cc: Mr. Peter Nakamura, Planning Director, County of Kauai
Persons to be Consulted

The following is a revised list of parties to be consulted. This list incorporates names of those who commented following publication of the EIS Preparation Notice in the OEQC Bulletin on April 23, 1991.

Federal Agencies

Department of the Army

State Agencies

Department of Health
Department of Land and Natural Resources
Office of Environmental Quality Control
University of Hawaii, Environmental Center

General Public

Michael H. Kido
1000 Friends of Kauai
Sierra Club, Kaua'i Group
Ms. Carol Wilcox
Jungle Bob's, Inc.
Mr. Kimo Paul Evans
Mr. Arnold T. Phillips II