

MINUTES OF THE  
MEETING OF THE  
BOARD OF LAND AND NATURAL RESOURCES

DATE: April 13, 1984  
TIME: 9:00 A. M.  
PLACE: DLNR Board Room  
1151 Punchbowl Street  
Honolulu, Hawaii

Roll  
Call

The meeting of the Board of Land and Natural Resources was called to order by Chairperson Susumu Ono at 9:05 A.M. The following were in attendance:

Members

Mr. Roland Higashi  
Mr. J. Douglas Ing  
Mr. Thomas Yagi  
Mr. Takeo Yamamoto  
Mr. Moses Kealoha  
Mr. Susumu Ono

Staff

Mr. James Detor  
Mr. Roger Evans  
Mr. Libert Landgraf  
Mr. Henry Sakuda  
Mr. Ralston Nagata  
Mr. Robert Chuck  
Mr. Melvin Young  
Mrs. Anne Furuuchi  
Ms. Jane Yamamoto  
Ms. Ann Lo-Shimazu  
Ms. Pattie Edwards  
Mr. Ronald Kama  
Mrs. LaVerne Tirrell

Others

Deputy A. G. Edwin Watson  
Deputy A. G. Chelun Huang  
Mr. Adam Vincent, DOT  
Mr. Russel Saito (Item E-2)  
Dr. Roy Kuboyama (Item H-7)  
Ms. Sohbie Reynolds &  
Mr. Roy Uehara (Item H-4)  
Messrs. Joseph Vierra &  
Jim Funaki (Item H-2)  
Mr. Bartholomew Kane (Item F-42)

MINUTES

The minutes of March 9, 1984 were unanimously approved as circulated. (Ing/Yagi)

Added

Mr. Ing moved to add the following items to the agenda. Motion carried unanimously with a second by Mr. Higashi:

Division of Forestry and Wildlife

Item C-1 -- Duty and Per Diem Status to Attend the Council of Western State Foresters Annual Conference, Albuquerque, New Mexico.

Division of Water & Land Development

Item D-12 -- Authorization to Hold Public Hearings on the Administrative Rules and Designation and Regulation of Geothermal Resource Subzones.

In order to accommodate those applicants present at the meeting, items on the agenda were considered in the following order:

ITEM F-20

TRANQUILINO ALONZO REQUEST FOR CONTINUATION OF TENANCY, KAHANA VALLEY, OAHU.

Four items involving Kahana Valley -- Items F-20, F-21, F-22 and F-23, were deferred by the board at its February 10, 1984 meeting for various reasons.

The problem with this Revocable Permit No. S-3998 was that there was another couple occupying a dwelling on the premises covered by Mr. Alonzo's permit, said Mr. Detor.

Staff's investigation indicated that a Mr. and Mrs. Ruest were presently occupying the premises. Mr. Ruest is a carpenter instructor with the Habilitat and had reconstructed Mr. Alonzo's residence as well as other construction work necessary on the farm. He is also involved with the farm activities such as planting and harvesting. Staff is therefore recommending that the Ruest's be allowed to occupy the premises only so long as they continue to assist Mr. Alonzo with farm duties and/or until such time as the Kahana Valley State Park Advisory Board and staff recommendation are formulated.

In answer to Mr. Ing's question, Mr. Detor said that he did not know whether the Ruest's were paying any kind of compensation to the Alonzo's. He did, however, have a statement from Mr. Alonzo which basically gave the background of how this situation came about.

Mr. Ono said that it was his understanding that the Ruest family was not considered one of the original families that might fall into whatever plan might evolve from the recommendations of the Advisory Committee and the Land Board. He wanted this made clear to the Ruests so there would be no misunderstanding. His primary concern was that it be clearly understood that the permit is to be issued only to Mr. Alonzo.

ACTION

Mr. Ing moved that the Board approve the cancellation of Revocable Permit No. S-3998 and authorize the issuance of a new revocable permit to Mr. Alonzo under the terms and conditions set forth in the submittal which was deferred by the Board at its meeting of February 10, 1984 and also to those terms listed in this submittal. Mr. Yamamoto seconded and motion carried unanimously.

ITEM F-21

JOHN MAINAAUPO REQUEST FOR CONTINUATION OF TENANCY, KAHANA VALLEY, OAHU.

ITEM F-22

WALTER Y. K. KIM REQUEST FOR CONTINUATION OF TENANCY, KAHANA VALLEY, OAHU.

ITEM F-23

E. C. LAMBERT & L. D. LEARY REQUEST FOR CONTINUATION OF TENANCY, KAHANA VALLEY, OAHU.

ACTION

Mr. Ing moved for approval of Item Nos. F-21, F-22 and F-23 as submitted, subject to those conditions recommended by staff. Motion carried unanimously with a second by Mr. Yagi.

As a point of clarification, said Mr. Ing, it is the board's directive that these are temporary permits until such time as further recommendation is made by the Kahana Valley Board and, at that time, depending on what these conditions are, the permits may or may not be continued.

Mr. Ono added also that for those who are living there on behalf of someone else's permit, the permittee does not have the authority to transfer any "right to the parties residing on that particular piece of property." The permit goes to the applicant and to the applicant only.

ITEM E-2

REQUEST TO ESTABLISH A SHORT-TERM LEASE FOR THE OPERATION OF PUBLIC CAMPING AND CABIN RENTALS, MALAEKAHANA STATE PARK, KAHUKU, OAHU.

Mr. Ing asked what our authority was for entering into a lease.

Mr. Nagata said that he believed that this was listed under Chapter 171, which has to do with our ability to negotiate with a youth, non-profit eleemosynary type organization.

Mr. Detor explained that DLNR plans to let it out under Chapter 143, which would be for campsite purposes, to an eleemosynary or non-profit organization for operation. The statute covers campsites for youth, athletic and/or educational activities and enables the board to directly award a lease to these types of groups under these circumstances.

Mr. Ing asked whether in the long-range plans for the park we eventually will go out to bid or would we continue this type of arrangement.

Mr. Nagata explained that in staff's discussion with the group they did come to the conclusion that if, in our efforts to take some other avenue such as going to a commercial concessionaire, or if the State is able to provide its own funding to develop the park, that they would like to at least have two years in which both sides will have no reservations, and could go their separate ways.

Mr. Ing had one concern. If the area was to be made available to the public, then he wanted to know the specific basis that it would be made available to the public. He did not want to see the organization have their own selection as to who they would allow and not allow to use the cabins and also did not want them to establish their own priorities as to who gets the cabins.

Mr. Nagata said that staff will put something together regarding Mr. Ing's concern. However, he stated that in staff's discussions with the group, they also were concerned and did not want them to only let groups that were affiliated with their organization have first choice.

Mr. Ono asked who would provide security for the renters in the area.

Mr. Nagata said that they had not gotten into that kind of detail yet. However, he understood that the organization would try to maintain sufficient controls in the area so that the public's welfare and safety would be taken care of. He explained also that a DOCARE officer is in residence in the Phase II area and something may have to be worked out as to the overlapping responsibilities.

Mr. Ono asked whether the Hawaii Christian Camps and Conference Association had an IRA tax exemption.

Mr. Russel Saito, representing the Association, stated that they are in the process of receiving the IRS tax exemption.

Mr. Ono said that he would have some problems entering into this arrangement without a final decision from the Federal government. Especially since this group is an Association.

Mr. Nagata suggested that, should the board consider this request favorably, there be a condition whereby DLNR would not enter into any lease until such a tax exemption is received from this group.

Mr. Nagata asked if it would be premature, should the board act favorably on this request, for him to go to the Land Management Division at the next meeting to request a right of entry to do some interim work.

Deputy A.G. Watson said that he would have some reservations. He said that he was aware of the dwellings being a part of the management, but he was not aware that the grounds would be a part of the management area -- where fees would also be charged for camping. He suggested that the board go ahead and act on this request and, later, they can go ahead and check on the management of the grounds.

Mr. Ing felt that certain things would need to be ironed out prior to a right of entry being granted.

ACTION

Mr. Ing moved for approval with the following conditions:

1. Prior to finalizing any documents, that formal notice be received from IRS as to this organization's non-profit status; and,
2. No right of entry be granted until staff has had a chance to look into the management aspects of the proposed contract, in consultation with the Attorney General's Office.

Mr. Yagi seconded and motion carried unanimously

ITEM E-3

MAKIKI ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION CENTER (MEEC): FEES AND STATE GRANT REQUEST

Under the existing "Agreement for Management of an Environmental Education Program in Makiki-Tantalus State Recreation and Special Use Permit", there is no authorization to charge fees. However, MEEC is now requesting permission to charge fees for a Summer Nature and Fun Program after having been advised of concerns about a similar program conducted last summer.

One concern that the board may have, said Mr. Nagata, is that last year the Center did go to the Legislature and attempt to get a State Grant request. The board may want to address this issue at this time. Staff is recommending that the Center be allowed to charge fees, subject to certain conditions.

How were the rates arrived at, asked Mr. Ono?

Mr. Nagata said that from what he understood, the group had tried to review rates from other summer type activities of this nature and it was also his understanding that the rates being charged were slightly below the prevailing private sector rates. They are able to accomplish this because of the fact that they are operating from State-owned properties.

Mr. Ono asked whether the rate was set and then the program developed? In other words, how did they arrive at the fee schedule.

Mr. Nagata did not know.

Mr. Ono said that he did have some concerns. Even though programs such as this are good, it was represented earlier that contributions and grants would be solicited and now MEEC wants to charge fees and also go to the Legislature for State general funding. The original idea of keeping it voluntary, or primarily private, goes out the window. The board approved it on one basis but now it seems that the funding means are shifting.

As I understand it, said Mr. Ing, this approval is on a trial basis?

Mr. Nagata said yes -- for one summer.

While sharing the Chairman's concern, Mr. Ing stated that he did realize that funding on a continuous basis becomes extremely difficult.

Mr. Kealoha asked that Mr. Nagata find out how the fees were arrived at.

Mr. Nagata said that staff would prepare a memo to the board in this respect.

ACTION

Mr. Ing moved for approval as submitted, with the understanding that after the program has been in operation for six-months that a report be submitted to the board. Mr. Kealoha seconded and motion carried unanimously.

ITEM H-7

CDUA FOR AN AFTER-THE-FACT BOAT PIER AT KANOEHU BAY, OAHU, TMK 4-5-58:39 OFFSHORE (DR. ROY F. KUBOYAMA).

Mr. Ono asked that Mr. Evans recap for the board the categories which developed following the Kaneohe Bay Study.

The following was presented to the board by Mr. Evans:

1. Staff took a look at the pier and the pier was in compliance. It was built on a rafter in 1964, the date of our regulation and it did have an approved CDUA. It also had a revocable permit so staff's recommendation at that time was to notify the owner that they were in compliance.
2. Again people were found in compliance and staff did find that these piers were built before 1964 and no CDUA was needed. They had to have a revocable permit, which they did have.
3. Piers that were built after 1964 did go through the CDUA process but they were lacking a revocable permit so they came in and got the required permit.
4. Piers that were built before 1964 and they did possess a DOT or Army Corps permit but did not have a revocable permit. Staff asked these people to apply for a revocable permit and be charged back rental.
5. Piers that were built after 1964 and they did possess a DOT or Army Corps permit but they did not have a CDUA or a revocable permit. Staff recommended that these people be required to get a CDUA and, if the board approved it then they be required to get a revocable permit. Back rental would be charged and a fine levied. But the amount of that fine was to be determined by the board and the board left an opening where each individual could come in and discuss the circumstances of his particular case.

6. Piers in this category were not in compliance. No permits were found and there was no response to staff's letter of inquiry and the recommendation was that we had to basically determine a date and, based upon the date determination, treat them on one of the previous categories and here we would recommend a heavier fine.
7. Piers were not in compliance and no permits were found but these people did respond to staff's letter.
8. The piers in this category were removed from the study because they were built on land under questionable jurisdiction.
9. The piers in this category were again removed from the study because these were built adjacent to State lands and we wanted to hold this in abeyance until Land Management and the Attorney General's office were able to determine the disposition of these cases.

Mr. Evans explained that most of the piers coming in would fall under Categories 5, 6 or 7 at this stage.

Category 5, when you say owner, are you referring to the owner that built the pier or the person who bought the pier when he bought the house, asked Mr. Kealoha?

In that particular instance, said Mr. Evans, staff is referring to the present owner of the property. As a part of staff's recommendation they are recommending that the back rental be charged back to one of two possible categories: 1) back to the date the pier was built or the date the individual purchased the property, whichever was later.

How was that owner to know that the pier was illegal, asked Mr. Kealoha? If I bought the house from you, how do I know if you don't tell me it is illegal and thereafter why should I be assessed the fine?

The thinking at that time, said Mr. Evans, the guy may not have been aware but he did have as a landowner responsibilities to be aware that everything was legal.

What happens if the owner disclaims the pier, asked Mr. Kealoha?

This was one of the variables in our thinking when we came in with our recommendation, said Mr. Evans. Rather than saying to people you don't have a permit therefore knock the pier down, we had two concerns: 1) knocking it down might do more harm to the environment; and 2) what kind of exposure do we lead ourselves to when we tell someone to knock it down and they say that if you want it to come down you knock it down yourself.

Based upon these variables, we try to take a more positive approach to bring everyone into compliance.

Dr. Kuboyama said that he bought a piece of property with a pier and did get the approval of the Corps of Engineers but he did not have a CDUA approval. He said that he bought the place in 1976 not realizing that a permit was required but he did keep the pier in repair so no injuries would occur. But now the State is saying that he has to pay this \$500.00 fine because he is in possession of the pier. I kinda wonder what the interpretation is. I realize that the law can't be helped, but I did not build the pier but kept it repaired for safety reasons because it was next to my lot and now I'm being fined \$500.00.

Another thing, according to the submittal it says that the applicant shall indemnify and hold the State of Hawaii harmless from and against any loss, liability, claim or demand for property damage, personal injury and death arising out of any act or omission of the applicant, etc., said Dr. Kuboyama.

From what I understood, if there is a pier adjacent to my property then I would be leasing the land under the pier. The board is also recommending that the pier become public but yet I'm responsible for casualties. This does not seem to make sense. I was wondering if the board could enlighten me as to the interpretation of this condition, asked Dr. Kuboyama.

Right now, said Mr. Ono, you do not have a lease or a permit from the State, which means that you and your predecessors had use of State properties all these years at no cost.

Another point brought out by Mr. Ono to Dr. Kuboyama is that generally when property is leased from the State it is under the custody of the lessee. However, when it comes to waterfront and the bay areas, because of the limited nature of these kinds of property the State's policy is to make it as accessible as possible to the general public. It is not quite the same as the farm land which Dr. Kuboyama used as an example.

If there is accessibility, who is responsible for what happens, asked Dr. Kuboyama? He felt that if the pier is made public then the State should take responsibility.

On the other hand, said Mr. Ono, the decision to take or not take the lease is your decision. The State does not say that you have to take the lease or the permit. If you decide to take the pier, then certain conditions are attached for the protection of the public.

I thought because I was leasing the land the pier would become private. However, if it is to be a public pier I would rather the pier be taken down.

Deputy A.G. Watson asked if Dr. Kuboyama was aware that the pier adjacent to his property was to be his pier for his personal use.

In other words, you bought it for that reason and maintained and used the pier. Although you had a Corps permit, you were without a Land Department permit for the use of the land as well as a CDUA permit until receiving notice of the \$500.00 fine. When you have a pier constructed on public land, that pier has to be made available to the public and you also have the responsibility of indemnifying the State holding them harmless, or taking out liability insurance and including same in your homeowner's policy.

Dr. Kuboyama did not mind the pier becoming public. He just did not want the responsibility of someone being hurt so stated that he would prefer that the pier be taken down.

Dr. Kuboyama stated that he at least knew that now he had options on what to do and also realized that he had to pay the \$500.00 fine because of the violation -- whether he decided to keep the pier or tear it down.

ACTION

Deferred to the next meeting of the Board of Land and Natural Resources.

ITEM F-2

HILO BAPTIST CHAPEL REQUEST FOR RIGHT OF ENTRY FOR PLANNING PURPOSES,  
WAIAKEA, SO. HILO, HAWAII.

Mr. Detor said that the Hilo Baptist Chapel is interested in locating land to use for church purposes near the campuses of the University of Hawaii, Hilo. They are interested in a parcel of land near the University but which would require a subdivision in order to accommodate their lease to them.

The University has no objection to the property being leased to the church. However, there are some problems with the subdivision. The Hawaii County Planning Department says that because the site is part of a larger parcel they would have to go through a subdivision process first.

Although the proposed use is permitted, the applicant should be aware that access hazards will exist when a traffic volume generator such as a church is established, and the Planning Department does have concerns about the traffic.

ACTION

It was moved by Mr. Higashi that the board authorize issuance of a right of entry to the Hilo Baptist Chapel to the subject parcel for a period of one-year from the date of approval, subject to those conditions listed in the submittal. Mr. Yamamoto seconded and motion carried unanimously.

ITEM H-4

VIOLATION OF FILM PERMIT CD-84-161 (EXCOR TRAVEL).

Excor applied for a commercial filming permit on February 7, 1984. The project, UFO Yaki Soba, was to be a "beach party with everyone enjoying the sun."

Mr. Evans explained that this permit was approved on February 9, 1984 subject to both the Basic Conditions set forth by the Board in CDUA 1050 and Special Conditions which were developed by the Department for use on a case by case basis. The permit, along with the fees, was acknowledged by the applicant and they did go out to film.

Mr. Evans stated also that there was concern expressed by the residents in the area. Their concern was that plastic and tin foil pieces of paper were being dropped from a helicopter and the winds were such that when the helicopter made the drop these pieces were blown all over the beach. At one point in this process, our DOCARE officer who was on the scene did tell the applicant to stop filming due to this type of violation -- the beach was not being kept clean as a part of the activity.

Even though there was communication between the applicant and the crew flying the helicopter, a second drop was made by the helicopter. After this drop, several other people unrelated to the filming activities again began expressing their concerns, said Mr. Evans.

The disks, both plastic and tinfoil, were scattered over a wide area ranging up to Ehukai Beach, approximately a quarter mile away.

The film crew was ordered and understood that they were to stop filming. Nevertheless, a third helicopter drop was made. When the third helicopter drop was made an argument broke out between the applicant and a member of the public who was standing in front of the movie camera. This third drop, explained Mr. Evans, was observed by an on-duty employee of the City and County -- one of the life guards in the area.



Mr. Evans noted that in reviewing the case, when the officer did inform the applicant of their responsibilities under the permit, the applicant did make the statement, or the representation, that they were sorry that it happened. However, in staff's view they found that basically three conditions of the film permit were in violation. These were Conditions 13 and 6 of the Special Conditions and Condition 3 of the Basic Conditions.

Feeling that this violation has occurred, staff is recommending that \$500.00 per violation, or a total of \$1500 be assessed and additionally that the board impose the administrative costs of \$100.00 upon the applicant. Staff is also recommending that, should the board find that indeed there were these violations and impose the sanctions, that the board consider another recommendation that, should the board find a film permit violation occurring by the same applicant within three years from today's (May 25, 1984) date that the board not allow the involved firm or its current principals from engaging in commercial filming activities on State lands, including the beaches, for a time to be determined by the board.

The reason staff is suggesting the above, said Mr. Evans, is that in many instances it has been brought to staff's attention that it is well worth it to the applicant to pay the \$500.00 for the violation and still get your shot. So, in some instances, it has become a cost of business. Staff feels that in order to overcome this and perhaps create an atmosphere where there is a greater respect for the use of State lands that when someone comes in, and is in a position like this, that they be put on notice that, alright, if you folks are going to continue -- if there is a fine by the board -- in the future the board may just well consider you not being allowed to use State lands for a certain period of time. Staff feels that this will tend to offset the idea of using the violation and its cost as a base of doing business.

You mention in your report that this type of thing flew all over the place -- about 1/4 mile away. Who cleaned the area up, asked Mr. Yagi?

Mr. Evans said that there was a follow-up the next day and the applicant did hire some people, with their own funds, to clean it up. Notwithstanding that, however, our DOCARE people in subsequent checks went out and found that that cleanup nevertheless did not clean the beach and that these disks did remain over a wide section of the beach.

On your recommendation E, asked Mr. Kealoha, you mean to say that beginning now and three years from today?

Mr. Evans answered yes.

Has DPED been informed of this violation, asked Mr. Kealoha?

Mr. Evans said that he did discuss this verbally with DPED, but he did not think that a copy of the submittal was sent to them.

Ms. Sohbe Reynolds of Excor Travel testified that of the 1200 to 1500 projects that she has handled, this is the first time that she has ever had any mis-communication problems with the filming.

Referring to Special Condition No. 6, which states that the applicant shall at all times while filming activities are taking place, maintain a contact person who shall be made available to department personnel in insuring compliance with all conditions of this permit, she explained that three days after the shooting, February 16 and 17, her agents were on the location and that she also was there all the time so she is in a position to explain, step by step, what happened on that particular day.

Ms. Reynolds said that the helicopter took off about 10:00 A.M. and was out for about 15 minutes and she was right next to the film camera on the location which is away from the road -- about 100 to 200 yards away.

The first drop was just to see how the wind is going and the second drop, without having too much interval, was the reflectors. The third drop was the time when a citizen came in front of the camera and stopped them from filming.

During those three consecutive times of turning around, the helicopter never landed any place and she did not recall any DOCARE officer or anyone else coming to her during those three drops. By the time the DOCARE officer came to talk to her, she could not do anything because the particular gentleman, Ed Rossman, was in front of the camera. Mr. Rossman made remarks e.g. "You Japanese, go back home, this is our land, etc." I tried to talk to him. We argued and there was no time for me to communicate with the helicopter at that point. Until that time, I did not ask for stopping the film because the DOCARE officer was about 200 yards away.

I talked to the DOCARE officer right after. I felt so sorry because of the time of complaints made to the DOCARE officers, even though the drops only took about 15 minutes. So I agreed to stop the filming for a little while. I told the DOCARE officer that I had a duty to finish this project with the close-up shots of the models with the same background. So I asked if it was alright to reopen and do the filming on the ground -- just the model close-up and he said if I call the office and talk to either Mr. Roger Pai or Mr. Matsuzaki then I may do so. I then left the area and went to the public phone and talked to the film office and explained to them what happened and also called the DOCARE office and talked to Norine and she said O.K. as long as you stopped the helicopter why don't you go ahead and finish shooting. So we did.

In the meantime, from the very beginning I had ten people for a cleaning crew to take care of the ground portion of the cleanup standing by. Mr. Evan's letter says that there was gusty, strong winds and so many went into the ocean, so I hired the City and County, Mr. Jeff Johnson, who is the lifeguard off-duty at that point, and he collected nine gentlemen to go out with the surfboards and start cleaning up. By the time the DOCARE officers who were on the site, were changing shifts, which was about 12:00, we picked up everything from the Sunset Beach area and as much from the ocean too. About 3:30 we checked again and cleaned up as much as we could until we couldn't see anymore in the area.

I am sorry that I didn't think about the thing traveling so far away and the next morning the City and County -- Ehukai Beach lifeguard called me up and said that he saw a lot of the reflectors in his beach area and would you like help in cleaning up. I told him to please do so and immediately I sent my assistant over to check and hire that particular person as a contact and a few persons to clean up the Ehukai Beach area. This was on February 22.

The morning of February 23, about 10:00 a.m., I went to Ehukai Beach, said Ms. Reynolds, and met with Mr. Kaniha and by then he had picked up about five bags. At that time I also took my cleaning crew and checked whether it was really done. At that time, the DOCARE officer Ernie, was also checking and he told me that I had done a very good job.

Referring to Condition No 3, Mr. Ono said to Mrs. Reynolds that she had mentioned that she or her agent was present at the site at all times. He called to her attention that the mere physical presence at the site does not satisfy Condition 6. The presence to insure compliance with the conditions of the permit is the key.

According to the DOCARE officer's report he asked at 10:19 that morning that filming be stopped. Although communication was available between you and the helicopter crew, a second drop was made by the helicopter about that time, said Mr. Ono.

I did have communication, said Ms. Reynolds, but by then everything was done. By the time the DOCARE officer talked to me all the flights and all the drops, and the argument was already done.

Three drops were already finished when the officer came to you, asked Mr. Ono?

Right, said Ms. Reynolds. There was the first drop. Then the second drop was the actual shooting. There was no shooting when the third drop was made. Everything happened in about nine minutes. I had a walkie-talkie with the helicopter but I was talking to Ed Rossman, who was threatening me and I did not have time to think about anything else but to just take care of the ground situation. When everything was done then I saw the DOCARE officer but on the way to me he talked to the gentlemen taking the photos.

Mr. Yagi said that according to staff's report, at 10:19 a.m., our DOCARE officer ordered the applicant to stop the filming and, at 10:30 a.m. the film crew was ordered to stop filming. Nevertheless, a third helicopter drop was made and, at this time, argument broke out between you and a member of the public who was standing in front of the movie camera.

Ms. Reynolds said that this was not true. Everything happened all together. She said that the officer talked to her after the argument.

Mrs. Reynolds, when you applied for the permit, did you indicate that there would be drops made, asked Mr. Ono?

Ms. Reynolds said that not at the time of application, but she did communicate over the telephone after that.

Were you concerned about the \$500.00 fine or Condition E., which says that if the board finds you guilty and you have another violation within three (3) years that you may not be allowed from engaging in commercial filming activities on State land including the beaches for a time to be determined by the board.

Ms. Reynolds said that \$1500.00 is a lot of money for her little business. However, she is more concerned that she would like the board to know that she has tried very hard to communicate with the board and done whatever they can to keep from damaging the areas they have been given permission to use.

There seems to be a major difference in the facts being presented. Between what the staff has presented and what the applicant has presented. I don't think that we can resolve all of these questions at this meeting but what we can do is defer this for some other meeting and even to the extent of subpoenaing witnesses -- put them under oath -- and let everyone have their say. Otherwise, I don't think we're going to make any headway on this, said Mr. Ono.

Who decides on windtesting and at what point are you aware of the windtesting, asked Mr. Kealoha? Like in this case, you were testing the wind and for that reason dropped the disks. Who decides that this has to be done?

Ms. Reynold's assistant, Roy Uehara, said that the Film Director makes this decision.

In answer to Mr. Kealoha's question, Mr. Uehara said that the decision to conduct a windtest is made just before the shooting.

Was the director aware of all the conditions in the permit, asked Mr. Kealoha?

Ms. Reynolds said that she explained the conditions as well as possible. He never read the conditions but I tried to explain. So I am really responsible for this case.

This dropping, asked Mr. Kealoha, was not only to test the wind but also to give more light and effect.

Ms. Reynolds said yes and that is the reason why, as she mentioned earlier, they were all aware of having to clean up.

Mr. Kealoha said that the remark made earlier was to test the wind.

Ms. Reynolds said that three drops were made. First was the wind test, second was actual shooting and the third was also actual shooting supposedly, but they could not do anything because someone was right in the front of the camera.

Was this the only time you used this method to test the wind, asked Mr. Kealoha?

Ms. Reynolds said yes.

What did you do to test the winds in previous shots, asked Mr. Kealoha.

Ms. Reynolds said that they have never done any air drop before and this was the first time.

Mr. Yagi suggested that this item be deferred.

Mr. Ono said that should additional information be received, it will be considered by the board and Ms. Reynolds will be contacted as to what the next step would be. However, no decision will be made at this time.

ACTION

Deferred.

The chairman asked that Mr. Evans get together with staff and come in with a report to the board recommending a course of action.

ITEM H-2

CDUA FOR SUBDIVISION OF AN OCEAN FRONT LOT AND MINOR CLEARING OF SIX EXISTING ACCESSES AT KALUA KOI, MOLOKAI.

Mr. Evans called to the board's attention that a public hearing was held on this request and, at that time, there was not a lot of comments from the various agencies. However, subsequent to that comments were received from various state agencies as well as in-house comments and that, together with the synthesis of the public hearing and the concerns which were expressed there, has resulted in an analysis which formulated a recommendation which basically does not support this application for subdivision of Lot 403, also designated as TMK: 5-1-06:156 and minor clearing of six existing accesses for the following reasons:

1. The intent of the subdivision is unclear.
2. The subdivision of Lot 403 is unnecessary and will not benefit either the 56 adjacent lot owners or the Molokai Community.
3. The application is in contrary to the objective of the general subzone.

Were any comments received from Maui County, asked Mr. Yagi?

Mr. Evans said that comments were received from the Maui County Planning Department (attachment Figure 3) and their comments relate to the SMA Area in which they did grant a permit to subdivide and reconsolidate. The extent of the permit did not incorporate approval to clear the public beach access.

Was this area always zoned agriculture, asked Mr. Kealoha?

The particular application that staff is dealing with is within the conservation zone, said Mr. Evans. The other part is in agriculture. However I don't know how long it's been in agriculture.

When Maui County approved the ag subdivision, was there anything in there to indicate that the purchasers of these lots would have to engage in agricultural activities, asked Mr. Ono?

Mr. Evans did not know.

Referring to Figure 4, Mr. Higashi asked if that was the final configuration being applied for.

Final, in terms of what would happen if the board approved this, said Mr. Evans.

In answer to Mr. Higashi's question, Mr. Evans said that, generally speaking, the high water mark shown on Figure 4 concurs with the line that the state is using.

If this were approved, would they be allowed to put a house up on each lot in the conservation zone, asked Mr. Higashi?

Mr. Evans answered yes.

Mr. Yagi moved for approval of staff's recommendation for denial. Mr. Yamamoto seconded.

Before acting on this item, Mr. Ono asked whether the applicant had any comments.

Mr. Joseph Vierra, representing Belt, Collins & Associates said that his comments would come from the analysis that was made. He called attention to the following paragraph which is found on page 7 of the submittal:

"Even at this point of the review, Staff is unsure where the certified shoreline is relative to the Conservation District boundary and the makai property line. Attempts to clarify these concerns prove fruitless. However, the question of why the subdivision is needed remains unanswered. Staff has learned that all the beach front lots were already sold. Our records show that only a small percentage of the owners of these lots actually are Hawaii residents. A majority of these people have a mainland mailing address. None live on Molokai. The speculative nature of these purchases seem obvious."

Starting at the top, Mr. Vierra said that the Certified Shoreline was actually certified by the Land Use Commission and shown as Exhibit 3.

On Exhibit 1, the certified conservation line was shown. This line was certified by the Department of Land and Natural Resources.

On Exhibit 2, all of the existing easements were shown.

On Figure 3, the certified conservation line, the certified shoreline and the landcourt property line were all superimposed on one map.

These are all of the additions of what are the currently legal things that are allowed so that staff being unsure as to where those are, they are actually shown on the application.

The second point made by Mr. Vierra is that at the time of the hearing and after the hearing, the applicant representative had indicated the question regarding the need for the subdivision would be referred to their legal counsel for response. That response was actually relative to what type of arrangements had been made with the adjacent property owners. It also indicated that he would provide information regarding the boundary of the county placed restrictions. Information was to be submitted two weeks after the transcript became available on March 12, 1984. The department has not received any response from the applicant relating to the above-mentioned concerns.

I am guilty of not having that in within two weeks, said Mr. Vierra. That was a misunderstanding on my part. Nonetheless, that information showing the document that was going to be executed with the adjacent land owner was turned in and the various questions that had been pointed out at the public hearing and in the transcript that we had were also answered at that time. It is correct, however, that it was not answered in a timely manner. Nonetheless, Mr. Vierra felt that those should have been used to determine the conclusions which were drawn by DLNR.

Earlier on, said Mr. Vierra, misunderstanding also occurred between themselves and the Planning Department as to who owned the land. It was the Planning Department's belief that the land was owned by the State. Until that was clarified, some several months had expired. Those months were actually time given by the applicant to clarify the point. He felt that the one additional week that they were late and guilty of was not allowed them in this instance where in an earlier case they had been allowed the opportunity to wait until that point had been clarified.

He felt that a lot of the points made may have resulted from that conclusion. He asked that 1) they be allowed the opportunity to work with the DLNR staff to go over those particular items and in that sense they would ask for a deferral although they would much prefer to actually show from their perspective exactly what it is that they are doing so that there is no confusion. We would prefer to make that presentation to the Land Board -- approximately five minutes of the board's time right now -- but they would do whatever the board preferred. Either defer or a chance to explain what may be inaccuracies or elements of concern that may not be accurate from the actual application that was submitted.

Regardless of whether I receive additional information or clarification of some of the points that you brought up, my basic concern is that the adjoining properties are in ag subdivision, said Mr. Ono. I have raised this question before and I raise it again, are these buyers going to farm these lots?

Would it be feasible for these people to farm these lots with the kinds of prices they would be paying for the lots, asked Mr. Ono?

Mr. Vierra did not know.

Because this is in ag subdivision and if they are going to farm it and in the course of farming this lot they would require additional area going into the conservation district zone, I would be more sympathetic. But not knowing that they are going to farm it -- regardless of what happens -- clarification on the points you raised will not alter my thinking. Mr. Ono assumed that Maui County gave approval for an ag subdivision because they felt that the buyers would be farming those lots.

I think some of the misunderstanding is just what the term agricultural means as versus what an agricultural designation is. I think an agricultural designation merely points out the possibilities for the type of land. In other words you cannot raise a pig farm in urban type of lands because those are restrictive uses, said Mr. Vierra.

Whether it be urban, rural or agricultural, what the County has to look at is whether it complies with the rules of the subdivision ordinance of the County of Maui. That's why we asked them for this review, said Mr. Ono.

If the boundaries of these lots are extended, will the owners have to pay additional monies to you, asked Mr. Higashi?

Mr. Vierra said that no extra monies would be paid. They would have a common interest with an exclusive area of use by easement in front of the fee simple property that they own in the conservation district.

If this CDUA is granted, our fear is that each individual property owner may come before this board for CDUA for fence. So there is a possibility of having 56 different kinds of fences or walls. This is a concern of the people of Molokai as well as the board, said Mr. Yagi.

Without granting this approval, the fifty-six lot owners could come before this board today to ask to put up a fence, to put up a wall or ask for a variety of things that they would have to get approval from the SMA and the board. So you deal with 56 no matter what, said Mr. Vierra. The only public side is the giving up of the area that is in dispute and for practical purposes, that is the sand.

To remove the ownership that these people have as an easement right right now from the high water mark back to the vegetation line, which means that the sand portion is now public where today it is gray.

The second right that the public has is crossing the conservation land to get from an already constructed public beach access to the sand or to the rocky shoreline and finally that right is also being granted to the county for a 10-acre lot that they have. These are public benefits across the conservation land that the owners currently have so you would have this problem no matter what. The only other thing that is not a public thing in any sense is that you clean up what is now a split three-time zoning into two different zones.

According to the land court title documents, said Mr. Ing, the adjacent owners have exclusive rights to the area fronting their parcel. Are there any restrictions with regard to either construction or use of that area?

Within the conservation district, only those that would be required by the permit process -- SMA and CUDA, said Mr. Vierra.

So there are no restrictive covenants, said Mr. Ing?

Mr. Vierra asked that that question be answered by their legal counsel, Jim Funaki.

Mr. Funaki said that the intent here is to have this conservation area, if the subdivision is approved by the board, to consolidate with the adjoining lot. There is a declaration of covenants covering the entire Kalua Koi Resort area which states that any single lot can have no more than one dwelling. In that respect the covenants would cover this situation if it becomes one lot. There won't be a series of houses built in the conservation area.

But there could be a series of fences built, said Mr. Yagi.

Mr. Funaki explained that they could do that now.

Mr. Funaki said that he has reviewed staff's analysis and there appears to be some confusion in the analysis as to the understanding of the subject and scope of this application. He stated that the applicant mainly requests two things concerning this subject lot -- which he referred to the conservation lot.

First, the applicant requests that they be permitted to delineate, physically, certain easement areas over the conservation lot and to clear such easement areas for purposes of allowing the public to use the access to the beach areas.

Second, the applicant seeks to subdivide the conservation lot into 56 lots for the purpose of rearranging the land titles in the land court to the conservation lot among the owners. In that regard, said Mr. Funaki, it should be emphasized that this application for subdivision does not request the building of homes or other improvements on the conservation lot. It does not request the construction of revetments on the conservation lot nor of building walls or fences, and it does not request the clearing, grubbing, digging or in any way changing the landscape and state of use of the conservation lot except the minor clearing for the public access areas.

Simply stated, this application for subdivision of the conservation lot does not request a change in the physical state or use of the conservation lot different from its existing physical state. In other words, said Mr. Funaki, the subdivision under this application is merely a paper subdivision without improvements contemplated to be filed in the land court to allow the rearranging of the land titles of the conservation lot among the very owners.

After much discussion, Mr. Ono asked the applicant what their intentions were when they filed for an ag subdivision. Was it residential, or was it ag?

Initially, there was a great deal of urban areas designated for the Kalua Koi area but the Molokai residents reacted very strongly and understandably so, said Mr. Funaki because they had so many areas classified as urban. Under the functional plans of the state which serves as guidelines at this time, that whole area is indicated as resort destination area. But because the Molokai residents were against such a heavily densed development of urban, both the Maui County and the developers were looking to developing a less dense kind of a thing,



yet trying to reconcile the State functional plan that it's a destination area and more to the life style and liking of the Molokai residents, they went to sort of a less dense, large lots, type of subdivision and it qualified as an agricultural subdivision because they could permit grazing and it is intended that some of these owners would maintain horses if provided bridal trails along the mauka portion of the Papohaku Subdivision.

This is the background as to how it evolved into an agricultural subdivision. It's kind of a trade off that was happening to reconcile the functional plan, the intent of Maui County, the developer's development and, recently, in the past year, the developers again went to the Land Use Commission and had approximately a thousand acres of urban land reclassified for rural development because it was more in keeping with the lifestyle of the Molokai residents, said Mr. Funaki.

Mr. Yagi asked whether they recognized the fact that since this lot is owned by Kaluakoi, the Land Use Commission could not work on the basis of condemnation. So the only alternative they had by law was to designate that area as conservation to keep that area for the people of Molokai. This way there would be no construction and as such an agricultural subdivision.

Mr. Funaki said that he was not aware of this.

If the conservation area is violated, then the intent of the Land Use Commission and the intent of the people's wish would also be violated, said Mr. Yagi.

Mr. Ono said that the board now had two things to consider:

- 1) A motion on the floor which has been seconded; and
- 2) Request from the applicant to defer this item to the next meeting.

Mr. Yagi asked that the Chairman act on the motion first.

ACTION

The board unanimously voted for approval of Mr. Yagi's motion, which was seconded by Mr. Yamamoto to accept staff's recommendation for denial.

ITEM F-42

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF OFFICE SPACE FOR THE OFFICE OF LIBRARY SERVICES LOCATED IN THE SALT LAKE SHOPPING CENTER.

Mr. Ing questioned and also felt that the rental of \$2.02 per sq. ft. was ridiculous.

Mr. Higashi asked what was the intent of having a library within a shopping center inasmuch as there is a common area maintenance expense which is shared and a lot of this expense goes into a promotional type fund. Is there any reason for going into the shopping center?

Mr. Bartholomew Kane, representing the DOE, said that an analysis done by the Neighborhood Board in that area identified that the Salt Lake Blvd. area is the most heavily travelled area so DOE conducted a site survey and the site that has been identified as a permanent home for this library is across the street from where the shopping center is.

Mr. Bartholomew said that they are now in the process of having that piece of property declared surplus by the federal government and in the process of acquiring that land. So in effect, DOE is literally trying to put a temporary facility in the area in which they plan to put a permanent facility. They have investigated other commercial areas throughout that whole area and this literally is the best area they've been able to determine.

Mr. Yagi asked if it wasn't possible to build another facility for this library on a school campus within that area?

Mr. Kane said that it was their original intention to put a temporary facility on the grounds of the school. However, because they are using federal monies to do this project, Washington objected, and so did the school facility themselves object and this why the library turned down this course of action.

In answer to Mr. Ing's question, Mr. Kane said that the nearest library is either in Aiea or Kalihi-Palama.

Mr. Kane explained that they have a lease for two years with an option to lease for the third year. They expect a permanent facility to be completed within that time.

What would be your alternative should the board deny this request, asked Mr. Higashi?

Mr. Kane said that they would have to wait until the permanent facility was completed.

ACTION

Mr. Yagi moved to approve the Department of Education's request to lease, subject to review and approval of the Lease agreement by the Office of the Attorney General. Motion carried with a second by Mr. Higashi.

Mr. Ing voted no.

ITEM F-33

RESUBMITTAL - SMITH'S MOTOR BOAT SERVICE, INC. APPLICATION TO LEASE LOT 21 OF THE WAILUA RICE & KULA LOTS, WAILUA, KAUAI.

Mr. Detor explained that this item was deferred at the last meeting with instructions to meet with the applicant and bring it back at this meeting. Mr. Detor said that he had met with the applicant and discussed several aspects of the proposal with him and that they had clarified some of the concerns the applicant had regarding the terms and conditions of the proposal.

With one exception, staff is recommending the same proposal as was presented at the last meeting. The amendment to that is that staff is suggesting that the rental for the first year be waived, which is the maximum allowable by law.

What happen's if the applicant is not the successful bidder, asked Mr. Yamamoto?

Mr. Detor said that if any improvements are put on the premises during the course of the permit, staff can incorporate a condition in the Notice of Sale that the successful bidder, if he is other than the current occupant, would pay for those improvements.

In answer to Mr. Ing's question, Mr. Detor said that there is no pre-qualification of bidders for this lease.

ACTION

Finding the area in question to be an economic unit in terms of its intended use, the board, upon motion by Mr. Yamamoto, unanimously authorized the sale of a lease at public auction under the terms and conditions listed in the submittal in addition to a condition stating to the effect that should the successful bidder be other than the current occupant, that he be responsible to pay for any improvements put on the premises by the current occupant. Motion carried unanimously with a second by Mr. Higashi.

ITEM F-38

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION REQUEST FOR ACQUISITION OF LEASE COVERING A  
A WAREHOUSE AT 2050 KIKOWAENA PLACE, HONOLULU, OAHU.

ACTION

Unanimously approved as submitted, subject to the review and approval of the lease agreement by the Department of Attorney General.  
(Ing/Yagi)

ITEM F-44

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL REQUEST FOR GRANT OF RIGHT OF ENTRY TO  
STATE LAND AT WAIAHA 2, NO. KONA, HAWAII.

Mr. Detor explained that this is a request by the Office of the Attorney General asking that the board take action to settle a case that they have pending in connection with a quiet title action.

Deputy A.G. Ed Watson explained that originally the property is one of seven properties in a quiet title action involving numerous claimants.

This particular property, parcel 9, is comprised of three land commission awards. The parcel itself at one time bounded along the old government road. The old government road subsequently was relocated about 30-70 feet further west into its present Mamalahoa Highway, thus creating a government remnant as well as an abandoned portion of the old government road which abuts parcel 9.

The County of Hawaii subsequently came in and acquired the lower half of the parcel for water tank site purposes. The result of the acquisition, as well as the realignment of the road, was that the remainder of parcel 9 was without access to the government road. So in this quiet title action, one of the issues is whether or not the landowners would be entitled to a grant of easement for access and utility purposes to the government road.

In working with the County of Hawaii, the Public Works Department as well as all of the parties involved, we have come up with a proposed easement, the width, location and delineation which has been determined by the County in line with the subdivision and county requirements. The easement itself would cross over the parcels that the County condemns. So the County by itself would be conveying a grant of easement (Easement A-3 & A-2) which includes the county area.

A-1 is a portion of State land which has been EO'd to the county for addition to the water tank site so, as far as this parcel is concerned, concurrence of the board is required.

A-5, which is approximately 836 sq. ft., is the only portion which the board itself would be adding to the easement and the request for the board right now is for concurrence with the County's granting of an easement A-1, and the outright granting of easement A-5, to the owners of parcel 9.

As far as A-4, part of the stipulation is that the abutting landowners who are parties to this particular lawsuit, and the landowners, would be acquiring that on their own.

In answer to Mr. Higashi's question, Mr. Watson said that they would not pay for the easement on A-5.

ACTION

Upon motion by Mr. Higashi and a second by Mr. Ing, the board voted unanimously to:

1. Approve the issuance of a Grant of Easement, Easement A-5, containing an area of 836 sq. ft., more or less, for roadway and utility purposes to and from Parcel 9, TMK 7-5-15 (Hawaii), as contained in the Grant Easement document attached hereto as Exhibit "A".

2. Concur with the issuance by the County of Hawaii of a Grant of Easement, Easement A-1, containing an area of 1,863 sq. ft. or 0.43 acres, more or less, for roadway and utility purposes over and across a portion of Governor's Executive Order No. 1589, subject however, to the terms, conditions and covenants as contained in the attached Grant of Easement document, in addition to any other terms and conditions the County of Hawaii may have.

RECESS

The board recessed at 12:15.

RECONVENE

The meeting reconvened at 1:30 p.m.

ITEM F-1-d

PDI-VII, INC. REQUEST TO ASSIGN ACCESS AND UTILITY EASEMENT (L.O.D. NO. S-27321) AT WAIHOLI, WAILUKU, MAUI.

ITEM F-1-e

CENTRAL KEOKEA ASSOCIATES REQUEST FOR CONSENT TO MORTGAGE GRANT OF EASEMENT (L.O.D. NO. S-27321) AT WAIHOLI, WAILUKU, MAUI.

ITEM F-1-f

OCEANFRONT ASSOCIATES REQUEST FOR CONSENT TO REAL PROPERTY WRAP AROUND MORTGAGE AND SECURITY AGREEMENT, GRANT OF EASEMENT (L.O.D. NO. S-27321) AT WAIHOLI, WAILUKU, MAUI.

Mr. Detor explained that the above three items are all associated transactions. What we're talking about is an easement which runs in Kihei and connects from the main road to private property but the easement is over state land. The board originally approved an assignment of an easement from Central Keokea, which held the easement, to PDI-VII on November 14, 1983.

Mr. Detor gave the following background:

1. F-1-d is a request to further assign the easement to Oceanfront Associates.
2. F-1-e is an after-the-fact request for a consent to a mortgage which Central Keokea made while they held the easement. They did not get the board's consent at the time.
3. F-1-f is a request for a consent to a wrap-around mortgage. This would wrap around the existing mortgage that Keokea did not get consent for originally.

ACTION

Mr. Yagi moved for approval of Items F-1-d, F-1-e and F-1-f as submitted. Mr. Yamamoto seconded and motion carried unanimously.

ITEM F-1-i

REVOCABLE PERMIT - WILLIS. E. LEACH request for por. of govt. lands at Kanahena, Kualapa, Kalihi, Papaka, Honuauia, Makawao, Maui being TMK: 2-1-04:por. 94 containing 0.098 ac for waterline easement purposes. Rental: \$10.00 per mo.

ACTION

Unanimously approved as submitted. (Yagi/Yamamoto)

Mr. Ono asked that Mr. Detor check to see whether or not the applicant lived on the island of Kauai.

ITEM F-6

STAFF RECOMMENDATION FOR ISSUANCE OF EXECUTIVE ORDER'S WITHDRAWING LAND FROM THE WEST MAUI AND KOOLAU FOREST RESERVES AND RESET ASIDE AS WEST MAUI AND HANAWI NATURAL AREA RESERVES, MAUI.

ACTION

Unanimously approved as submitted. (Yagi/Yamamoto)

- ITEM F-7                    RICHARD DAN APPLICATION TO PURCHASE ACCESS EASEMENT AT KANAHERA-NAU, HONUOLA, MAKAWAO, MAUI.
- ACTION                    Finding the subject area is of minimum size relative to the intended use and constitutes an economic size, the board unanimously approved:
1. The direct sale of the subject easement to the applicant subject to the terms and conditions listed in the submittal; and
  2. Granting of an immediate right-of-entry to the applicant covering the subject easement area subject to the terms and conditions listed in the submittal.
  3. Other terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Chairperson.
- ITEM F-8                    HAWAII HOUSING AUTHORITY REQUEST FOR RIGHT OF ENTRY TO CONDUCT FEASIBILITY STUDY, WAKIU & KAWAIPAPA, HANA, MAUI.
- ACTION                    Unanimously approved as submitted, subject to the terms and conditions listed in the submittal. (Yagi/Yamamoto)
- ITEM F-9                    EDWIN T. IGE, JR., ET AL, REQUEST FOR RIGHT OF ENTRY FOR CLEARING, UPGRADING, LANDSCAPING, AND MAINTENANCE PURPOSES, KIHEI, MAUI.
- ACTION                    Unanimously approved as submitted, subject to the terms and conditions listed in the submittal. (Yagi/Yamamoto)
- ITEM F-10                    DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION REQUEST FOR AUTHORIZATION TO DISPOSE OF HIGHWAY REMNANTS, MAUI.
- ACTION                    The board unanimously authorized the Department of Transportation to dispose of the listed highway remnants on the island of Maui on a direct basis in accordance with Section 171-52, HRS, subject to the terms and conditions listed in the submittal. (Yagi/Yamamoto)
- ITEM F-39                    DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF RENEWAL OF LEASE COVERING ROOMS 102 THROUGH 121 AND ROOMS M-123 THROUGH M-145 IN THE J. WALTER CAMERON CENTER, WAILUKU, MAUI.
- ACTION                    Unanimously approved as submitted, subject to the review and approval of the lease document by the Office of the Attorney General. (Yagi/Yamamoto).
- ITEM F-43                    HAWAII TELEPHONE CO. & MAUI ELECTRIC CO., LTD. APPLICATION FOR RIGHT OF ENTRY AND EASEMENT AT OLINDA, MAKAWAO, MAUI.
- ACTION                    Finding the area in question to be an economic unit in terms of the intended use and finding also that Hawaiian Telephone Company and Maui Electric Co., Ltd. have no suitable land of their own for the proposed use, the board, upon motion by Mr. Yagi and a second by Mr. Yamamoto voted unanimously to:
1. Authorize the direct sale of the subject easement to Hawaiian Telephone Company and Maui Electric Company, Ltd. subject to the terms and conditions listed in the submittal; and,
  2. Approve granting of an immediate right-of-entry to the applicant covering the subject easement area subject to the terms and conditions listed in the submittal.

ITEM J-6 RIGHT-OF-ENTRY, KAHULUI HARBOR, MAUI (CORPS OF ENGINEERS, PACIFIC DIV., DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY.)

---

ACTION Unanimously approved as submitted. (Yagi/Yamamoto)

ITEM J-22 ISSUANCE OF REVOCABLE PERMITS, HARBORS DIVISION, LAHAINA AND MAALAEA HARBORS, MAUI.

---

ACTION Unanimously approved as submitted. (Yagi/Yamamoto)

ITEM F-1-a JAMES HOYLE APPLICATION FOR REVOCABLE PERMIT COVERING LOT 11-B AND IMPROVEMENTS, HANAPEPE TOWN LOTS, HANAPEPE, KAUAI, BEING TMK 1-9-05:53, AREA: 5909 sq. ft. land area; 800± sq. ft. building. RENTAL: To be determined by staff appraisal, commencing as soon as possible. PURPOSE: Business (artist studio and working area).

---

ACTION Unanimously approved as submitted. (Yamamoto/Yagi)

ITEM F-1-c ALFRED BALAURO APPLICATION FOR REVOCABLE PERMIT, COVERING LOT 25 OF THE HANAPEPE RICE & KULA LOTS, HANAPEPE, WAIMEA, KAUAI, BEING TMK 1-9-01:14, AREA: 6.10 acres±. RENTAL: \$180.00 per mo. commencing April 1, 1984. PURPOSE: General Agriculture/Employee Residence.

---

ACTION Mr. Yamamoto moved for approval subject to amendment of the commencement date from April 1, 1984 to May 1, 1984. Motion carried unanimously with a second by Mr. Yagi.

ITEM F-1-h DAVID WELLINGTON APPLICATION FOR REVOCABLE PERMIT COVERING LOT 1-A, HANAPEPE, WAIMEA, KAUAI, BEING TMK 1-9-07:5, 7, 8, 9 and 28. AREA: 10.1± acres. RENTAL: \$10.00 per mo. commencing April 1, 1984. PURPOSE: Pasture

---

ACTION Unanimously approved as submitted. (Yamamoto/Yagi)

ITEM F-29 STAFF RECOMMENDATION FOR AMENDMENT OF PREVIOUS BOARD ACTION (4/8/83, AGENDA ITEM F-10) AUTHORIZING SALE OF A LEASE COVERING LAND AT HANAPEPE, KAUAI.

---

On April 8, 1983, the board authorized the public auction sale of a lease for pasture purposes at Hanapepe, Kauai.

The new lease is intended as a replacement for a current pasture lease held jointly by Joseph Brun and Joseph Rita (G. L. NO. S-3815) scheduled to expire on June 11, 1984.

Staff, in its recommendation, failed to provide sufficient time for the present lessees to vacate the property and dissolve their herd should a new lessee replace them.

ACTION Mr. Yamamoto moved that the language of the term (of lease) in Item F-10 dated April 8, 1983, be amended to read as follows:

"Term: Fifteen (15) years, to commence as of the date of sale if the present occupant is the successful bidder; otherwise, lease to commence sixty (60) days after the date of sale."

Mr. Yagi seconded and motion carried unanimously.

ITEM F-30

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION REQUEST FOR EXECUTIVE ORDER SETTING ASIDE LAND AT HANAMAULU, LIHUE, KAUAI.

ACTION

The board, upon motion by Mr. Yamamoto and second by Mr. Yagi, voted unanimously to:

1. Accept jurisdictional control of Parcels 6, 9 and 11 as shown on DOT Right-of-Way Map of the Ahukini Road, FASP No. S-0579(1), dated November 16, 1962; and
2. Authorize recommending to the Governor issuance of an executive order setting aside the foregoing parcels under the management and control of the Department of Transportation for addition to the Lihue Airport Complex.

ITEM F-31

STAFF RECOMMENDATION FOR REDUCTION IN UPSET PRICES OF THREE HOUSELOTS AND IMPROVEMENTS IN THE KEKAHA GARDENS SUBDIVISION, KEKAHA, KAUAI.

Mr. Detor said that the subject three houses were put up for bid twice and, both times, had no bidders. Accordingly, staff is recommending that the upset prices be reduced to encourage and stimulate bidding even though the appraisal price was higher.

Mr. Detor explained that the board has the authority to lower the upset price set by appraisal.

The amounts listed in the submittal, said Mr. Detor, includes the cost of processing the repurchase but does not include the prices paid for maintenance, fire insurance, water meter, etc. while the lots have been vacant and, accordingly, asked that the amounts shown in the submittal be amended as follows:

Lot 127	\$85,230.00	to \$ 87,525.00
Lot 135	\$112,226.00	to \$115,211.00
Lot 146	\$81,065.00	to \$82,176.00

ACTION

Upon motion by Mr. Yamamoto and a second by Mr. Yagi, the board unanimously voted to reduce the upset prices for Lots 127, 135 and 146 as shown above and also authorized the public auction sale of these house lots at the reduced prices.

ITEM F-32

MANUEL VASQUES APPLICATION TO PURCHASE ABANDONED DITCH RIGHT OF WAY, KAPAA, KAUAI.

ACTION

Finding the area to be physically unsuitable for development as a separate unit because of its size, shape and location, and by definition is a remnant, the board, upon motion by Mr. Yamamoto and a second by Mr. Yagi, voted unanimously to approve the direct sale of the remnant to the applicants, subject to the terms and conditions listed in the submittal.

ITEM F-34

STAFF RECOMMENDATION FOR AMENDMENT OF PREVIOUS BOARD ACTION (9/25/81, AGENDA ITEM F-18) AUTHORIZING SALE OF A PASTURE LEASE COVERING PORTIONS OF HANAPEPE VALLEY, HANAPEPE, KAUAI.

ACTION

Unanimously approved as submitted. (Yamamoto/Yagi)

ITEM F-35

WILLIAM KIMO FERNANDES & LEHUA FERNANDES-SALLING REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF TERM, G. L. NO. S-3674, WAILUA RICE & KULA LOTS, KAWAIHAU, PUNA, KAUAI

ACTION

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 171-92, HRS, the board, upon motion by Mr. Yamamoto and a second by Mr. Yagi, voted unanimously to authorize the extension of the term of General Lease No. S-3674 for a period of fifteen (15) years with the lease terminating on December 17, 2001 subject to the terms and conditions listed in the submittal and such other terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Chairman.

- ITEM F-36      WILLIAM KIMO FERNANDES & LEHUA FERNANDES-SALLING APPLICATION FOR EASEMENT, WAILUA RICE & KULA LOTS, KAWAIIHAU, PUNA, KAUAI.
- ACTION      Finding the area in question to be an economic unit in terms of the intended use, the board, upon motion by Mr. Yamamoto and a second by Mr. Yagi, voted unanimously to authorize the direct award of a 15-ft.-wide by 150-ft.-long foot pathway easement to the applicants and also granted them a right of entry to the subject easement area and permission to construct the foot pathway and to mow the river bank situated between General Lease No. S-3674 and the Wailua River, subject to the terms and conditions listed in the submittal.
- ITEM F-40      DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES AND HOUSING REQUEST FOR ACQUISITION OF LEASE COVERING OFFICE SPACE IN THE KAPAA SHOPPING CENTER, KAPAA, KAUAI.
- ACTION      Unanimously approved as submitted, subject to the review and approval of the lease agreement by the Office of the Attorney General. (Yamamoto/Yagi).
- ITEM I-2      FILLING OF POSITION NO. 02959, CONSERVATION AND RESOURCES ENFORCEMENT OFFICER V, MAUI.
- In answer to Mr. Yagi's question, Mr. Mutsuzaki said that if, for some reason, Mr. Jacob desires to return to his old position, he will be allowed the right to do this.
- ACTION      The board unanimously approved the appointment of Jacob Mau to fill the Conservation and Resources Enforcement Officer V Position No. 02959 effective April 16, 1984. (Yagi/Yamamoto)
- ITEM I-1      APPOINTMENT OF VOLUNTEER HUNTER SAFETY INSTRUCTORS, OAHU, MAUI, HAWAII, AND KAUAI.
- ACTION      Upon motion by Mr. Higashi and a second by Mr. Kealoha, the board unanimously approved appointment of the following volunteer hunter safety instructors:
- |         |   |       |  |
|---------|---|-------|--|
| OAHU:   | John E. Kobayashi<br>John J. Gunning                            | MAUI: | Frank H. Krau<br>Robert K. Okawa<br>Larry L. Killion<br>Michael Y. W. Ing<br>Sandra L. Powers<br>John R. Brooks II<br>Melvin K. Murakami |
| HAWAII: | Leroy M. Tuttle<br>Robert N. Tanoue<br>Roku Kanekuni            |       | Bobby De Mattos<br>Abel H. Alves, Sr.  |
| KAUAI:  | Arthur C. Rita, Jr.<br>Patrick W. Rita, Sr.<br>Calvin G. Lagazo |       |  |
- ITEM-J-17      ISSUANCE OF REVOCABLE PERMIT, HARBORS DIVISION, KEWALO BASIN, OAHU (SERVCO PACIFIC, INC.)
- ACTION      Mr. Yagi moved for approval as submitted. Mr. Yamamoto seconded and motion carried.
- Mr. Kealoha was disqualified from voting on this item.



- ITEM J-14      CONSENT TO ASSIGNMENT OF LEASE, HARBOR LEASE NO. H-70-14, HARBORS DIVISION, KEEHI LAGOON, OAHU (AMFAC MARINE SUPPLY, INC. TO KEEHI MARINE CENTER, A HAWAII LIMITED PARTNERSHIP).
- ITEM J-15      APPROVAL OF CONSENT TO ASSIGNMENT OF LICENSES NOS. 26 AND 114, HARBORS DIVISION, KEWALO BASIN, OAHU (AMFAC MARINE SUPPLY, INC.)
- ACTION      Mr. Higashi moved for approval of Item Nos. J-14 and J-15 as submitted. Motion carried with a second by Mr. Kealoha.
- Mr. Ing was disqualified from voting on this item.
- ITEM J-2      LEASE HOLDOVER, LEASE NO. DOT-A-81-20, LIHUE AIRPORT, KAUAI (KAUAI AIRPORT TAXI ASSOCIATION, INC. (KATA)).
- ACTION      Unanimously approved as submitted. (Yamamoto/Higashi)
- ITEM J-3      APPLICATION FOR ISSUANCE OF REVOCABLE PERMITS, AIRPORT DIVISION.
- Insofar as Kenai Helicopter's and Papillion Helicopter's permits, Mr. Ono requested deferral inasmuch as DLNR may still have some outstanding matters to clear up.
- ACTION      Mr. Yamamoto moved for the approval of all permits listed in Item J-3 with the exception of those permits issued to both Kenai and Papillion Helicopters. Mr. Higashi seconded and motion carried unanimously.
- ITEM J-4      RENEWAL OF REVOCABLE PERMITS, CONFORMING USE, AIRPORTS DIVISIONS.
- ACTION      Mr. Higashi moved for approval of all permits listed in Item J-4 except for Revocable Permit No. S-3018 issued to Kenai Helicopters. Mr. Kealoha seconded and motion carried unanimously
- ITEM J-12      ISSUANCE OF REVOCABLE PERMIT, HARBORS DIVISION, NAWILIWILI HARBOR, KAUAI (LINDA BAIL, DBA BUBBLES BELOW DIVING CHARTERS; ARDEL N. DEPPE; JOHN TEXEIRA; DON & ANN MOSES, DBA LADY ANN CHARTERS.)
- ACTION      Unanimously approved as submitted. (Yamamoto/Ing)
- ITEM E-5      FILLING OF CLERK-TYPIST III POSITION, KAUAI STATE PARKS OFFICE.
- ACTION      The board unanimously approved the appointment of Clarice Shimatsu to Position No. 17437. (Yamamoto/Higashi)
- ITEM D-6      APPROVAL FOR AWARD OF CONTRACT - JOB NO. 51-KW-27, DRILLING KALAHEO WELL NO. 2 (5631-02), KALAHEO, KAUAI.
- ACTION      The board voted unanimously to award the contract for the subject project to Roscoe Moss Company for their low bid of \$574,380.00, subject to the Governor's approval. (Yamamoto/Kealoha)
- Having accommodated all those applicants present at the meeting, the board moved back to the top of the agenda.
- ITEM B-1      OUT-OF-STATE TRAVEL REQUEST FOR HENRY M. SAKUDA, ADMINISTRATOR, DIVISION OF AQUATIC RESOURCES, TO ATTEND THE ANNUAL CONFERENCE OF THE WESTERN ASSOCIATION OF FISH AND WILDLIFE AGENCIES.
- ACTION      Mr. Kealoha moved for approval of Mr. Sakuda's out-of-state travel request as submitted for the period July 15-19, 1984. Motion carried unanimously with a second by Mr. Higashi.

ADDED  
ITEM C-1 DUTY AND PER DIEM STATUS TO ATTEND THE COUNCIL OF WESTERN STATE FORESTERS ANNUAL CONFERENCE, ALBURQUERQUE, NEW MEXICO FROM APRIL 23-26, 1984.

---

ACTION Unanimously approved as submitted. (Kealoha/Ing)

ITEM D-1 PERMISSION TO ADVERTISE FOR BIDS - JOB NO. 4-OW-26, DRILLING WAIPIO-MONITOR WELL (2659-02), OAHU.

---

ACTION Unanimously approved as submitted. (Ing/Higashi)

ITEM D-2 PERMISSION TO ADVERTISE FOR BIDS AND TO ENTER INTO CONTRACT FOR SURVEY SERVICES - JOB NO. 4-OW-28, DRILLING MOKULEIA EXPLORATORY WELL, KAMANANUI, WAIALUA, OAHU.

---

ACTION Unanimously approved as submitted. (Ing/Higashi)

ITEM D-3 PERMISSION TO ADVERTISE FOR BIDS - JOB NO. 4-OW-22, DRILLING KAPAKAHI WELL (1746-03), HONOLULU, OAHU.

---

ACTION Unanimously approved as submitted. (Ing/Higashi)

ITEM D-4 ELECTRICAL SERVICE WITH HAWAIIAN ELECTRIC CO., INC. FOR JOB NO. 4-OW-22, DRILLING KAPAKAHI WELL (1746-03), HONOLULU, OAHU.

---

ACTION Unanimously approved as submitted. (Ing/Higashi)

ITEM D-5 PERMISSION TO ADVERTISE FOR BIDS - JOB NO. 1-OL-31, WAIKIKI SEAWALL WALKWAY REHABILITATION, PHASE III, HONOLULU, OAHU.

---

ACTION Unanimously approved as submitted. (Ing/Higashi)

ITEM D-6 APPROVAL FOR AWARD OF CONTRACT - JOB NO. 51-KW-27, DRILLING KALAHEO WELL NO. 2 (5631-02), KALAHEO, KAUAI.

---

(See Page 25 for Action)

ITEM D-7 AUTHORIZATION TO HOLD PUBLIC HEARINGS ON WATER RATE INCREASE FOR STATE IRRIGATION SYSTEMS.

---

ACTION The board unanimously authorized the holding of public hearings at Waimea, Molokai and Waimanalo to receive testimony on the proposed irrigation water rate changes, and appoint as Master, Robert Chuck, Manager-Chief Engineer or his representative to conduct the hearings. (Higashi/Kealoha)

ITEM D-8 PERMISSION TO ADVERTISE FOR BIDS - JOB NO. 4-OW-17, PUMP, CONTROLS AND APPURTENANCES FOR WAIANAE WELL (2810-02), WAIANAE, OAHU.

---

ACTION Unanimously approved as submitted. (Ing/Higashi)

ITEM D-9 PERMISSION TO ADVERTISE FOR BIDS - JOB NO. 2-HW-21, RENOVATION OF UPPER HAMAKUA DITCH AND CONSTRUCTION OF ACCESS ROAD, WAIMEA IRRIGATION SYSTEM, SO. KOHALA, HAWAII.

---

ACTION Unanimously approved as submitted, subject to CDUA approval. (Higashi/Kealoha)

ITEM D-10 APPROVAL FOR AWARD OF CONTRACT - JOB NO. 22-HW-33, PUMP CONTROLS AND APPURTENANCES, LAUPAHOEHOE WELL NO. 2 (5814-02), LAUPAHOEHOE WATER SYSTEM, NO. HILO, HAWAII.

---

ACTION The board voted unanimously to award the contract for the subject project to Haituka Brothers Limited for their low bid of \$307,087.00, subject to release of funds by the Governor. (Higashi/Kealoha)

- ITEM D-11      APPROVAL FOR AWARD OF CONTRACT - JOB NO. 41-OL-33, CLEARING INOAOLE AND KAHAWAI STREAMS, WAIMANALO, OAHU.
- ACTION      The board voted unanimously to award the contract for the subject project to Ideal Construction, Inc. for their low bid of \$74,900.00 for the basic bid. (Ing/Kealoha)
- ADDED  
ITEM D-12      AUTHORIZATION TO HOLD PUBLIC HEARINGS ON THE ADMINISTRATIVE RULES ON DESIGNATION AND REGULATION OF GEOTHERMAL RESOURCE SUBZONES.
- Mr. Chuck said that his staff's program is to have board briefings in June and July and possibly have the board hold the hearings on subzoning of August of this year.
- Mr. Chuck stated also that DPED has a Department of Energy which has been working with the Federal Agency of Energy for grants for this kind of work. The latest word we have to date is that it looks like we will be receiving over \$100,000.00 Federal Grant specifically for this subzoning work that we have here.
- In response to Mr. Higashi's question as to whether this can be wrapped up before the end of December, Mr. Ono said that provided there is no legal challenge along the way to any of the board's action.
- ACTION      It was moved by Mr. Ing, seconded by Mr. Higashi, that the board authorize staff to hold public hearings in each county to receive testimony on the Administrative Rules on Designation and Regulation of Geothermal Resources Subzone. Motion carried unanimously.
- ITEM E-1      PERMISSION TO ADVERTISE FOR BIDS, JOB NO. 46-OP-22, SEWAGE SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS, SAND ISLAND STATE PARK, OAHU.
- ACTION      Unanimously approved as submitted, subject to approval of the Governor. (Ing/Kealoha)
- ITEM E-2      REQUEST TO ESTABLISH A SHORT-TERM LEASE FOR THE OPERATION OF PUBLIC CAMPING AND CABIN TENTALS, MALAEKAHANA STATE PARK, KAHUKU, OAHU.
- (See Page 4 for Action)
- ITEM E-3      MAKIKI ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION CENTER (MEEC): FEES AND STATE GRANT REQUEST.
- (See Page 5 for Action)
- ITEM E-4      SPECIAL USE PERMIT FOR SAND ISLAND STATE RECREATION AREA, HONOLULU, OAHU.
- The Exchange Club of Bishop Street is requesting permission to utilize Sand Island State Recreation Area for their proposed 10 Kilometer Run on Sunday, June 24, 1984. The event is intended to raise monies for the Hawaii Child Abuse and is expected to attract 1000 runners. Participants (runners) will be charged an entry fee; however, no fees will be collected at the park and no sales will be conducted on park areas.
- In answer to Mr. Kealoha's question, Mr. Ing explained that the Exchange Club is made up mostly of young business executives.
- Mr. Kealoha asked whether they were experienced in handling this type of run.
- Mr. Nagata said that they will be working with a group that has running gates, etc. so it will be handled with some degree of professionalism.

Mr. Ono asked where the participants would be parking their cars.

Mr. Nagata pointed the area out on a map. He explained that the area being considered for parking is under the jurisdiction of DOT and it was also his understanding that this had been coordinated with DOT.

In answer to Mr. Ono's question, Mr. Nagata said that there may be potential problems with parking by the regular park users.

The runners would like to use twenty-five stalls at the end of the park where the new comfort station is constructed and so there would be a reservation of stalls there. They would also be running back to the

park on their return so we have asked them to keep to the side of the road. But it may be a little disruptive to traffic so we would like to require that traffic not be held up unnecessarily, said Mr. Nagata.

ACTION

Mr. Ing moved that the board authorize issuance of a Special Use Permit for the 10 Kilometer Run to: 1) run within the undeveloped area; 2) run along the road edge in the developed park area without closing off vehicular access; and, 3) set up temporary start/finish lines, gates, and first aid stations. Motion carried unanimously with a second by Mr. Higashi.

ITEM E-5

FILLING OF CLERK-TYPIST III POSITION, KAUAI STATE PARKS OFFICE.

(See Page 25 for Action)

ITEM E-6

FILLING OF PARK CARETAKER III, POSITION NO. 15210, ROVING CREW, OAHU PARK SECTION.

ACTION

The board unanimously approved the appointment of Mr. Robert Yee to fill Position 15210. (Ing/Higashi)

ITEM E-7

ALLOCATION OF HISTORIC PRESERVATION GRANTS-IN-AID.

ACTION

Mr. Ing moved for the Board to authorize the Chairperson and another member of the Board to negotiate and execute contract agreements with the nine proposed subgrantees listed in the submittal, subject to the Attorney General's approval as to form. Mr. Higashi seconded and motion carried unanimously.

ITEM F-1

DOCUMENTS FOR CONSIDERATION

Item F-1-a

(See Page 22 for Action)

Item F-1-b

DONALD S. SHINGTAKU and HELEN E. SHINGTAKU, REQUEST FOR CONSENT TO MORTGAGE, G. L. NO. S-4760 COVERING LOT 13, PANAWEA AG PARK, WAIAKEA, SO. HILO, HAWAII.

Item F-1-g

RAYMOND NICOLA, JR. REQUEST FOR CONSENT TO MORTGAGE, G. L. NO. S-4791, LOT 1, PAHOA AG PARK, PHASE II, KEONEPOKO IKI, PUNA, HAWAII.

Item F-1-j

BRYSON KUWAHARA REQUEST TO ASSIGN G. L. NO. S-4415 TO B. K. EXOTICS, INC. COVERING LOT 1, PAHOA AG PARK, KEONEPOKO IKI, PUNA, HAWAII.

ACTION

Mr. Higashi moved for approval of Items F-1-b, F-1-g and F-1-j as submitted. Mr. Kealoha seconded and motion carried unanimously.

Item F-1-c (See Page 22 for Action)

Item F-1-d

Item F-1-e

Item F-1-f

(See Page 20 for Action on Items F-1-d, e and f)

Item F-1-h (See Page 22 for Action)

Item F-1-i (See Page 20 for Action)

ITEM F-2

HILO BAPTIST CHAPEL REQUEST FOR RIGHT OF ENTRY FOR PLANNING PURPOSES,  
WAIAKEA, SO. HILO, HAWAII.

(See Page 8 for Action)

ITEM F-3

STAFF RECOMMENDATION FOR CANCELLATION OF G. L. NO. S-4471, KAOHE 3,  
HAMAKUA, HAWAII.

Mr. Detor explained to the board that the Lessee has paid their delinquent rental since the submittal was written and therefore asked that this submittal be withdrawn.

Mr. Higashi called to the board's attention that this was the third time this has come before the board for cancellation, and the lessee, has made payment at the very last minute.

Mr. Ono felt that there should be something in writing discouraging such a practice of riding to the very last minutes.

Technically speaking, even though they paid up, the fact that the Notice of Default time has expired, the board could go ahead and cancel the lease anyway, said Mr. Detor. However, he suggested that maybe a warning could be sent this time to the lessee saying that the lease will be cancelled whether they pay up or not once the default time runs out.

ACTION

Mr. Higashi moved for disapproval of staff's recommendation to cancel G. L. No. S-4471 but with the proviso that the lessee be notified in writing that, hereafter, whether they pay in full or not, said lease will be cancelled should the default time run out. Mr. Kealoha seconded and motion carried unanimously.

ITEM F-4

COUNTY OF HAWAII REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF LEASE TO VOLCANO COMMUNITY  
ASSOCIATION, OLAA, PUNA, HAWAII.

ACTION

Unanimously approved under the terms and conditions listed in the submittal. (Ing/Kealoha)

ITEM F-5

GEORGE MARTIN APPLICATION TO PURCHASE REMNANT PARCEL R-10, NO. HILO,  
HAWAII.

ACTION

Finding the subject highway parcel to be physically unsuitable for development as a separate unit because of its size and shape and is a remnant by definition, the board, upon motion by Mr. Ing and a second by Mr. Kealoha, unanimously approved the sale of the subject remnant under the terms and conditions listed in the submittal.

ITEM F-6

STAFF RECOMMENDATION FOR ISSUANCE OF EXECUTIVE ORDER'S WITHDRAWING  
LAND FROM THE WEST MAUI AND KOOLAU FOREST RESERVES AND RESET ASIDE AS  
WEST MAUI AND HANAWI NATURAL AREA RESOURCES, MAUI.

(See Page 20 for Action)

- ITEM F-7 RICHARD DAN APPLICATION TO PURCHASE ACCESS EASEMENT AT KANAHENA-NAU HONUOLA, MAKAWAO, MAUI.  
 (See Page 21 for Action)
- ITEM F-8 HAWAII HOUSING AUTHORITY REQUEST FOR RIGHT OF ENTRY TO CONDUCT FEASIBILITY STUDY, WAKIU & KAWAIPAPA, HANA, MAUI.  
 (See Page 21 for Action)
- ITEM F-9 EDWIN T. IGE, JR., ET AL, REQUEST FOR RIGHT OF ENTRY FOR CLEARING, GRADING, LANDSCAPING, AND MAINTENANCE PURPOSES, KIHEI, MAUI.  
 (See Page 21 for Action)
- ITEM F-10 DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION REQUEST FOR AUTHORIZATION TO DISPOSE OF HIGHWAY REMNANTS, MAUI.  
 (See Page 21 for Action)
- ITEM F-11 STAFF RECOMMENDATION FOR APPROVAL OF EXTENSION OF SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT COVERING STATE USE OF PORTION OF THE WAIANAE-KAI MILITARY RESERVATION, WAIANAE, OAHU.  
 ACTION Unanimously approved as submitted. (Ing/Higashi)
- ITEM F-12 NATIONAL VOLLEYBALL ASSOCIATION REQUEST FOR AMENDMENT OF PREVIOUS BOARD ACTION (2/10/84, AGENDA ITEM F-10) AUTHORIZING RIGHT OF ENTRY FOR VOLLEYBALL TOURNAMENT AT FORT DERUSSY BEACH, HONOLULU, OAHU.  
 ACTION The board voted unanimously to amend its action of February 10, 1984 under agenda Item F-10 by authorizing the change in commencement time of the tournament from 1:00 p.m. to 10:00 a.m. on Friday, July 13, 1984. (Ing/Kealoha)  
 Mr. Ono asked that Mr. Detor check with the Military on this request for change of time.
- ITEM F-13 DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF RENEWAL OF LICENSE COVERING USE OF NAVY PARKING LOT FOR LEHUA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL, PEARL CITY, OAHU.  
 Use of this parking lot by DOE expired on March 31, 1984 and they have requested a continued use of the area for the period April 1, 1984 to March 31, 1989.  
 ACTION Mr. Ing moved that the board approve of and execute Navy License No. N6274284RP00027, which would allow the DOE continued use of the parking lot for the period April 1, 1984 to March 31, 1989. Motion carried unanimously with a second by Mr. Kealoha.
- ITEM F-14 VFW APPLICATION TO LEASE STATE LAND AT WAIKIKI, HONOLULU, OAHU (BRIEFING).  
 ACTION Deferred. Inasmuch as today's board agenda was pretty heavy, the VFW thought it best to come in at another time to brief the board on their plans.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION FOR AMENDMENT OF PREVIOUS BOARD ACTIONS AUTHORIZING GRANT OF SEWER EASEMENTS TO THE CITY AND COUNTY OF HONOLULU, WAIMANALO, OAHU.

---

ITEM F-15

ACTION

Upon motion by Mr. Ing and a second by Mr. Kealoha, the board voted unanimously to amend its actions of July 8, 1983 and January 27, 1984 under agenda items F-8, by deleting the waiver of relocation clause provision and inserting in lieu thereof, the following: "The standard relocation clause." All other terms and conditions of the foregoing Board actions of July 8, 1983 and January 27, 1984 under agenda items F-8 shall remain unchanged.

ITEM F-16

JOHNNY CASTILLO REQUEST FOR HOLDOVER TENANCY, G. L. NO. S-3783, LOT 1, WAIMANALO AG SUBDIVISION, WAIMANALO, OAHU.

---

ACTION

The board unanimously approved a one (1) year holdover of G. L. No. S-3783 at the new lease rental described in the submittal.  
(Ing/Kealoha)

ITEM F-17

DAVID YOUNG APPLICATION TO PURCHASE HIGHWAY REMNANT, HONOLULU, OAHU.

---

ACTION

Finding the subject highway parcel to be physically unsuitable for development as a separate unit because of its size and shape and is a remnant by definition, the board, upon motion by Mr. Ing and a second by Mr. Kealoha, voted unanimously to approve the sale of the subject remnant under the terms and conditions listed in the submittal.

ITEM F-18

FRANK HATA APPLICATION TO PURCHASE ABANDONED PORTION OF CALIFORNIA AVENUE, WAHIAWA, OAHU.

---

Mr. Detor pointed out on a map the area owned by Frank Hata, and the area set aside to DOE. They have declared an area which they use for parking as surplus so what is being suggested is to pull said area out of the executive order and then sell as a remnant, together with the road remnant shown on the map, to the abutting owners.

Mr. Detor said that the City had talked at one time about widening the road. However, in checking with the City they said that the earliest would be seven years before they would need that land for road widening purposes. Staff is recommending therefore that DLNR go ahead with the sale but put a proviso that if the City should need it they can re-purchase at the same price that he pays for it now -- rather than pay at an increased price in the future, should such price escalate.

Mr. Higashi asked whether the proviso would have a time limit.

Mr. Detor thought it to be a good idea since it does seem unfair to make it forever. Mr. Detor said that they have checked with the City several times and they don't know when they would need the area. They said that the earliest would be seven years.

Mr. Ing suggested giving them ten years.

ACTION

Deferred, for further study.

ITEM F-19

MIYOSHI OTANI APPLICATION TO PURCHASE HIGHWAY REMNANT, AIEA, EWA, OAHU.

---

ACTION

Finding the subject highway parcel to be physically unsuitable for development as a separate unit because of its size and shape and is a remnant by definition, the board, upon motion by Mr. Ing and a second by Mr. Higashi, unanimously approved the sale of the subject remnant under the terms and conditions listed in the submittal.

- ITEM F-20      TRANQUILINO ALONZO REQUEST FOR CONTINUATION OF TENANCY, KAHANA VALLEY, OAHU.
- (See Page 2 for Action)
- ITEM F-21      JOHN MAINAAUPO REQUEST FOR CONTINUATION OF TENANCY, KAHANA VALLEY, OAHU.
- ITEM F-22      WALTER Y. K. KIM REQUEST FOR CONTINUATION OF TENANCY, KAHANA VALLEY, OAHU.
- ITEM F-23      E. C. LAMBERT & L. D. LEARY REQUEST FOR CONTINUATION OF TENANCY, KAHANA VALLEY, OAHU.
- (See Page 2 for Action Items F-21, F-22, & F-23.)
- ITEM F-24      STAFF RECOMMENDATION FOR AMENDMENT OF PREVIOUS BOARD ACTION AUTHORIZING AND RECOMMENDING ISSUANCE OF AN EXECUTIVE ORDER SETTING ASIDE LAND FOR STATE PARK PURPOSES, KAHALA HEIGHTS, HONOLULU, OAHU.
- The Division of State Parks has indicated that the land in question has no State Park value and should be used as a county park and/or some other non-recreation purpose.
- ACTION      The board voted unanimously to amend its action of August 27, 1976, under agenda Item F-25, by rescinding Paragraph 3 under RECOMMENDATION covering the foregoing "submittal of a recommendation to the Governor to set aside the subject area to the Department of Land and Natural Resources for a State Park." (Ing/Higashi)
- ITEM F-25      CALVIN MANN APPLICATION TO PURCHASE HIGHWAY REMNANT, EWA, OAHU.
- ACTION      Finding the subject highway parcel to be physically unsuitable for development as a separate unit because of its size and shape and is a remnant by definition, the board, upon motion by Mr. Ing and a second by Mr. Higashi, unanimously approved the sale of the subject remnant under the terms and conditions listed in the submittal.
- ITEM F-26      STAFF RECOMMENDATION FOR AMENDMENT OF PREVIOUS BOARD ACTION AUTHORIZING DISPOSITION OF LEASES IN THE WAIMANALO AG. PARK, WAIMANALO, OAHU.
- ACTION      Mr. Ing moved, Mr. Higashi seconded and the board unanimously approved the proposed aquaculture use in Lot 10, Waimanalo Agricultural Park, Phase I, by amending the definition of "diversified agriculture" contained in the December 2, 1983 action (Item F-12) to read as follows:
- The term "diversified agriculture" shall mean the conduct of activities concerned with the production and marketing or horticultural crops such as vegetables, orchard, flowers, foliage, melons and others including such other activities related thereto. The definition shall also include "aquaculture" when applied to Lot 10 only. Livestock operations are excluded.
- ITEM F-27      SISTERS OF THE SACRED HEARTS APPLICATION TO PURCHASE HIGHWAY REMNANT PARCEL, FAP NO. I-H-1(26), HONOLULU, OAHU.
- ACTION      Finding the subject highway parcel to be physically unsuitable for development as a separate unit because of its size and shape and is a remnant by definition, the board, upon motion by Mr. Ing and a second by Mr. Higashi, unanimously approved the sale of the subject remnant under the terms and conditions listed in the submittal.



- ITEM F-28      HAWAII HOUSING AUTHORITY APPLICATION TO PURCHASE HIGHWAY REMNANT R-3 OF THE INTERSTATE HIGHWAY FAP NO. I-H-1-1(93), HONOLULU, OAHU.
- ACTION      Finding the subject highway parcel to be physically unsuitable for development as a separate unit because of its size and shape and a remnant by definition, the board, upon motion by Mr. Ing and a second by Mr. Kealoha, unanimously approved the sale of the subject remnant under the terms and conditions listed in the submittal.
- ITEM F-29      STAFF RECOMMENDATION FOR AMENDMENT OF PREVIOUS BOARD ACTION (4/8/83, AGENDA ITEM F-10) AUTHORIZING SALE OF A LEASE COVERING LAND AT HANAPEPE, KAUAI.
- (See Page 22 for Action)
- ITEM F-30      DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION REQUEST FOR EXECUTIVE ORDER SETTING ASIDE LAND AT HANAMAULU, LIHUE, KAUAI.
- (See Page 23 for Action)
- ITEM F-31      STAFF RECOMMENDATION FOR REDUCTION IN UPSET PRICES OF THREE HOUSELOTS AND IMPROVEMENTS IN THE KEKAHA GARDENS SUBDIVISION, KEKAHA, KAUAI.
- (See Page 23 for Action)
- ITEM F-32      MANUAL VASQUES APPLICATION TO PURCHASE ABANDONED DITCH RIGHT OF WAY, KAPAA, KAUAI.
- (See Page 23 for Action)
- ITEM F-33      RESUBMITTAL - SMITH'S MOTOR BOAT SERVICE, INC. APPLICATION TO LEASE LOT 21 OF THE WAILUA RICE & KULA LOTS, WAILUA, KAUAI.
- (See Page 18 for Action)
- ITEM F-34      STAFF RECOMMENDATION FOR AMENDMENT OF PREVIOUS BOARD ACTION (9/25/81, AGENDA ITEM F-18) AUTHORIZING SALE OF A PASTURE LEASE COVERING PORTIONS HANAPEPE VALLEY, HANAPEPE, KAUAI.
- (See Page 23 for Action)
- ITEM F-35      WILLIAM KIMO FERNANDES & LEHUA FERNANDES-SALLING APPLICATION FOR EASEMENT, WAILUA RICE & KULA LOTS, KAWAIHAU, PUNA, KAUAI.
- (See Page 23 for Action)
- ITEM F-36      WILLIAM KIMO FERNANDES & LEHUA FERNANDES-SALLING APPLICATION FOR EASEMENT, WAILUA RICE & KULA LOTS, KAWAIHAU, PUNA, HAWAII.
- (See Page 24 for Action)
- ITEM F-37      DEPARTMENT OF LABOR AND INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS REQUEST FOR ACQUISITION OF SUBLEASE COVERING SUITE 201-212, KING-MCKINLEY BLDG., HONOLULU, OAHU.
- ACTION      Unanimously approved as submitted, subject to the review and approval of the sublease agreement by the Office of the Attorney General.  
(Ing/Kealoha)
- ITEM F-38      DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION REQUEST FOR ACQUISITION OF LEASE COVERING A WAREHOUSE AT 1050 KIKOWAENA PLACE, HONOLULU, OAHU.
- (See Page 18 for Action)

- ITEM F-39 DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF RENEWAL OF LEASE COVERING ROOMS 102 THROUGH 121 and ROOMS M-123 THROUGH M-145 IN THE J. WALTER CAMERON CENTER, WAILUKU, MAUI.
- 
- (See Page 21 for Action)
- ITEM F-40 DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES REQUEST FOR ACQUISITION OF LEASE COVERING OFFICE SPACE IN THE KAPAA SHOPPING CENTER, KAPAA, KAUAI.
- 
- (See Page 24 for Action)
- ITEM F-41 DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF AMENDMENT OF SUBLEASE COVERING SPACE IN THE FORMER SAINT AUGUSTINE SCHOOL SITE, HONOLULU, OAHU.
- 
- ACTION The Board unanimously approved DOH's request to amend its present sublease agreement dated February 23, 1983 as mentioned in the submittal with Waikiki Community Center effective December 1, 1983, subject to the review and approval of the sublease agreement by the Office of the Attorney General. (Ing/Higashi)
- ITEM F-42 DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF OFFICE SPACE FOR THE OFFICE OF LIBRARY SERVICES LOCATED IN THE SALT LAKE SHOPPING CENTER.
- 
- (See Page 18 for Action)
- ITEM F-43 HAWAIIAN TELEPHONE CO. & MAUI ELECTRIC CO., LTE. APPLICATION FOR RIGHT OF ENTRY AND EASEMENT AT OLINDA, MAKAWAO, MAUI.
- 
- (See Page 2 for Action)
- ITEM F-44 OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL REQUEST FOR GRANT OF RIGHT OF ENTRY TO STATE LAND AT WAIAHA 2, NO. KONA, HAWAII.
- 
- (See Pages 19 & 20 for Action)
- ITEM H-1 CDUA FOR RENOVATION OF UPPER HAMAKUA DITCH AND CONSTRUCTION OF THREE ACCESS ROADS AT THE KOHALA FOREST RESERVE, HAWAII.
- 
- ACTION The board unanimously approved the application for the subject renovation subject to those conditions listed in the submittal with the exception of Condition No. 2, which is to be deleted.
- ITEM H-2 CDUA FOR SUBDIVISION OF AN OCEAN FRONT LOT AND MINOR CLEARING OF SIX EXISTING ACCESSES AT KALUA KOI, MOLOKAI (KALUA KOI CORPORATION.)
- 
- (See Page 17 for Action)
- ITEM H-3 CDUA FOR A COMMERCIAL PICNIC TOUR OF KAHAKAAULANA ISLAND (HARRIS ISLAND) AT KEEHI LAGOON, OAHU (DAN'S DIVE SHOP, INC.)
- 
- Mr. Evans said that there were no negative input at the public hearing nor from the Divisions. However, there was concern about trash and liquor on the island, so condition No. 12 states that no liquor shall be served on board the catamaran if the tour group is allowed onto the island and no liquor shall be served on the island.
- Mr. Ing said that although the condition reads that no liquor shall be served on the island, it does not say anything about liquor being consumed, so what happens if they bring their own liquor?
- Mr. Evans remarked that he understood what Mr. Ing meant.

Rather than given this land use indefinite status, Mr. Evans said that staff is recommending that only one year be allowed. In the meantime could take a look at how they have been operating and conducting themselves and, at the end of the year, have an evaluation and then decide whether this venture should be extended.

ACTION

Mr. Ing moved for approval with the amendment that the applicant will provide insurance in the minimal amounts of \$500,000.00 and, subject also, to those terms and conditions listed in the submittal. Motion carried unanimously with a second by Mr. Higashi.

Mr. Ono asked that the minutes reflect that the disposition question has to be addressed by the Department of Transportation. The way it's worded now, he still was not sure that this was covered.

ITEM H-4

VIOLATION OF FILM PERMIT CD-84-161

(See Page 12 for Action)

ITEM H-5

CDUA FOR AN AFTER-THE-FACT BOAT PIER AT KANEOHE BAY, OAHU, TMK 4-5-47:120 OFFSHORE (DR. EDWIN TASAKI).

ITEM H-6

CDUA FOR AN AFTER-THE-FACT BOAT PIER AT KANEOHE BAY, OAHU, TMK 4-5--58L:21 OFFSHORE (SOLOMON S.W.K. KAU)

(Action for Items H-5 & H-5 shown after Item H-10)

ITEM H-7

CDUA FOR AN AFTER-THE-FACT BOAT PIER ART KANEOHE BAY, OAHU, TMK 4-5-58:39 OFFSHORE (DR. ROY KUBOYAMA).

(See Page 8 for Action)

ITEM H-8

CDUA FOR AN AFTER-THE-FACT BOAT PIER AT KANEOHE BAY, OAHU, TMK 4-4-14:53 OFFSHORE (CHARLES T. SUETSUGU).

ITEM H-9

CDUA FOR AN AFTER-THE-FACT BOAT PIER AT KANEOHE BAY, OAHU, TMK 4-6-022:022 OFFSHORE (FRANK E. CECCARELLI).

ITEM H-10

CDUA FOR AN AFTER-THE-FACT BOAT PIER AT KANEOHE BAY, OAHU, TMK 4-5-047:053 OFFSHORE (KENNETH T. TABE).

ACTION

Mr. Kealoha moved for approval of Item Nos. H-5, H-6, H-8, H-9 & H-10 as recommended by staff. Motion carried unanimously with a second by Mr. Higashi.

Mr. Kealoha stated that he still had reservations about the sign.

ITEM H-11

FILLING OF POSITION NO. 13086, ACCOUNTANT IV, ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES, OAHU.

ACTION

The board unanimously approved the appointment of Mr. Dennis I. Takahashi to Position No. 13086, Accountant IV, SR 21B, \$1,635.00. (Ing/Higashi)

ITEM I-1

APPOINTMENT OF VOLUNTEER HUNTER SAFETY INSTRUCTORS, OAHU, MAUI, HAWAII, AND KAUAI.

(See Page 24 for Action)

- ITEM I-2 FILLING OF POSITION NO. 02959, CONSERVATION AND RESOURCES ENFORCEMENT OFFICER V, MAUI.  
 (See Page 24 for Action)
- ITEM J-1 MODIFICATION NO. 1 TO LEASE NO. DOT-A-83-23, HONOLULU INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT, OAHU (FAA).  
 ACTION Unanimously approved as submitted. (Ing/Higashi)
- ITEM J-2 LEASE HOLDOVER, LEASE NO. DOT-A-81-20, LIHUE AIRPORT, KAUAI (KAUAI AIRPORT TAXI ASSOC., INC. (KATA)).  
 (See Page 25 for Action)
- ITEM J-3 APPLICATION FOR ISSUANCE OF REVOCABLE PERMIT'S 3823, ETC., AIRPORTS DIVISION.  
 (See Page 22 for Action)
- ITEM J-4 RENEWAL OF REVOCABLE PERMIT'S 3018, ETC., CONFORMING USE, AIRPORTS DIVISION.  
 (See Page 22 for Action)
- ITEM J-5 REVISION OF RENTAL, RENEWAL OF REVOCABLE PERMIT'S 3160 & 3648, AIRPORTS DIVISION.  
 ACTION Unanimously approved as submitted. (Ing/Kealoha)
- ITEM J-6 RIGHT-OF-ENTRY, KAHULUI HARBOR, MAUI (CORPS OF ENGINEERSS, PACIFIC DIVISION, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY)  
 (See Page 22 for Action)
- ITEM J-7 ISSUANCE OF REVOCABLE PERMIT, HARBORS DIVISION, KEEHI LAGOON SUBDIVISION, OAHU (AQUELINO PAGALA).  
 ACTION Unanimously approved as submitted. (Ing/Higashi)
- ITEM J-8 ISSUANCE OF REVOCABLE PERMIT, HARBORS DIVISION, PIER 18 SHED, HONOLULU, OAHU (SIN HUNG CORP., C/O UNITED FISHING AGENCY).  
 ACTION Unanimously approved as submitted. (Ing/Higashi)
- ITEM J-9 ISSUANCE OF REVOCABLE PERMIT, HARBORS DIVISION, KEWALO BASIN, HONOLULU, OAHU (WAIKIKI MARINE SALES, INC.).  
 Mr. Vincent requested that the rental shown in the submittal be changed from \$13.00 to \$17.00.  
 ACTION Unanimously approved with the above amendment. (Ing/Higashi)
- ITEM J-10 ISSUANCE OF REVOCABLE PERMIT, HARBORS DIVISION, PIER 40, HONOLULU HARBOR, OAHU (SHELL OIL CO.).  
 ACTION Unanimously approved as submitted. (Ing/Higashi)
- ITEM J-11 ISSUANCE OF REVOCABLE PERMIT, HARBORS DIVISION, PIER 40 SHED, HONOLULU OAHU (JOHN A. KAUFFMAN).  
 ACTION Unanimously approved as submitted. (Ing/Higashi)

- ITEM J-12 ISSUANCE OF REVOCABLE PERMIT, HARBORS DIVISION, NAWILIWILI HARBOR, KAUAI (LINDA BAIL, DBA BUBBLES BELOW DIVING CHARTERS: ARDEL NO. DEPPE: JOHN TEXEIRA; DON & ANN MOSES, DBA LADY ANN CHARTERS).
- (See Page 25 for Action)
- ITEM J-13 CONTINUANCE OF REVOCABLE PERMIT'S, HIGHWAYS DIVISION.
- ACTION Unanimously approved as submitted. (Higashi/Kealoha).
- ITEM J-14 CONSENT TO ASSIGNMENT OF LEASE, HARBOR LEASE NO. H-70-14, HARBORS DIVISION, KEEHI LAGOON, OAHU (AMFAC MARINE SUPPLY, INC. TO KEEHI MARINE CENTER, A HAWAII LIMITED PARTNERSHIP).
- ITEM J-15 APPROVAL OF CONSENT TO ASSIGNMENT OF LICENSE NOS. 26 AND 114, HARBORS DIVISION, KEWALO BASIN, OAHU (AMFAC MARINE SUPPLY, INC.).
- (See Page 25 for Action on Items J-14 & J-15)
- ITEM J-16 APPROVAL OF CONSENT TO SUBLEASE A PORTION OF THE PREMISES OF HARBOR LEASE NO. H-70-14, KEEHI LAGOON, OAHU (KEEHI MARINE CENTER).
- ACTION Deferred for lack of quorum inasmuch as Mr. Ing was disqualified to act on this item.
- ITEM J-17 ISSUANCE OF REVOCABLE PERMIT, HARBORS DIVISION, KEWALO BASIN, OAHU (SERVCO PACIFIC, INC.).
- (See Page 24 for Action)
- ITEM J-18 ISSUANCE OF REVOCABLE PERMIT, HARBORS DIVISION, KEEHI LAGOON, OAHU (KEEHI MARINE CENTER, A HAWAII LIMITED PARTNERSHIP).
- ACTION Unanimously approved as submitted. (Kealoha/Higashi)
- ITEM J-19 APPROVAL OF CONSENT TO MORTGAGE, HARBORS DIVISION, HARBOR LEASE NO. H-70-14, KEEHI LAGOON, OAHU (KEEHI MARINE CENTER - BANK OF HAWAII).
- ACTION Unanimously approved as submitted. (Kealoha/Ing)
- ITEM J-20 REQUEST FOR SALE OF A LEASE BY PUBLIC AUCTION, HARBORS DIVISION, PIER 35, HONOLULU, OAHU.
- ACTION Unanimously approved as submitted. (Ing/Kealoha)
- ITEM J-21 ISSUANCE OF A CONTRACT FOR A RESTAURANT AND PARKING LOT, HARBORS DIVISION, KEWALO BASIN, HONOLULU, OAHU.
- ACTION Unanimously approved as submitted. (Ing/Kealoha)
- ITEM J-22 ISSUANCE OF REVOCABLE PERMIT, HARBORS DIVISION LAHAINA AND MAALAEA HARBORS, MAUI.
- (See Page 22 for Action)

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 3:15 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,



LaVerne Tirrell  
Secretary

APPROVED:



SUSUMU ONO  
Chairperson

lt