

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

DATE: November 8, 1985  
TIME: 9:00 A.M.  
PLACE: Kalanimoku Building  
Room 132, Board Room  
1150 Punchbowl Street  
Honolulu, Hawaii

ROLL  
CALL

Chairperson Susumu Ono called the meeting of the Board of Land and Natural Resources to order at 9:00 A.M. The following were in attendance:

MEMBERS

Mr. J. Douglas Ing  
Mr. Roland Higashi  
Mr. Moses W. Kealoha  
Mr. Susumu Ono

Absent & Excused

Mr. John Y. Arisumi  
Mr. Leonard Zalopany

STAFF

Mr. James Detor  
Mr. Mason Young  
Mr. Charles Gill  
Mr. Roger Evans  
Mr. Libert Landgraf  
Mr. Charles Wakida  
Mr. Takeo Fujii  
Mr. Ralston Nagata  
Mr. Richard Fassler  
Mr. Paul Kawamoto  
Mr. Bill Gorst  
Mrs. LaVerne Tirrell

OTHERS

Ms. Dona Hanaike, Deputy A.G.  
Mr. Peter Garcia, DOT  
Mr. Norman Lamb (Item F-9)  
Mr. William Stevens (Item F-12)  
Mr. George Noguchi (Item H-1)  
Messrs. Leo Williams and Guy Nakamoto (Item H-3)  
Ms. Anita Gouveia (Item H-4)  
Mrs. Healani Doane (Item E-5)  
Mr. James Wagner (Item C-3)  
Mr. Rodney Young (Item E-3)  
Ms. Dana Naone, Mrs. Alice Kuloloia,  
Mr. Eddie Chang & Mr. Leslie Kuloloia (Item F-7)  
Messrs. Carlton Ching & Harvey Hida (Item H-5)

MINUTES

Mr. Ing moved for approval of the October 11, 1985 minutes as circulated. Seconded by Mr. Kealoha, motion carried unanimously.

ITEM H-2

CDUA FOR THE GRADING AND CONSTRUCTION OF A WATER TANK, ROADWAY, PIPELINE, DRAINAGE CHANNEL AT HALAWA, OAHU.

ACTION

The board unanimously approved this request to amend the application to include the subdivision of easements as per submitted plan and to permit applicant to use a one-acre plot, adjacent to the water tank, as an alternate grading disposal site subject to the terms and conditions listed in the submittal. (Ing/Kealoha)

ITEM H-1

CDUA FOR AN AFTER-THE-FACT SEAWALL AT PUPUKEA-PAUMALU, OAHU (MICHAEL DIXON).

Mr. Evans said that this is an after-the-fact application which follows up previous action relating to the construction of a wall which occurred around the late 20's of this century. The property subsequently has been sold and the State survey indicated that the wall or portions thereof did lie on State land. As a result the board did take an action earlier and basically imposed a financial penalty on the current landowner of the property. As a part of that the board also directed the applicant to file an after-the-fact application for this seawall. The applicant did pay his financial responsibility and did file the application. Staff is here this morning as the end of the process of that application.

Mr. Ing asked, "in the action that we took in March, the penalty that was imposed, was that for encroachment?"

Mr. Evans said that the fine that was imposed was for encroachment in conservation land. There was a violation of 183-41 which was \$500.00 and also an encroachment fine of \$3500.00.

With regard to Recommendation B.3 and the amount of the appraisal of the easement, Mr. Ing said that he would like to make it clear that this is with the approval of the Chairman. He said that the board has not gone strictly by independent appraisal of the easement. In some cases it has been a term of years.

Mr. Detor said that easements can be issued directly regardless whether they are term of years or perpetual. Since they are directly issued, the law requires an independent appraisal. You can only go on a staff appraisal if it's going to auction.

Mr. Ing moved to approve 1) this after-the-fact request for a loose rock seawall at Pupukea-Paumalu, Oahu subject to the conditions listed in the submittal and, 2) the disposition, in the manner listed in the submittal. Mr. Kealoha seconded.

Mr. George Noguchi, attorney for the applicant, said that they did receive a copy of the report and wanted to commend staff for making a very thorough and irrational decision regarding this matter. However, he asked that the board also consider the fact that in the event, upon certification of the shoreline, we find that the encroachment involves square footage that possibly could be rectified by removal of the rocks, that he has this option to do so at any time without any further penalty -- of course, meeting the requirements of every governmental agency approving the removal and subsequent improvement.

Mr. Higashi said, "then you would no longer need an easement."

Mr. Noguchi said, "right."

Mr. Ono asked Mr. Evans whether, in the past, if you have cases where the applicant wanted to take corrective measures if another CDUA would be required.

Mr. Evans said, yes. Staff did have similar cases in the past and it was standard procedure that no further CDUA would be required as long as it is related to the original.

ACTION

Mr. Ing withdrew his first motion and Mr. Kealoha his second.

Mr. Ing then moved with the amendment that in the event the applicant after the shoreline survey decides that he wants to remove that portion of the wall that encroaches State land that he does have that option but that prior to doing so that he notify the Planning Office. Seconded, by Mr. Kealoha, motion carried unanimously.

ITEM H-3

CDUA FOR AN AFTER-THE-FACT SEAWALL AT KAALAEA, OAHU (LEO WILLIAMS).

Mr. Evans said that although staff has recommended an after-the-fact approval, they have also recommended that a penalty of \$500.00 be imposed basically for constructing the wall without permission of this board.

The applicant, Mr. Leo Williams, said that his intent was not to encroach on State land nor do this work without a permit. He said that he had contracted a contractor to build a fence on the sides and the frontage of the property and in that agreement he was to get the appropriate permits. In addition to that, he proceeded without getting the proper permits which Mr. Williams said was his problem and not the contractors. He said that the pilings are sitting in what was the original property. He said that he would need to get a shoreline certification so that he could apply for a variance to keep the fence on the borders of the property.

Mr. Ing asked Mr. Williams for the dates of his shoreline certification.

He said that he has two. The original one dated January 28, 1981 shows the property as being 5,634 sq. ft. and the other one which was done in 1984 shows the property to be 5,542 sq. ft. Apparently the original developer of this property had encroached on State lands and was instructed to pull back the property boundaries about 10 to 15 feet and when he did that he probably got flustered so with the extra pilings instead of putting it all the way across he only set up a seawall across part of the property and arbitrarily pushed the rest of the piling over the side and they were very unsafe. So when he had the fence built they were going to bring a back hoe in so he instructed them if they could use the backhoe to remove those pilings and they said they could but proceeded without the proper permits.

Mr. Ing asked if the work was done before or after the 1984 survey.

Mr. Williams said before. When he applied for the variance for the fence he found out that he could not have the survey certified because the shoreline had been altered.

Mr. Ing asked, "what came first, the pilings or the erosion?"

Mr. Williams felt pretty sure that the erosion came first.

Mr. Guy Nakamoto, who lives in the area, said that just recently he saw pilings that were inside the water so he requested that the board delay their decision. He would like to check this out because he feels that this wall is outside of the neighbor's wall too. It is an encroachment beyond the neighbor's boundary.

Mr. Williams said that there are other pilings in front of the neighbor's walls. But there are no other pilings in front of his property.

Mr. Kealoha asked the applicant if he would mind deferring this item.

Mr. Williams said that his problem is that the City and County has him in the prosecutor's office for the fence. He needs to apply for a variance to keep his fence and this has been happening since January of 1984.

Mr. Ono asked, "what if we take an action subject to staff looking at possible violations that may not be attributed to Mr. Williams at all?"

**ACTION**

Mr. Ing moved to approve as recommended by staff with the amendment that in the event the applicant decides to remove the encroachment from the land that he be given that option. Seconded by Mr. Kealoha, motion carried unanimously.

ITEM F-9

RESUBMITTAL - MAKANI KAI MARINA ASSOC. OF APARTMENT OWNERS REQUEST FOR AMENDMENT OF PREVIOUS BOARD ACTION (6/14/85, AGENDA ITEM F-5) AUTHORIZING SALE OF A BREAKWATER EASEMENT AT KANEOHE BAY, KANEOHE, OAHU.

Mr. Detor explained that this item was deferred at the last meeting so that staff could get a representative of the applicant to attend the meeting and answer any questions that the board may have. This had to do with a recommendation approved by the board at the June 14, 1985 meeting, at which time following up on a CDUA approval the board approved sale of an easement for breakwater at Kaneohe Bay. The proposed amendment to that particular action was to remove one of the conditions that was attendant to the first action and that was that the public shall at all times have full unrestricted use of the easement area.

Mr. Detor pointed out that the original CDUA did not have this particular condition in it. This was inserted when staff came to the board at the June 14 meeting with the easement submittal itself so they incorporated the CDUA conditions as an added condition. Now what staff is talking about is removing that particular condition and the reasons that the applicant has for asking that this be done is listed in the submittal.

Mr. Detor pointed out to the board the Marina area itself and the area that they want to fence off.

Mr. Ono asked Mr. Detor if he didn't feel that the public should have access to this area.

Mr. Young said that public access across the fee land to the breakwater is not possible because of the security gates at the entrance and the only way they were able to get out to the Marina was to call the applicant for permission to go in from the public road.

"So the seawall, at that point, deadends right into the channel", said Mr. Ing.

Mr. Kealoha asked, "how does the public get to the seawall now?"

Mr. Young said that they would have to go through the fee property or from the ocean.

Mr. Ono asked, "if that portion is sealed off from the public, would the rental increase?"

Mr. Detor was not sure because this would call for an independent appraisal.

Mr. Kealoha asked, "when one asks to waiver that so-called public use, or restricting the public use, doesn't that then become an exclusive easement?"

Mr. Detor said not necessarily. It could still be a non-exclusive easement. Saying non-exclusive does not mean that anyone can go there. What it means is that the State retains the right to sell another easement over the very same course.

Mr. Kealoha said that as it stands now, anyone wanting to get to the water's edge cannot get there.

Mr. Detor said that as a practical matter it would be kind of hard to get there anyway unless they are able to come in from the ocean or go through the property which has a locked gate.

Mr. Ono then asked, "why this request?"

Mr. Detor said that they are being sued right now by somebody who fell off and, secondly, they want to be sure that they have a right to keep people off of there. The way it was worded initially, which was not consistent with the CDUA, was that the public would have the right to use the wall. Staff normally just follow the CDUA requirement. However, this time they added the condition in.

Mr. Kealoha said that if this condition had not been included at the time the board took action he is not sure whether he would have voted for this easement.

Mr. Ono asked whether we had other situations where the State's policy is to allow public access e.g. piers. He wanted to know the difference here.

Mr. Detor said that the law requires, for swimming and bathing piers, that signs be posted and the public have access. There are not such legal requirements for boat piers. However, the board has at times imposed this.

Mr. Norman Lamb, representing Makani Kai, said that access from the water would be quite hazardous because of the large boulders and a drop of about 10 feet.

Mr. Detor asked if the wall they plan to construct would be on top of the seawall.

Mr. Lamb said that if the board so desires they would put a fence across that area that demarks the State property from their own private property. Mr. Lamb said that they already have a fence that will not allow access to the seawall from their property.

Mr. Ing asked if the wall was put in before or after they had an incident where someone jumped from the wall.

Mr. Lamb said that it was put in afterwards at the request of the insurance company.

Mr. Kealoha asked what would happen if they did not have the seawall.

Mr. Lamb said that they do have quite a bit of wave action that comes into the Marina itself and they feel that it does help the desalting problem.

Mr. Kealoha asked if that was the reason for applying to build the seawall.

Mr. Lamb said that they did not apply to build a seawall. The wall was already there when the Association took over the property. They think that the developer put that in sometime in the mid 70's. They just inherited the problems.

From a public access point of view, said Mr. Ing, the only way they can get to that section of the seawall is to come from the ocean.

Mr. Lamb said yes.

Mr. Ing said that under the circumstances of this particular request, he has no problem with removing that condition. Depending on what the individual situation was he knows that the board's policy has always required it but in this particular situation he does not see a need to have that access -- particularly in light of the dangerous situation. He feels that perhaps the value of the easement should be reevaluated.

ACTION

Mr. Ing moved that the submittal be approved with a subsequent condition that the value of the easement be reevaluated.

Mr. Kealoha asked if the State would still be held harmless with the removal of the condition.

Mr. Detor said yes.

Mr. Kealoha seconded, motion carried unanimously.

ITEM H-4

RESUBMITTAL OF VIOLATION OF LAND USE WITHIN CONSERVATION DISTRICT AT IOLEKAA VALLEY, HAIKU, OAHU (ANITA GOUVEIA).

Mr. Evans said that this item had been deferred at an earlier meeting at the request of the parties involved in order that they might have time to do their own ground survey of the area. The board also instructed staff to return the matter to the board within sixty days which they are now doing.

Mr. Ono said that he thought there was another request for deferral.

Mr. Evans said that he was not aware of another request for deferral.

Mr. Ono thought that Mr. Heen had requested more time.

Mr. Evans was of the impression that Mr. Heen was going to be at this morning's meeting.

Mrs. Gouveia, because of problems in getting legal aid and in obtaining their own surveyor, asked that the board defer this item. She said that they did have a surveyor come out but all he did was confirm the State's survey so they would like to have another surveyor come out to do a thorough survey. She said that this would involve some money which she has not been able to obtain.

Mr. Kealoha asked how much time she would need.

Mrs. Gouveia said another month or until the next meeting to be held on Oahu.

Mr. Ono did not want to defer this item for an indefinite period of time. He said that staff was asked to come back to the board within sixty days, which they did, and he is willing to o.k. a reasonable request but not keep it open-ended.

Mrs. Gouveia asked if she could read her letter to the board. However, Mr. Ono asked that the letter just be submitted for the record.

Mrs. Gouveia then asked for a sixty day extension.

Mr. Ono wanted Mrs. Gouveia to understand that if the next meeting closest to the sixty days happens to be on another island that she and/or her representative would have to go to that island.

Mrs. Gouveia said that she understood this.

ACTION

Mr. Kealoha moved to defer this item for sixty days from November 8, 1985. Seconded by Mr. Ing, motion carried unanimously.

RESUBMITTAL OF CDUA FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF A WATER SYSTEM AND CONSTRUCTION OF ROADWAY IMPROVEMENTS FOR THE WAIAHOLE AGRICULTURAL PARK AT WAIAHOLE, OAHU (MR. HARVEY HIDA).

Mr. Evans said that the board had deferred this item at an earlier meeting. Specific questions were raised at that meeting. The board was concerned about the extraction of water from the point 0.8 mgd well. Mr. Evans said that they did have a chance to review this with the Division of Water and Land Development who have indicated that, in their view, there would not be any damage done by withdrawing this amount of water from the well. However, DOWALD does propose for the board's consideration, should this application be approved, the following three conditions as insurance on the well:

1. Pumping data be maintained by the applicant and monthly pumpage reports be submitted to the Department.
2. A DLNR approved stream monitoring system be installed by the applicant and data be gathered for at least three years after pumping begins and that the data be submitted to the Department monthly.
3. If any of the Department's natural resource concerns in the Conservation District are affected in the future by the pumpage of the two proposed Waiahole wells, the applicant be required to pump a quantity as determined by the Department.

With the above conditions, Mr. Evans said that staff recommends approval.

Mr. Evans brought also to the Board's attention a letter received from the Waiahole/Waikane community association in which they have had an opportunity to review the basic plan of the Housing Authority and they are in agreement that the board consider approval of this matter.

Mr. Ing said that when this was deferred staff was asked to contact the Waiahole/Waikane people.

Mr. Evans said that they did, through the HHA.

Mr. Ing asked, "who was contacted?"

Mr. Evans said Mr. Ching and they in turn contacted the Board of Water Supply as well as the community association.

Mr. Ono said that he did not understand the meaning of proposed Condition No. 3.

Mr. Evans said that basically what Condition No. 3 means is that the board can control the amount of water being pumped. Based upon the criteria of any deliterious affect on any of our programs.

Mr. Ono said that he still didn't understand what it meant.

Mr. Evans said that it means that with this approval of 0.8 mgd a day if that does pose a negative effect on our department's concerns and our function areas that the department could require that a lesser pumpage per day occur.

Mr. Ono asked whether that condition could not be worded in a more direct fashion. If we pump from a well and the nearby stream gets affected (there is a reduced flow) then the pumping be stopped or modified. Mr. Ono asked if these similar conditions were not imposed with the Board of Water Supply request.

Mr. Evans said yes. They asked the Division of Water and Land Development to see what they do with applications that the Board of Water Supply is involved with. They did look at what they do with the Board of Water Supply applications and all things considered they felt that this would be an equivalent of what the board puts on for the Board of Water Supply.

Mr. Ono said that the conditions imposed on the Board of Water Supply are more direct and to the point.

Mr. Ing asked, "what if we modify it to read that the department reserves the right to reduce the withdrawal from the well if the stream flow is affected by that withdrawal?"

Mr. Kealoha felt that we could approve now and come up with the conditions later.

Mr. Evans said that they do have for the board's consideration Condition No. 8 which does provide the board, through it's Chairman, to develop any specific language along this line which the board may desire to have put in.

Mr. Ono felt that all of the conditions should be spelled out specifically so that there would be no misunderstanding once the well is in place and the pumping starts.

ACTION

Mr. Ing moved for approval with the following amendments:

1. Pumping data be maintained by the applicant and monthly pumpage reports be submitted to the department.
2. A DLNR approved stream monitoring system be installed by the applicant and data be gathered for at least three years after pumping begins and that the data be submitted to the department monthly.
3. That the department reserves the right to reduce the withdrawal from the well if that withdrawal materially affects the stream flow.

Mr. Higashi seconded.

Mr. Ono asked for clarification. You say that the department has the right to reduce. Is it possible that the department may not necessarily reduce? He was trying to get whether the department shall reduce it or leave it optional.

Mr. Ing said that he would like to leave it optional. In other words, we will have the right to do it, but not necessarily will do it.

Mr. Kealoha asked if we were still dealing with the 0.8 mgd and the 1.1 mgd. He said that his problem is trying to address the amounts to be withdrawn per day. Do we go below the 1.1 or the 0.8 mgd.

Mr. Evans said that we are only asking for 0.8 mgd. The 1.1 mgd was a previous lease. The board's approval is for 0.8 mgd with the possibility that it could be lowered in the future.

Mr. Ono asked if the Board of Water Supply condition which the board has put in place mandates the board to reduce pumpage or is it optional.

Mr. Evans did not know.

Mr. Ono said that his preference would be to keep it mandatory. If there is a material effect on the stream flow that the department reduce pumpage. If that is the way we have been doing it with the Board of Water Supply he felt that we should be applying the same standards to ourselves.



Mr. Evans said that staff could check the language on that to insure that the language in this particular amended condition is consistent.

Mr. Ing said, "the amendment is subject to the clarification or consistent with the standard board language for the Board of Water Supply."

Mr. Higashi seconded.

Mr. Hida said that the 0.8 mgd that they are planning to withdraw from the well is less than the 1.1 mgd that the Waiahole Water Co. used to withdraw.

Mr. Ono said, "then the condition the board is attaching should not bother anybody."

Mr. Ono called for a vote. Motion carried unanimously.

ITEM E-4

AMENDMENT TO CONTRACT NO. 18016 WITH SEA GRANT EXTENSION SERVICES CONCERNING THE PLANNING OF KAKAAKO WATERFRONT PARK, HONOLULU, OAHU.

ACTION

Mr. Ing moved to authorize the Chairman and a member of the Board to execute an amendment to Contract No. 18016 for the extra work as being requested for an additional fee of \$30,000, subject to the approval of the Attorney General and the release of required funds by the Governor. Seconded by Mr. Kealoha, motion carried unanimously.

ITEM F-7

RESUBMITTAL - COUNTY OF MAUI REQUEST FOR QUITCLAIM OF PORTION OF MAKENA-KEONEOIO GOVERNMENT ROAD, MOOLOA, HONUULA, MAKAWAO, MAUI.

Mr. Detor said that this item was deferred at the last meeting to determine if the litigation pending on this would have any effect. Mr. Detor said that he did check with the attorney general's office and they say there is no problem. However, he brought to the board's attention that just the day before yesterday they received from the Hui Alanui O Makena a request for a contested case hearing involving this particular quitclaim by the board.

Mr. Ono said that they would take this under advisement and refer it to the Attorney General's Office for review.

Recess

The board recessed at 10:00 a.m. for five minutes at the request of Mr. Kealoha.

Reconvene

Mr. Ono called the meeting back to order at 10:05 a.m.

Mr. Kealoha declared himself in conflict of this issue and asked that he be removed from any discussion on this matter.

The Chair determined that Mr. Kealoha did indeed have a conflict and, with that declaration they really did not have a quorum to act on the substance of the submittal but what they would like to do is have whoever would like to make comments on this particular item to give them an opportunity to comment because the next time this is taken up they do not know which island it will be on so this would be a good opportunity to at least have people who might have interest in this case have their say.

Mr. Leslie Kuloloia said that there were four of them from Makena, Maui and requested permission for all four to speak.

Ms. Dana Naone said that when this item was taken up at the last meeting on Maui they did not realize that this was on the agenda.

Ms. Naone said that when the litigation first started the reason they had asked for a contested case hearing on the initial approval of the exchange of State lands with Seibu was that the roadway at that time was included in the

exchange package. Since that time it has been determined that the County owns interest in it and the reason they are appearing before the board today is because they feel that the State is still involved with the exchange of the roadway since the State will become the whole fee holder of Seibu's 8.7-acre at One'loa.

Ms. Naone said that they have never really had a chance to talk about how important this road is not just as an archaeological site but as a deep cultural importance to the Hawaiian community in Makena and this is what each one of them would very briefly like to present to the board today. She pointed out that although it seems that this portion of the road is very small (1,100 feet), one of the reasons that it is this particular length is because that road is framed by two private parcels owned by George Ferreira, who is also a plaintiff in this suit. If Mr. Ferreira's place was not there and Seibu was the owner in either direction it might very well have been extended.

Ms. Naone said that the building of the new Makena-Alanui Road, which is about 800 to 1000 feet mauka of the existing shoreline road, would push everyone consistently farther off the coast. So far in a 2.6 mile distance only five access or connector roads have been proposed between the top road and the coastline itself so they are very concerned because they have seen these kinds of things happen in Kaanapali and then Wailea also looped the road around its resort and the effect has been that people have had a much more difficult time getting to the beach and it has come to be known among some people as technical access as opposed to the kind of access that the public really can enjoy. The Makena Road, in two points, and also the Ulupalakua-Makena Road which used to connect the whole Kanaio-Ulupalakua District to Makena is proposed for closure. So what we see here is the whole restructuring of the use of the Makena area through closure of the old roads and the building of new roads and they see this as moving the public really off the coast line.

Mr. Ing said, "under the County's proposal, is any access going to be allowed through the area in which that road went or is it going to be cut off on both ends?"

Ms. Naone said that it would be cut off at both ends. In the SMA Permit awarded to Seibu one of the conditions of that permit is that they provide beach access at Makena Landing which is considerably farther down from their resort and one access at Naupaka Beach where the road runs along. It runs right along the Naupaka Beach. The reason they are so sure that this road is both the pre-historic Piilani Road and the Makena Road and that it runs in the same place and is the same body of road and provides the same right of way that is being provided for the public for 100 years is because of the landmarks in the area. She pointed out Makena Church which was founded in 1832 so the road runs very close to the church and still runs there today. Kalani Heiau which is also shown is located on the Kihei end of the cul-de-sac above Mr. Ferreira's property. From archaeological studies it seems pretty clear that would be where a heiau was. So with those two visible, on-the-ground markers, they feel quite certain that the road did run in exactly that alignment. It is critical to their argument that it is not only of historical and archaeological importance but of great cultural importance.

Mr. Eddie Chang believed the Makena-Seibu road to have been built in the late 1700's. The County did not come in until World War I and they now want to claim the road which he feels belong to the people of Maui and not the County. Mr. Chang said that if the road is closed they will have no access to the beach for fishing.

Insofar as the Ulupalakua Road, Mr. Chang said that this was built a long time ago. People from Kula used the road to pick their freight up in the 1800's. When this road was closed by the County there was no notice to the public.

Mr. Chang remarked that the County of Maui has a habit of closing roads. They closed the road at Wailea and they are now talking about closing the road to Polo Beach and this road was also used a long time ago. Mr. Chang said that he used to go there with his grandparents every Saturday to pick up poi. The County never ever took care of that road so they had to use the trail. It wasn't until World War II that the army put in the road.

Mrs. Alice Kuloloia, who has an interest in property at Makena, said that they have no objection to Seibu coming in and having their hotel but they object to the way things have been done. They are concerned and feel that some of the things that have been going on have been wrong. Mrs. Kuloloia went on to express her feelings about the road being quitclaimed to Seibu. She did not feel that what was being done was right. She pleaded with the board to look carefully into their hearts to see what is really going on with the County. Don't only look at it from the County's side but also from their side. They believe that these roads should really be kept open otherwise they have to go all the way through Paia and come down through Kula to get to the beach.

Mr. Leslie Kuloloia said that the Ulupalakua-Makena Road is an ancient road which has been used for over 100 years. He felt that development has now encroached into what is considered one of Maui's top cultural resource centers. They are not against development but they would like the board to reconsider the Makena Road situation. They have not understood the resolutions that have been proposed and/or adopted. They would like to work according to the law. At all the hearings which they attended the public was against the closing of the road so they ask that each board member investigate what is really happening before a decision is made.

Ms. Naone said that she understood that the County has asked that the State quitclaim whatever interest they may have in the roadway and the reason they are asking the State not to quitclaim any interest, if they have any interest, is because they feel that it keeps the whole question open as to whether or not this road is going to be closed. It is a sad thing that this had to be a part of the exchange that was insisted on by Seibu. They had met several times with Seibu to negotiate this problem but the sticking point has always been the road. Seibu, so far, has been adamant about it being closed.

Ms. Naone said that she had read a letter from Ralston Nagata saying that a thorough cultural study should be done before any action is taken to dispose of it and this is basically one of the things they are asking. They would like to be able to present as strong a case as possible before the final exchange goes through. They are having a difficult time persuading the County so they feel that if the State is at all open to having this thing heard fairly that it won't quitclaim it's interest at this time.

Mr. Kuloloia said that they have told Seibu that they are willing to have an overpass built over the Makena Road. This has been suggested to Seibu but they have not accepted it.

ACTION

Deferred.

ITEM E-5

PERMISSION TO NEGOTIATE WITH HOONANI MAUNA-ALA MAI NA MAMAKAKAUA AND TO EXECUTE CONTRACT DOCUMENT FOR PHASE VI RESTORATION OF THE ROYAL MAUSOLEUM CHAPEL, NUUANU, OAHU.

---

Mr. Nagata asked that "Phase XI" as shown in the second paragraph of page 1 be changed to "Phase VI".

The board questioned staff's recommendation wherein the above contract would be "subject to consultant approval and" and asked that this be deleted from the recommendation.

ACTION

Mr. Ing moved for approval as amended. Seconded by Mr. Higashi, motion carried unanimously.

ITEM C-3

TERMINATION OF TIMBER (LAND) LICENSE OF BIO POWER CORP. DUE TO NON-PAYMENT OF FEES FOR HARVESTED FOREST PRODUCTS AND OTHER VIOLATIONS OF THE TERMS OF THE LICENSE.

---

Mr. Landgraf said that he was in receipt of a letter from Bio Power Corporation requesting that this matter be deferred at least until the next meeting of the board.

Mr. Landgraf said that the Deputy Attorney General who has been working with staff agrees with this position and feels that it is in the interest of the State.

Mr. On asked what would happen if Bio-Power does not comply with the Board's previous decisions.

Mr. Landgraf said that he really doesn't know.

Mr. Landgraf said that the company had filed a petition with the court for Chapter 11 Reorganization dated July 22nd and advice to staff is that as long as this automatic stay is in place it prevents staff from taking any administrative or judicial action on Bio-Power. Staff has filed a petition with the court for relief from that stay and the hearing for that petition is on November 22, 1985.

Mr. Ing said if we can't do anything anyway why not just cancel it.

Mr. Landgraf said that it is his understanding that we cannot cancel it until the court says we can. Bio-Power has agreed until such time to stop all harvesting activities and to clean up. As it is now, because of this thing, we cannot legally ask them to stop harvesting.

Mr. Higashi said that he has been working closely with Messrs. Landgraf and Wakida and recommended deferring this until the next meeting. He said that a legal battle has been going on for a while and this is the first sign of some kind of compromise to at least cease the harvesting.

Mr. James Wagner, Attorney for Bio-Power, commented on the question about the fine. He said that Bio-Power did pay the fine of \$1000.00. However, the penalty for damages to State land that occurred prior to filing bankruptcy is a listed debt. He said that it is the desire of Bio-Power to work things out with the State so that their timber contracts remain in place. This is the reason they have requested a deferral.

ACTION

Deferred to the next meeting of the board, which is to be held in Hilo.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION FOR ISSUANCE OF NEW REVOCABLE PERMITS TO ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS, KAHANA VALLEY, OAHU.

Mr. Detor went over with the board the eight PERMIT POLICIES listed in the submittal.

Mr. Detor asked that the COMMENCEMENT DATE shown on the first page of Exhibit A be changed from 12/1/85 to 1/1/86.

Mr. Ono asked whether the Advisory Council had a chance to review the findings, the criteria and recommendation by staff.

Mr. Nagata said that he wasn't sure whether the full advisory board had had a chance to review the submittal.

Ms. Gwen Kim, a social worker with the Liliuokalani Children's Center, and a member of the Kahana Advisory Council, asked to be heard by the board as an individual and not as a member of the Council.

Ms. Kim said that the Advisory Board did submit what they thought to be an up-to-date census of the residents and made recommendations for permits. There are two people who were recommended in the report but were not included in our submittal. She just wanted to point this out for the record. She requested a change in Policy Nos. 4 and 6. Rather than saying "when the board was established", if they could say, "up to the time that the report was submitted by the Kahana Advisory Board", that no resident or no people would then be accepted thereafter. If the board made that the cut-off date then the other people would be included and it would present a logical criteria for residents and for successorship for any future buildings.

Mr. Detor said that apparently these two people came in between May 30, 1984 and now.

Ms. Kim said that actually one of them was residing in the valley, and members of her family were at the meeting, for about eight years. That person is Evelyn Tehada. The other resident, who is Lani Hiram, did build her house on her father's property but it was before the report was submitted and she was included in said report.

Mr. Ono asked if the Advisory Council was recommending that these two names be included.

Ms. Kim said that the Advisory Council did recommend that these two be issued permits and on the basis that they be grandfathered.

Mr. Ono asked if the Advisory Council, recognizing that there should be some kind of cut-off, did not go along with the earlier cut-off date.

Ms. Kim said that if the cutoff date was that recommended by the department then these two people would be excluded. But if they went with the cutoff date as to when the report was submitted to the board it would then include these two people. Ms. Kim said that we are only talking about two people. One has been a resident for about eight years and the other one is a blood relative living on that permit area.

Mr. Ono asked, "if they have been residents for eight years, then why wouldn't they have been on the original list?"

Ms. Kim said that they were living with someone who did have an original permit to help take care of the woman of the house through an illness and then continued to reside in the same house when the woman passed away.

Mr. Kealoha asked if she was talking about the cripple lady.

Ms. Kim did not know her. She was just going on the basis of written testimony from Ms. Tehada.

Mr. Ing said that he did not want to consider the other two permittees until he has more background. He preferred to act on those names submitted today and then later entertain another submittal when they know more about the two people and then he would like the staff to have a chance to respond.

Ms. Kim said that she would appreciate the board leaving this as an open question.

Mr. Ono commented personally, "if there is to be a reconsideration for the two others that are not included in this list, the justification will have to be a real, real strong one as to why they should be allowed to obtain a permit."

Along the same lines, Mr. Kealoha said that he had difficulty inasmuch as Ms. Kim has said that she represents herself as an individual but still speaks as a part of the council. He would prefer that the Council come before the board with this recommendation.

Ms. Kim said that it was an official position of the council that these two people be included in the report.

Mr. Kealoha said, yes, but you cannot speak for the council.

She said that she can speak for the council inasmuch as the inclusion of the two names being an official position of said council.

Mr. Ono asked if she could answer questions for the council.

She said that she could not do this.

Mr. Ono said that the reason for his personal comment is that once we start amending cut-off dates, we might start having future requests so he would just as soon make a decision and stick by it. He said that one of the problems all these years has been that exact problem -- where do we draw the line?

ACTION

Mr. Ing moved for approval as recommended by staff. Seconded by Mr. Kealoha, motion carried unanimously.

ITEM E-2

THE SPLASH AND SPIN BIATHLON GROUP REQUESTS A PERMIT FOR A SWIM/BIKE BIATHLON AT SANS SOUCI STATE RECREATION AREA.

Because this event was to start at 5:00 a.m., Mr. Kealoha voiced concern that all of the curb side parking areas would be used and the people who go to the beach at 8:00 a.m. would have no parking.

Mr. Ron Young said that they will not be parking within the beach area, but they hope to partially rope the driveway inasmuch as bikes will be coming in and out of that driveway. Mr. Young said that they expect the last bike to be out of the area by 9:15 a.m.

Since this event will not take place until March 9, 1986, Mr. Kealoha suggested that Mr. Young come back with some kind of drawing as to how he would be applying this to the size and shape of the ingress and egress of the water, the grassy area and the finish line. Also, plans as to how the bike racks and the finishing line will be set up. Mr. Kealoha's concern is that the public can still go in and out of San Souci.

Mr. Ono asked Mr. Nagata that henceforth he would like to have maps attached showing the route, etc. for all similar kinds of requests.

ACTION Deferred.

ITEM F-1 DOCUMENTS FOR CONSIDERATION.

ITEM F-1-a ECONOMIC LABORATORY, INC. REQUEST FOR CONSENT TO SUBLEASE PORTION OF G. L. NO. S-4118 TO DUTY FREE SHOPPERS, N.V., LOT 11, SHAFTER FLATS INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT, BEING TMK 1-1-64 CONTAINING 44,000 SQ. FT.

ITEM F-1-b KONO TRUST REQUEST FOR CONSENT TO ASSIGN, SUBLEASE, AND ASSUME MORTGAGE, TO ELAINE K. KONO, G. L. NO. S-3611, WAIAKEA, SO. HILO, HAWAII.

ITEM F-1-c KONO TRUST REQUEST FOR CONSENT TO ASSIGN, SUBLEASE, AND ASSUME MORTGAGE TO ELAINE K. KONO, G. L. NO. S-3592, WAIAKEA, SO. HILO, HAWAII.

ITEM F-1-d KONO TRUST REQUEST FOR CONSENT TO ASSIGN, SUBLEASE, AND ASSUME MORTGAGE TO ELAINE K. KONO, G. L. NO. S-3723, WAIAKEA, SO. HILO, HAWAII.

ITEM F-1-e KONO TRUST REQUEST FOR CONSENT TO ASSIGN, SUBLEASE, AND ASSUME MORTGAGE TO ELAINE K. KONO, G. L. NO. S-3609, WAIAKEA, SO. HILO, HAWAII.

ITEM F-1-f GLEN LOVEJOY APPLICATION FOR REVOCABLE PERMIT FOR PARKING AND LANDSCAPING PURPOSES, BEING TMK 4-5-13:36 AND 32 CONTAINING 6,098 SQ. FT., MORE OR LESS. RENTAL: \$11.00 PER MO.

ACTION Mr. Kealoha moved to approve Items F-1-a through F-1-f as submitted. Seconded by Mr. Higashi, motion carried unanimously.

ITEM F-2 COUNTY OF HAWAII, DEPT. OF WATER SUPPLY, APPLICATION FOR WATERLINE EASEMENTS, WAIAKEA, SO. HILO, HAWAII.

ACTION Mr. Higashi moved to authorize the grant of easements to the applicant subject to the terms and conditions listed in the submittal. Seconded by Mr. Ing, motion carried unanimously.

ITEM F-3 RESUBMITTAL - STAFF RECOMMENDATION FOR AMENDMENT OF CONDITIONS, R. P. NO. S-6045, PUNA, HAWAII.

Mr. Detor said that this is a request for reduction in rent covering the Diamond Head Papaya permit. This was deferred at the meeting of October 25, 1985 inasmuch as staff did not have a map showing what areas would be involved. These areas were pointed out, from a map, to the board members.

Mr. Ono said that another question was whether the board had previously adjusted anybody's rental.

Mr. Detor said that they have. The most recent adjustment that they made was two meetings ago on the Richard Corr permit on Kauai where he had a residence on the lot which he removed.

ACTION Mr. Higashi moved to authorize restructuring of Revocable Permit No. S-6045 as proposed in the submittal subject to other terms and conditions as authorized in the Board action of September 9, 1983 under Agenda Item F-1-f. Seconded by Mr. Kealoha, motion carried unanimously.

- ITEM F-4 HANK HILLIARD, ET AL, REQUEST FOR AUTHORIZATION TO CONSTRUCT WIND GENERATOR TOWER WITHIN FLOOD EASEMENT AREA, WAIMEA, SO. KOHALA, HAWAII.
- ACTION The board voted unanimously to allow the applicant to construct a wind generator tower within the flood easement area, Puukapu Watershed Project, under the terms and conditions listed in the submittal. (Higashi/Kealoha)
- ITEM F-5 THE GOOD LAND PARTNERSHIP REQUEST FOR AMENDMENT OF PREVIOUS BOARD ACTION (5/11/84, AGENDA ITEM F-4) AUTHORIZING SALE OF AN EASEMENT, OLAA RESERVATION LOTS, PUNA, HAWAII.
- ACTION The board voted unanimously to amend its action of May 11, 1984 by substituting The Good Land Partnership as applicant subject to all the terms and conditions as originally approved. (Higashi/Kealoha)
- ITEM F-6 COUNTY OF MAUI APPLICATION FOR DRAINAGE EASEMENT, LAHAINA, MAUI.
- ACTION Unanimously approved subject to the conditions listed in the submittal. (Kealoha/Higashi)
- ITEM F-7 RESUBMITTAL - COUNTY OF MAUI REQUEST FOR QUITCLAIM OF PORTION OF MAKENA-KEONEOIO GOVERNMENT ROAD, MOOLOA, HONUULA, MAKAWAO, MAUI.
- (See Page 11 for Action.)
- ITEM F-8 DIVISION OF STATE PARKS REQUEST FOR ACQUISITION OF LAND REQUIRED FOR ADDITION TO SACRED FALLS STATE PARK, HAUULA, OAHU.
- ACTION Unanimously approved as submitted. (Ing/Kealoha)
- ITEM F-9 RESUBMITTAL - MAKANI KAI MARINA ASSOCIATION OF APARTMENT OWNERS REQUEST FOR AMENDMENT OF PREVIOUS BOARD ACTION (6/14/85, AGENDA ITEM F-5) AUTHORIZING SALE OF A BREAKWATER EASEMENT AT KANEOHE BAY, KANEOHE, OAHU.
- (See Page 6 for Action.)
- ITEM F-10 STAFF RECOMMENDATION FOR ISSUANCE OF NEW REVOCABLE PERMITS TO ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS, KAHANA VALLEY, OAHU.
- (See Page 14 for Action.)
- ITEM F-11 STAFF RECOMMENDATION TO SERVE NOTICES OF DEFAULT AND CAUSE FORFEITURE OF REVOCABLE PERMITS, OAHU.
- Mr. Detor asked to amend this item by deleting all names listed except the following three inasmuch as that they did post the required liability insurance:
- . R.P. S-4053 to Edwin Uyechi
  - . R.P. S-4164 to William Weir
  - . R.P. S-4202 to Gregoria Lloren
- ACTION Mr. Ing moved for approval as amended. Seconded by Mr. Kealoha, motion carried unanimously.
- ITEM F-12 STAFF RECOMMENDATION FOR CANCELLATION OF REVOCABLE PERMIT NO. S-5696, WAIALEE, KOOLAULO, OAHU.
- Mr. Detor said that this is a recommendation for cancellation of a permit at Waiale. What happened here is that the permittee had constructed a lean-to kind of improvement on the premises without getting the o.k. of the department. He had been asked to remove same and has not complied although letters have been sent and he has also been visited personally.



Mr. Kealoha thought the penalty to be rather harsh for a so-called lean-to.

Mr. Detor said that a condition of the permit is that they get an o.k. before doing anything. In this case, the permittee did not get permission.

Mr. Young said that when staff made an inspection of the area there were three violators with the same type of construction so they were asked to remove same. Two of the three did.

Mr. Higashi said, "or get approval."

Mr. Young said that the area where the patio was constructed was not covered under the permit. The permit is only for the building and not for the surrounding area.

"So there is encroachment", said Mr. Ono.

Mr. Kealoha asked if it wouldn't be more reasonable for us to up the rent and if he so desires have him come in and make an application to keep it then maybe we can evaluate the building and issue a new permit.

Mr. Young said that when people have come in with requests he didn't think staff has been unreasonable and denied them, in fact they have given approval. In this case, these violations were found while making their Oahu inspection so rather than just let it sit they decided to do something about it and come before the board to let them know that staff is doing their job.

Mr. Kealoha asked whether there was an addition to this building where in the same letter you transmitted to the Permittee that he demolish or remove another portion of the building.

Mr. Young explained that this permit is a duplex. There is another permittee within that duplex and there was a structure adjoining this covered patio which staff asked to have removed and it was removed but it was removed by the department because the permittee said that it was not within his permit area and he was right so the department expended the cost to remove that addition.

Mr. Kealoha said that he would rather see the cost passed on to the permittee and start over again. Revise staff's recommendation to permit him to stay on and if he hasn't knocked down the patio then maybe he should be fined for that construction and then reappraise the building and up the rent if he wants to keep it or remove the patio. In any case, if any building or portion of a building needs to be removed that the guy should pay for it.

Mr. Ing asked whether the permittee wanted to stay on.

Mr. Young said that he thought he did but he has not spoken to the permittee since the notice was sent out.

Mr. Kealoha asked if the applicant was at today's meeting.

Mr. Young said yes.

Mr. Kealoha asked if there would be any problem amending the recommendation to have him remunerate the case and pay the State for the amount expended to remove the addition that was there and permit him to continue the permit and in the case of the so-called lean-to he wasn't sure if that was removed or not.

Mr. Young said that the permit could be amended to include that and assess the rental by raising it retroactive to the date of construction.

Mr. Ono said that staff has spent a lot of time on this so he would like to see administrative costs charged.

Mr. Detor said that as he understood it, the board was asking that staff do the following:

1. Reimburse the State the money which was spent to remove the other structure.
2. That this particular permit be expanded to include the patio area which is not within the present permit area if it is still there.
3. That the rental structure be satisfied to include that if it's there.
4. Administrative costs be tacked on.

Mr. Ono said that he did not want the first visit included inasmuch as it was part of staff's regular job. Just additional expenses incurred driving out there to check and recheck.

Mr. Ono asked Mr. Stevens if he had any comments.

Mr. Stevens said that he has already removed the slab and the roof.

Mr. Ono asked if it was his preference to remain there.

Mr. Stevens said yes.

Mr. Kealoha asked Mr. Stevens how important the slab and lean-to was to him.

Mr. Stevens said that it was just a convenience. Instead of staying inside of the house they could go outside and sit down when friends were over.

Mr. Kealoha said that if they wanted a patio then he should apply for it with the drawings.

Mr. Stevens said that he did apply after he had erected and was asked to remove it. In any event it is already down.

Mr. Ing asked that this be deferred until staff has had a chance to make a follow-up and then come back with further recommendations. There is still the question of administrative charges, reapplication of the removal, etc.

ACTION           Deferred for further staff study.

ITEM F-13

DSSH REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF RENEWAL OF LEASE COVERING ROOMS 201-204 OF WESTGATE SHOPPING CENTER, WAIPAHU, OAHU.

ACTION

Unanimously approved subject to the review and approval of the lease agreement by the Office of the Attorney General. (Ing/Kealoha)

ITEM F-14

BUDGET & FINANCE REQUEST FOR ACQUISITION OF LEASE COVERING OFFICE SPACE IN MAUI AIDE OFFICE, 2307 MAIN STREET, WAILUKU, MAUI.

ACTION

Unanimously approved subject to review of the lease agreement by the Office of the Attorney General. (Higashi/Ing)

ITEM F-15

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES AND HOUSING FOR APPROVAL OF RENEWAL OF LEASE COVERING ROOM 401 OF THE QUEEN EMMA BUILDING, HONOLULU, OAHU.

ACTION

Unanimously approved subject to review of the lease agreement by the Office of the Attorney General. (Ing/Kealoha)

ITEM B-1

FILLING OF TWO EXEMPT TEMPORARY FISHERY TECHNICIAN III POSITION NOS. 18691E AND 19880E IN THE DIVISION OF AQUATIC RESOURCES.

ACTION

Mr. Ing moved to approve the appointment of Rodney Watson to Position 18691E and Brooks Tamaye to Position 19880E. Seconded by Mr. Kealoha, motion carried unanimously.

ITEM B-2

APPROVAL TO PHASE OUT THE COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT FOR PRAWN INDUSTRY DEVELOPMENT ON DECEMBER 31, 1985.

Mr. Ing moved for approval as submitted.

Mr. Ono voiced concern in the wording of the recommendation "that the Chairman may approve immediate mass production activities at the Anuenue Fisheries Research Center", which means that he can reactivate the shut-down facility. He would prefer to see some kind of criteria established as to when the State can reactivate because if the State does go back into business it is going to impact some of the private hatcheries and if that is the case then he would like everyone to know under what conditions the State gets back into the picture otherwise they will not invest money to set up private hatcheries.

Mr. Kawamoto said that he has not worked out any procedures yet but he's sure they could work this out.

Mr. Kawamoto said that they were thinking in terms of when the farmer comes to us with a request in writing and saying that there is no available post larval from which they can buy from and even possibly requiring a letter of turn-down from the hatcheries to indicate that there is no post larval.

Mr. Ono asked, "what if a farmer comes and says, the private hatchery is charging too much so I want the State to get back into the hatchery operation. Would that be a reason?"

Mr. Kawamoto said that they were not going on the basis of cost but of the supply itself.

ACTION

Mr. Ing withdrew his first motion and moved for approval of this item with the additional condition that mass reproduction is authorized only if there is no post larval available from private sources. Mr. Higashi seconded, motion carried unanimously.

ITEM C-1

FILLING OF NURSERY WORKER I, POSITION NO. 4669, ISLAND OF MAUI.

ACTION

Mr. Ing moved to approve the appointment of Mr. Florentin C. Feliciano to fill Position No. 4669. Seconded by Mr. Kealoha, motion carried unanimously.

ITEM C-2

FILLING OF FORESTER III, POSITION NO. 27099, ISLAND OF HAWAII.

ACTION

Mr. Higashi moved to approve the appointment of Mr. Nelson Ayers to Position 27099. Seconded by Mr. Kealoha, motion carried unanimously.

ITEM D-1

APPROVAL FOR AWARD OF CONTRACT - JOB NO. 13-KW-14, DRILLING LAWAI EXPLORATORY WELL (5530-04), LAWAI, KAUAI.

ACTION

The board voted unanimously to approve the award of contract to Roscoe Moss Company for a bid price of \$287,200.00 for drilling and testing the Lawai Exploratory Well at Lawai, Kauai. (Higashi/Kealoha)

- ITEM E-1 FILLING OF PARK CARETAKER II, POSITION NO. 08752-E, LAPAKAHI STATE HISTORICAL PARK, HAWAII PARKS SECTION.
- Mr. Higashi moved to approve the appointment of Mr. William Ayoso to Position No. 08752-E. Seconded by Mr. Ing, motion carried unanimously.
- ITEM E-2 THE SPASH AND SPIN BIATHLON GROUP REQUESTS A PERMIT FOR A SWIM/BIKE BIATHLON AT SANS SOUCI STATE RECREATION AREA.
- (See Page 15 for Action.)
- ITEM E-3 REQUEST TO USE THE TIP OF AINA MOANA STATE RECREATION AREA (MAGIC ISLAND) TO HOST SURF PAC '86 BY HAWAIIAN ISLAND CREATION AND ZIPPY'S RESTAURANTS.
- Mr. Ing said that because no map is attached to the submittal it is kind of hard to know the location of the areas being discussed.
- ACTION Mr. Ing moved to authorize issuance of a permit to Hawaiian Island Creation and Zippy's Restaurants to hold their Surf Pac '86 meet on March 28, 29, 30, 1986 subject to the conditions listed in the submittal. Seconded by Mr. Kealoha, motion carried unanimously.
- ITEM J-1 LEASE, HONOLULU INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT, OAHU (UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, U. S. ARMY ENGINEER DIVISION, PACIFIC OCEAN).
- ACTION Unanimously approved as submitted. (Kealoha/Ing)
- ITEM J-2 APPLICATION FOR ISSUANCE OF REVOCABLE PERMIT NOS. 4136, 4123, AND 4127, AIRPORTS DIVISION.
- ACTION
1. The board voted unanimously to approve Revocable Permits 4136 and 4127. (Higashi/Kealoha)
  2. Revocable Permit 4123 to APCOA, Inc. was deferred for lack of quorum. Mr. Ing did not act on this item.
- ITEM J-3 APPLICATION FOR ISSUANCE OF REVOCABLE PERMIT NOS. 4132, ETC., AIRPORTS DIVISION.
- ACTION Unanimously approved as submitted. (Ing/Kealoha)
- ITEM J-4 ISSUANCE OF REVOCABLE PERMIT, HARBORS DIVISION, FORT ARMSTRONG, PINE TREE GROVE, HONOLULU, OAHU (HAWAIIAN DREDGING & CONSTRUCTION CO.).
- ACTION Unanimously approved as submitted. (Ing/Higashi)
- ITEM J-5 USE OF HARBORS DIVISION FACILITIES, PIERS 10 AND 11 SHED, IRWIN PARK AND SURROUNDING AREAS UNDER HARBORS DIVISION JURISDICTION, OAHU (HONOLULU MARATHON ASSOCIATION).
- ACTION Unanimously approved as submitted. (Ing/Kealoha)
- ITEM J-6 USE OF HARBORS DIVISION FACILITIES, PIER 9, PASSENGER TERMINAL, HONOLULU, OAHU (HAWAII KAI YOUTH ORGANIZATION).
- ACTION Unanimously approved as submitted. (Ing/Higashi)

ITEM J-7

RESUBMITTAL OF APPROVED CONTRACT FOR THE OPERATION OF THE AUTOMOBILE PARKING FACILITIES AT KAHULUI, AIRPORT, MAUI.

ACTION

Unanimously approved as submitted. (Higashi/Kealoha)

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 12:05 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

*Laverne Tirrell*

Mrs. LaVerne Tirrell  
Secretary

APPROVED:

*S. Ono*

SUSUMU ONO  
Chairperson

It