

**CULTURAL RESOURCES COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
NOVEMBER 7, 2005**

A. CALL TO ORDER

The regular meeting of the Cultural Resources Commission (Commission) was called to order by Chairperson Samuel Kalalau, III, at 9:10 a.m., Monday, November 7, 2005, Planning Department Conference Room, Kalana Pakui Building, 250 South High Street, Wailuku, Maui, Hawaii.

A quorum of the Commission was present. (See Record of Attendance.)

Mr. Samuel Kalalau: Will this meeting please come to order. This is -- welcome everyone to our November 7 County of Maui Cultural Resources Commission meeting. First of business, commissioners, we're gonna vote on our minutes of September 1.

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 1, 2005 MEETING

Mr. Lon Whelchel: I move that we approve the minutes as read.

Mr. Keeaumoku Kapu: Second.

Mr. Kalalau: It has been moved and second. Any discussions?

There being no discussion, the motion was put to a vote.

It has been moved by Mr. Whelchel, seconded by Mr. Kapu, then unanimously

VOTED: to approve the minutes of the September 1, 2005 meeting.

Mr. Stanley Solamillo: Under Permit Review, Historic District Applications, there are none presented to this Commission. Under Advisory Review, we have Mr. Roy Figueiroa, General Manager of Makena Resort Corporation.

C. PERMIT REVIEW

- 1. HISTORIC DISTRICT APPLICATIONS - none**
- 2. ADVISORY REVIEW**

- a. **MR. ROY FIGUEIROA, GENERAL MANAGER, MAKENA RESORT CORPORATION (MRC) requesting review and comment on the Cultural Resource Management Plan for Makena Resort located at TMK 3-2-1:05, 06, 07, and 08, Makena, Island of Maui (A. Cua).**

Ms. Ann Cua: Mr. Chair, members of the Commission, just a couple of items before I introduce the applicant. A little bit of background information. Back in July of 2004, you reviewed the Draft Cultural Resource Management Plan for previously recorded archaeological sites in the Makena Resort properties, and it was dated January 15, 2004. This was the draft document. At that time, the applicant informed you that they would be bringing the final copy to you for review and comments. Also, and you acknowledged that in a letter to the applicant that you would be awaiting the receipt of the final document.

Also, one of your recommended conditions to the County Council regarding the change in zoning was that the Cultural Resource Management Plan, currently being prepared for Makena Resort Corp., shall be completed and submitted for approval by the State Historic Preservation Division after review and comment by the Cultural Resources Commission. So this is in line with that condition that you recommended to the Council. I should note that the Council has not acted on the change in zoning yet so that is not yet a condition of zoning, but this goes along with your recommended condition that you offered to the County Council.

So the document that was submitted to you, the final report, is dated September 2005, you all have a copy of that. We also received, and I believe you have a copy of a letter dated October 23, 2005 from Maui Tomorrow Foundation Incorporated, signed by its President, Ron Sturtz. So, with that, I'd like to call up the applicant, Roy Figueiroa and/or his representative to address you.

Ms. Gwen Hiraga: Good morning, members of the Commission. My name is Gwen Hiraga, good morning, and with me this morning is Roy Figueiroa, Vice-President of Makena Resort Corp., and Aki Sinoto, the archaeologist that did prepare the Cultural Resource Management Plan. As Ann mentioned, last year July, we did come before you to provide you with the draft report, and we received your comments and recommendations, and now we have the final report before you and we're here to respond to any questions that members of the Commission may have. Thank you. And I believe I would think that most of the commissioners would have questions on the report itself and Aki Sinoto will be able to respond to that.

Ms. Cua: Mr. Chair, I think we would ask if Mr. Sinoto could maybe do an overview for you.

Mr. Aki Sinoto: Good morning, Chair and members of the Commission. My name is Aki Sinoto. I'm the Principle of Aki Sinoto Consulting and I'm a private archaeological

consultant practicing in the State of Hawaii. Before I give you a summary overview of what the plan entails, I'd like to go over, real quickly, what the objectives of this plan are, and I'll just read from a section in the Cultural Resource Management Plan document, under the subheading of Objectives.

A cultural resource management program that is well planned and implemented balances the preservation component with the data recovery component that will contribute to the available body of archaeological data and enhance the interpretive value of the in situ physical remains. The objectives under which the current management plan is prepared are: one, the selection of sites and complexes for permanent in situ preservation that best represent particular chronological periods, functions, and the specific shoreline to inland activity zones and micro-environments in the Makena region; second, the selection of areas with easier and safer accessibility when such choices are available and warranted; and, third, the preservation of sites and localities that can be used for an integrated interpretive program throughout the property and its neighboring areas; four, the preservation of religious and burial sites with restricted or exclusive access for native Hawaiian and confirmed descendent visitations; and, five, continued consultation with native Hawaiian organizations, primarily Na Kupuna O Maui, regarding the implementation of proper cultural protocols for pertinent elements of the plan; and, finally, the selection of sites and complexes for intensive data recovery that also represent the same criteria for the selection of preservation sites in order to enhance the archaeological data base and the interpretation of the preservation areas.

And, to that, I'd like to add that much of the proposed work for the data recovery phase will be undertaken progressively as new development initiatives arise and, also, during that process, more sites may still be recommended for in situ preservation. So just because a site is represented within the data recovery category doesn't mean that they'll be studied and destroyed. There will be opportunity to evaluate significance and, again, recommend some of those sites, possibly, for permanent preservation.

So those are the objectives under which this document was prepared. And now I can give you a brief summary of what the document presents. Basically, there has been a lot of cultural resource management type, historic preservation related investigations conducted in the Makena region from about 1974, just prior to development of the Seibu golf course and the resort areas. And there's probably a large number of studies done within that region, not only for this owner, but for other owners that occupy the neighboring areas. But this particular study was undertaken for the Makena Resort Corporation, therefore, first we looked at all of the major studies that were done for this owner and then came out with about 15 major surveys that we felt that covered their holdings quite well, and combined and compiled the results of these 15 previous studies to come up with this document. So all of the pertinent site descriptions you find in this document are excerpted from the previous studies, and you'll see, after each excerpt, a reference presented within the

description section. A lot of the plan view maps and the detailed maps are also excerpted from the specific studies.

Now, in terms of the recommendations, each of these previous reports made their own recommendations for preservation and data recovery, so we've compiled this, evaluated it in the context of the data that we have available today. So some of the recommendations have been changed according to newer data that we have available to us today, but, basically, we followed the recommendations given by the authors of these previous 15 reports.

And there were three components that were required, that were determined to be necessary to be part of this plan, and the first, because of the locations of the sites, were fairly vague. There were very few of the surveys that included instrument recorded locations, so we felt that more accurate location information was the first thing that needed to be done so a GIS inventory of all of the sites that are included in this plan was undertaken and completed. We have a GPS point survey of all of the sites that are recommended for in situ preservation in the plan, and we have GIS location of all data recovery sites. The GPS point surveys are intended to be done at each given project when new development initiatives are proposed for specific area; we would go in and do point surveys of the data recovery site locations.

So after the locations were determined, we needed to do -- make a determination of the preservation sites. So with the assessment and evaluation through the compiled results of the 15 previous reports, a total of 15 sites consisting of 303 constituent features were selected for in situ preservation, so this is permanent preservation. And then the determination of the sites slated for data recovery was made and in this category, a total of 46 sites consisting of 169 constituent features were selected.

So, basically, we have two categories of sites: preservation sites and data recovery sites. And for preservation sites, the selection criteria we used included, certainly, the evaluation of the previous recommendations given by the previous researchers, which also included the site type, size, the significance, age, location, and function. And in terms of the preservation categories recommended, there were four categories: one recommended for public interpretation; one for passive preservation, which is just simply data banking or banking of the data for future research purposes; and, three, sites that are exclusively reserved for native Hawaiian access and visitation; and, four, some sites may have a combination of the above categories, so the other three categories, some might have a combination of those.

In terms of the protocols that needed to be followed when preservation sites were looked at, we consulted with cultural groups, primarily we had the most response from the Makena area residents and Na Kupuna O Maui. We also requested from Hui Alanui O Makena, but

they deferred until the other entities had completed review of the report, and they also wanted to complete a review of the report also before they gave us any input. So, in terms of the protocols, the elements for which the community input were sought are listed here, basically, the nature of access to these sites, especially for religious, ceremonial, and burial sites; and the mode of preservation recommended for specific sites, and these would be the four categories that I just discussed prior to this, and also signage, if appropriate, needed to discuss the type, design, and content of each sign. Also, the signage needs to be consistent throughout the resort so we don't have different signs here and there. Also the size and types of buffer zones around the preservation areas need to be determined and needs to be specifically specific for each site. And the need for any stabilization or restoration, for instance if there's a obvious new crumble to a feature wall, especially in this area, there's a lot of deer that come down during certain season and they tend to knock down walls, so when we observe fresh crumbling, do we recommend putting it back or do we leave it as is, so those are the things that still need to be deliberated. Also, in terms of the interpretive sites, we need to discuss the native flora that can be used for the landscaping. Another thing that will be discussed will be stewardship of specific sites by specific community groups.

One thing that also needs to be understood is that because our archaeological investigations in the area started as early as the early '70's, many of these sites that are recommended for preservation are already in preservation within the developed areas, for instance, in amongst the golf course and also in some of the other areas next to the hotel and so forth, but there are a few sites that are still in non-developed areas and a lot of the criteria need to be applied for those sites.

Now moving to data recovery sites, the selection criteria are essentially the same as those for the preservation sites. Also, again, initially we need to evaluate the recommendations that were given in the previous reports and then we evaluate those in light of the data that we have available to us today. And the reason the selection criteria needs to reflect the same type of consideration as for the preservation sites, is, after all, we're trying to shed light on what we're preserving so we need to be able to tell a story of the preservation sites.

In terms of the implementation of the data recovery procedures, these will be incremental, as I said earlier, and they'll be implemented as development initiatives arise for separate projects. So what I'm saying is this is not -- this document isn't the final say by far on any of these sites. We still need to go through a review and approval process for each specific development area by the State Historic Preservation Division, so there's, again, several steps needed before any development takes place. And although there's been some misinformation being spread, there is no imminent development being proposed by the Makena Resort at this particular time.

So as the incremental implementation takes place, we need to prepare a detailed data recovery plan, and the data recovery plan will be reviewed and approved by the State Historic Preservation Division before we can proceed; this will include detailed mapping, subsurface testing, and probably intensive excavations of the sites, and, again, the GPS point survey for accurate location data will be done then. And, as I said earlier, perhaps some of the sites, as a result of data recovery, might be recommended for in situ preservation out of that pool of sites that were recommended for data recovery.

So that's a really brief overview of what the plan presents and the objectives of the plan. So now if the members have any questions, I'll be happy to answer them.

Mr. Kalalau: Commissioners, you have any questions? I have a question.

Mr. Sinoto: Yes?

Mr. Kalalau: You're saying on the data recovery plans, and that the State historical preservation department needs to overlook each site individually, will they be setting the boundaries and the preservation plans individually on each site?

Mr. Sinoto: Well it won't be for each particular site but what I'm saying is the State, when they review sites, they review it in terms of the particular parcel of land that's being recommended for some action that'll probably be within the parcel that'll be recommended for development, so a particular parcel may have a number of sites, but each of those sites will be put into this data recovery plan and the Historic Preservation Division will have to approve the plan before anything can proceed.

Mr. Kalalau: Just like, you know, major sites that is considered permanent for preservation, did you say the number of them is 302?

Mr. Sinoto: Yeah, there I don't want any confusion between the low number of what we're calling sites and the 303 features. So the 303 features are the individual structural remains that are being preserved, although some of the features may be put together as a complex, so one complex may have 40 features. So the important number to think about is the number of features, yeah, so 303 features are being preserved within the property.

Mr. Kalalau: And then I wasn't too clear on it, but you mentioned that there's some non-permanent structures or non-major sites?

Mr. Sinoto: Well, what I was trying to say was that we have two categories of sites that are being discussed in this plan. One are the -- is the category for preservation. These are sites that will not be touched that will be preserved, the area around them will be buffered, and in case of a large area, we have one site that's a four-acre precinct that includes

hundreds of features, and that'll be an exclusion area that will be earmarked by the developer with an agreement with the State, and it'll be for permanent preservation. The other sites that I was talking about are data recovery sites where data would be recovered and after the data recovery, with the full understanding of the State when they give us the approval, oftentimes sites that have been -- where data recoveries have been completed are destroyed.

Mr. Kalalau: Okay, but you also mentioned that some of your guys recommendations will be made by past research documents?

Mr. Sinoto: Yeah, in fact, that's what I said that because there's been so much previous work done in the area, we selected, out of the maybe 50 or 60 such studies, we selected 15 of the major surveys that covered -- if you take the 15 surveys, it covers the whole project area, and so we used the recommendations made by the previous authors to come up with the current recommendations, but sometimes, you know, the earlier authors had only their group of sites to make the recommendations with, but, today, we have the benefit of looking at all of these other studies, so in terms of evaluations, we can make the evaluations in light of a more broader context of archaeological knowledge in the area.

Mr. Kalalau: Okay, thank you. Just one more. You was mentioning about organizations that will be involved in, not caretaking, but I guess stewardship of some of the sites. How will these organizations get selected?

Mr. Sinoto: That's still -- we don't have any -- anything written in stone but our primary cultural group that we consulted with is Na Kupuna O Maui.

Mr. Kalalau: Okay, thank you. Anymore questions, commissioners?

Mr. Kalei Moikeha: Within the Abstract and the Introduction of this -- of the report here, it's repetitive and I guess it's for a specific purpose when you say, "Although many of the survey reports include the preservation and data recovery recommendations, a comprehensive management summary involving all of the extant cultural resources recorded in the property has never been compiled," that's from the Abstract. And then going into the Introduction, you kinda clarify, "Thus, the current Cultural Resource Management Plan, that integrates the results of pertinent archaeological investigations completed to date, was requested by the Makena Resort Corporation and prepared by you." Okay, so are you also saying that, within this report, that you have complied or tried to comply with what was missing? I mean, you know, it comes out, thus, the current Cultural Resource Management Plan, so this is what we have --

Mr. Sinoto: Right.

Mr. Moikeha: Correct? So are you saying that you tried to cover what was never compiled?

Mr. Sinoto: Never compiled meaning never documented?

Mr. Moikeha: I'm not sure. I'm asking you.

Mr. Sinoto: Well, as the title states, this is a resource management plan for previously recorded archaeological sites, but what I'm saying is that by selecting the 15 pertinent studies, we feel that the total area that we're looking at in this study, minus the 600 some-odd acres that's the mauka most part portion that won't be touched, these 15 studies have adequately covered the lower area.

Mr. Moikeha: So, if I understand correctly, then so those 15 sites were actually --

Mr. Sinoto: Studies.

Mr. Moikeha: Were studies that were done previous to you going in there then?

Mr. Sinoto: Yes.

Mr. Moikeha: And all you did was go in? So you folks never found anything else and you didn't do work on your own to find additional sites or studies?

Mr. Sinoto: We, what we did was we went back and relocated a lot of the sites that were previously recorded and then, in so doing, we do a lot of walk through of the area, but in this particular case, we found no new sites. And also we have the benefit of having pretty much the same people that have worked through these years working right now doing this study.

Mr. Moikeha: And when you did the study and research, did you include any of the Hawaiian organizations yourself, I mean were there anyone -- was there anyone included or it was just your staff that went in and did the studies?

Mr. Sinoto: We, together with Makena Resort, held several occasions where we had tours for different groups, and they came, and we had informal discussions with them, and some of the input is in here, but the most formal discussions of the cultural protocols and so forth were conducted with area residents and Na Kupuna O Maui.

Mr. Moikeha: But they themselves did not walk through with you on -- as you're conducting the surveys and study itself?

Mr. Sinoto: What we did was we did a tour and we showed the highlighted areas within the property, but they didn't actually come out on a daily basis to walk through the area with me, no.

Mr. Kalalau: Anymore questions?

Mr. Whelchel: In the Cultural Resource Management Plan, Page 11, it states, "With the departure of key staff, GIS coordination with the division was unfortunately suspended." Is there GIS coordination of future plans?

Mr. Sinoto: Yes, what happened was, at this particular juncture, the staffing at the Historic Preservation, particularly in the Honolulu office, right now they're totally understaffed, and the person that was doing the GIS also left the office, but the only thing that does for us is it delays the amount of time necessary to gear up again with the GIS so, basically, we have all the geographic data, what needed help from them was to download the narrative database data that they have in terms of the site descriptions and so forth, but we can do that within our own resources but it would take us longer.

Ms. Kalalau: Anymore questions? Ann?

Ms. Cua: Can you talk a little bit about the Burial Council. Have you gone to them or are you planning --

Mr. Sinoto: As I stated, since a lot of the 15 studies that we've included in the compilation were done through a period of about 31 years, there -- on several occasions when burial sites had been discovered, we did go before the council to have certain determinations made. In fact, the -- all of the burial sites that were discovered within the property are inside of the in situ preservation category today, and the manner of preservation and especially the access, I guess, obligations are -- were discussed with the Burial Council and, right now, we're kind of on hold with the last item that the Burial Council was helping us with, which is the development of signage for the particular burial sites, but we're putting that on hold until we can come out with a consistent type of signage with language and type faces and designs for the whole resort so that they are aware of the burial sites within the property, and we certainly make new contact with the Burial Council if new burial sites are discovered.

Ms. Cua: So is it your plan to take this plan, which compiles everything, all 15 reports that have been done previously, which they've had involvement with, is it your intent to take this combined plan to them?

Mr. Sinoto: Yeah, we certainly wanna avail a copy for them for review, but we wouldn't really go before the council on a agenda item until such time as the signage plans and the specific treatment for the burial sites have been completed.

Ms. Cua: Okay, the only reason I mention that is when the CRC made its comment, its recommended condition to the Council, which is not a condition yet but it is the will of the CRC, and I didn't read the whole condition where it had talked about having this plan come to this body for review and comment, it says, "In consultation with the Maui/Lanai Island Burial Council and Na Kupuna O Maui," and you did indicate that you have this ongoing --

Mr. Sinoto: Yes.

Ms. Cua: Involvement with Na Kupuna, and so I'm sure they're very familiar with this, but I just kinda was wondering, you know, it seemed that the intent of the CRC was to have this document as well, I guess, at least have the consultation by the Burial Council, so that's why I ask that.

Mr. Sinoto: Because -- because there are a number of previously recorded burial sites, I think, yeah, they should -- they should review, although we are not recommending anything new on those sites.

Ms. Cua: Right.

Mr. Moikeha: Mr. Chair?

Mr. Kalalau: Kalei?

Mr. Moikeha: Just a comment. First of all to the County, you know, to me a document of such relevance, I wouldn't mind getting this a little bit earlier, we got this like in the last week, to kind of review and kinda go through, you know, as I am new within this and, to me, it's really important. And this comment goes to Mr. Sinoto. I think you answered some of my questions that I've had and, number one, when you made the statement as far as the, you know, the implementation of data recovery, that this is not the final document, you know, and that it has to go to the State Historic Preservation Division also, you know, in my mind, as I read these things, agricultural pursuance in the Makena region were small scale and probably on the level of family garden and horticulture, the relative abundance, that word "abundance" of terraces, low retaining walls, mounds tells me a lot. To me, it tells me there's probably a lot more out there that we probably have not seen and should see. And I think that's the key word for me, you know, as far as that we should be able to see that and, you know, as we talk about the study that was done and we just reflect back on the work of what others have done to those 15 sites, to me, would have been great if there's

a possibility that, you know, I'm not sure how the research was done, if you just went to those specific sites or if you just, you know --

Mr. Sinoto: Oh, wait, I think we have basic misunderstanding.

Mr. Moikeha: Studies.

Mr. Sinoto: Yeah, it's 15 studies and the 15 studies pretty much cover the whole acreage --

Mr. Moikeha: Okay.

Mr. Sinoto: You know, of the holding, except, as I mentioned, the uppermost part --

Mr. Moikeha: Right.

Mr. Sinoto: Which remained in the Ulupalakua property until recently, and it's out of this development area anyway.

Mr. Moikeha: Okay.

Mr. Sinoto: Yeah, and so --

Mr. Moikeha: So what you're saying is that those 15 studies should have covered everything that you covered?

Mr. Sinoto: Yeah, essentially --

Mr. Moikeha: That 1800 acres that you talk about, it was covered already?

Mr. Sinoto: Well, it's 12, yeah, because --

Mr. Moikeha: You're not taking the 600 above?

Mr. Sinoto: Yeah.

Mr. Moikeha: Okay, I read that. Okay, I understand that. Okay.

Mr. Sinoto: And, also, if you look at the conclusions of a lot of those studies, it talks about certain climatic conditions and rainfall and things that make the density of especially agricultural sites sort of more concentrated at certain areas of the property. The property straddles eight separate ahupua`a so we're looking at a lot of different climatic as well as

geological zones. And another thing though about preservation, and I think I made that point in the Objectives portion, is that I think it's a reality that we can't preserve everything that we come across and that's why we need studies that evaluate the significance as well as look at over a broader context, a regional context, which sites are probably the most important to preserve because, you know, a lot of the sites have similar functions, similar morphology, so along with input from bodies like yourselves and then the Hawaiian groups, we wanna try and come up with a reasonable preservation initiative so that we can do that.

Mr. Moikeha: Mr. Chair, just one last comment then. I actually -- as I read the report, I thought it was well done. I would think that, for future, a comment that if some way, form, or another, as studies are conducted once again, that the implementation of these Hawaiian groups are added within, you know, I mean, not just consulted with, I mean I wouldn't mind seeing them walking through with you or whoever is going to do the rest of the study or more studies or surveys or what have you.

Mr. Kalalau: Thank you, Kalei.

Ms. Cua: Mr. Chair?

Mr. Kalalau: Ann?

Ms. Cua: Just one additional comment I think to maybe clarify a little bit what was said. The additional review done by State Historic Preservation Division on a given project is going to occur as each project site is developed. As mentioned to you previously, as mentioned to the Council, the area that is being looked at in the change in zoning, all of those sites, either are completely within or touch a part of the special management area, and if you have a piece of property that is -- has a portion of it in the special management area, the development of that property goes through the special management area permit process. When an application is submitted to the Planning Department, it gets sent to a number of governmental agencies; one agency being the State Historic Preservation Division. So while State Historic Preservation Division is now and will be asked to approve this document, they also, basically, get a chance to look at each individual site as it is being developed. The comments that come forth for that individual site will get incorporated as a condition. I'm sure they're going to use this document in coming out with their comments, but they'll have site specific comments for individual projects. So I just wanted to provide that clarification.

Mr. Kapu: I get one comment. You said consultation is, well, bottom line, you look to Na Kupuna O Maui for advice a lot, yeah. My question is pertaining to the site that has possible burials on top. How many burial sites you found in the area, roughly?

Mr. Sinoto: Within the plan, I think there are four burial sites.

Mr. Kapu: Four separate burial sites? Did any lineal descendants come forward?

Mr. Sinoto: Yes, we had lineal descendants for the one site that's -- all four sites, by the way, are preserved, nothing has been disinterred, they're all preserved in place, and we did have lineal descendants for the one site that is preserved at the edge of Fairway 9.

Mr. Kapu: So your recommendations would fall solely upon the lineal descendants in this ...(inaudible)...

Mr. Sinoto: Yeah, as I said, because a lot of the work had already been done during the previous, in this particular case, it was about 10, 15 years ago, that process has already been concluded involving the lineal descendants and the Burial Council as well.

Mr. Kapu: Okay, I get further comments but I'd rather hear from the community first, if I may. Mahalo. Thank you.

Mr. Kalalau: Okay, is there anymore questions, commissioners? If not, does the applicant have anyone else that wants to speak before we open this for public comments, public testimony? If not -- okay, Lisa?

Ms. Rotunno-Hazuka: I just wanted to put on the record that I do have to recuse myself because of my association.

Mr. Kalalau: Okay. Thank you, Aki. We'll now open this portion for public comments and public testimony. Our first speaker is Joe Bertram.

Mr. Joe Bertram: Good morning, commissioners. My name is Joe Bertram. I am the President of Greenways Maui and I've been instrumental in working with the South Maui Heritage Corridor Trail. This is a trail that we've been developing in south Maui to create a walking trail, Hawaiian walking trail, along the entire length of the south Maui coast. What I'm hoping in this plan is that if you look at our current General Plan, I'm on the new general plan advisory committee, and it really -- I'm on it with a lot of trepidation because our original General Plan isn't even being followed. You might see in this process, I commend that the developer, I think, they're doing a good job as far as identifying sites, but what the General Plan says as far as our historical and cultural sites is that to develop an open space master plan to -- for important cultural, historic, recreational, and open space resources. So, as you can see, it's not just cultural, it's not just historical, it's historical, open space, and recreational resources, so they want a comprehensive plan that looks at all our open space and all the components of the open space including the cultural sites. So what I'd really like to see in this plan is not just preservation of sites, but access as well, that is so important. One of the sites that we saw down in -- near Palaua Beach was actually behind someone's gate or I guess there's one on a fairway, you know, and these

are great that they're being preserved, but if people can't access them that are accessible in the sense that these are sites you chose to be accessible, but if they can be accessed to only by car, then it really doesn't -- it's not accessible in the Hawaiian way. The one cultural aspect of Hawaii that is unique to most native cultures is walking and if we don't include walking as part of a cultural plan, then we're missing a major component of what it means to be Hawaiian or what it means to be something that is preserved as a Hawaiian thing. Our Eddie Pu project is to create this cultural trail. My recommendation is that you look at this and include a coastal trail in this plan, include a trail system off this coastal trail to access the areas that you feel are -- should be accessed, and that you look at the whole open space system and include this and see we have an open space master plan made for the south Maui region, this was put out by the County, and you can include that, you can include it in this. We need a comprehensive plan for the whole south Maui region, and this we could actually implement into the general plan process. This is the type of information we could use to actually create the type of general plan that really makes sense and doesn't have to be reinterpreted every time a project comes up. They can already be there. So it's just -- this is what you do. You put in this trail. Here's the sites to be preserved. End of story. So I encourage you to look at it comprehensively, I encourage you to look at the other plans that exist besides just the site plans, and put in a trail, please.

Mr. Kalalau: Question. Question, Joe. On your cultural trail, you know, with the green -- with your -- the greenway --

Mr. Bertram: Right.

Mr. Kalalau: Thing you have down there, does it end before the project or --

Mr. Bertram: Well, as you see, I have the maps here, but, basically, what we proposed is that there be a coastal trail the entire length of the trail -- of the coast, and we named it after Eddie Pu because Eddie Pu walks this trail every year, and he walks along the coast, you know, so even though there's no trails there and there are homes and there are other things in the way, it's not impossible to do. We could put this trail in and it seems like this is, again, it is a cultural aspect of Hawaii that we're losing very rapidly and if it's not included in cultural plans, we're not going to keep it, and it's so important that that be part of it. So, yes, we -- as you can see, these are just big broad, you know, slashes going across the entire coastline, all the way from -- this is, excuse me, this is Wailea, and this is Peahu, Palauea, Keahou, and then this goes to -- this is Makena here, see it goes right over here, and I guess it's the property in question right down there, yeah, so it does show it going across there; again, this is just general, but it is the idea, the intent to develop a trail that will go around the whole island along the coast, but we also wanted to tie into trails then that access inward as well and, hopefully, then access the cultural and historical sites that are so important that we could make them a daily part of our lives, not just something that

we can go and visit, you know, on grandma's birthday or something, but this is actually something that we access daily and becomes a regular part of our existence.

Mr. Kalalau: Okay, thank you. Any questions?

Mr. Kapu: These, yeah, these trails and walkways that go around the island, is this something pending with the County right now?

Mr. Bertram: No. What we have, basically, is they've been put into the -- most of the greenways have been put under the ...(Inaudible)... of Public Works, and Public Works is ...(inaudible)... dedicated to cars and so we've had a lot of trouble as far as, you know, trying to get the trails even built. They just put one, part of our greenway in Kihei, where they put the road and the greenway halfway and the other half is just a road with swells on both sides, no walking, no biking, it is just -- it's really almost criminal but --

Mr. Kapu: So in your hopes to sort of create this within the development, you understand you have to go through State, County, private developers --

Mr. Bertram: Well, actually, this is a little secret here, but the trail that we put in, it was from the Kihei Surfside to Kam III, you might go and take a look at it, that's in the area of the Kihei Boat Ramp, we built it. We just put it in. Basically, because the shoreline management rules, when I was on the Planning Commission, specifically accepted trail building as, you know, one of the things that are exempt from the types of permitting process that you have to go through for most coastal things because this is a Hawaiian walking trail. All we did was we cleared out the area where people were already walking and we lined it with the coral stones that actually had just washed up on the beach there, that was very serendipitous; all of a sudden we had a genuine Hawaiian walking trail that people can use at night even because of the white coral that we used to line it. So it is a matter of just making sure that we have the corridor preserved and we'll do it, we'll put it in, we don't have to wait for the Council for the County, we will actually build it ourselves, we have been and will continue to do that, and we're working with the South Maui Coastal Heritage Trail Corridor, Greenways Maui, and Tri-Isle RC&D to continue to make this happen.

Mr. Kapu: Okay, in closing, I'd just like to add that, you know, every time we go into cultural sensitive areas, we have to make sure we maka`ala to the point as to where the impact pertaining to our cultural heritage was by us, yeah. The impact was by us, okay, we need to be cautious.

Mr. Kalalau: Kauai?

Ms. Kapuni: Excuse me. I just have one -- I'm sorry. Excuse me. E kala mai. I just wanted to make one comment. It would be nice to have Hawaiians walk first but -- and I say that meaning no disrespect, but I also wanted to know if the trail was a native Hawaiian trail, the one that you have made or built or --

Mr. Bertram: Oh, okay, what --

Ms. Kapuni: Was it a native Hawaiian trail?

Mr. Bertram: What it is is it's where a trail is or it is all State land. It goes from the Kihei Surfside up to Kam III, which is of course County land. Now what it was was people were already walking, basically, along the coast there so they had created a little trail, just a little --

Ms. Kapuni: Is that a native Hawaiian trail cause on Molokai get choke Hawaiian trails?

Mr. Bertram: Right, right. No, it's not on a map other than what we have is a Na Ala Hele Map, which basically shows just a dotted line going down the coast in Kihei where you can't really -- there's not a -- you can't get down to that type of specificity to know whether or not that was an actual trail that had been used before or if it's something that was just created because that was where people walked.

Ms. Kapuni: People used it and have been using it for a while.

Mr. Bertram. Right. I think -- yeah, go ahead.

Ms. Kapuni: Another thing too I wanted to ask is, for the project at Makena, you would like to see these trails on their property --

Mr. Bertram: I would like to --

Ms. Kapuni: ...(inaudible)... access to sites?

Mr. Bertram: I would like, mainly, a coastal trail and then whatever people decide, whether it's cultural resources or the folks that are developing this, where they can see possibilities of inward, you know, mauka-makai trails, that is good, and, again, I think respecting what you were saying is that only in the decisions of the people who are there and decide that if that if they wanted to access sites as well, but trails themselves are a cultural resource and that is so important that we maintain trails and create trails.

Ms. Kapuni: Who is to build the trails on this Makena project? And who's to maintain them? And liability and all this stuff? If I sprained my ankle on your trail --

Mr. Bertram: Right, right now, there is, of course, Na Ala Hele, which is the statewide trails and access council, which does provide for liability protection if it's designated as a Na Ala Hele trail. The trail that we have, that we created on our own, basically is covered by the State in that sense because anything in State land and County land, people just walking, basically, on these lands are protected, the State and County indemnified themselves from any kind of liability. This particular trail has been -- was built and is being maintained by the neighbors in that area. It was for folks who were just picking up trash there on a regular basis who then put this in, they've been dealing -- they partnered with the Kihei-Wailea Rotary Club as well as the different neighborhood groups as well as the condo groups that have come together to help put it in and they're maintaining it as well, and that's the type of model that we'd like to promote to continue just the neighborhood that the people who live there and the people who will be walking this trail will also maintain and continue to build it.

Ms. Cua: Mr. Chair, I think it's important to note that something like that, whether it's a trail or walkway, it's not independent of the County approval process and so I need to correct your comments because that is important to note. Anybody, whether it's a developer, a public group doing any kind of walkway trail, you know, if it's in the special management area, if it's in the shoreline setback area, it needs to come to the County for approval. Something like historic sites would be something that would be looked at, so I just throw that out.

Mr. Kalalau: Thank you, Ann. Our next speaker is Pat Borge.

Mr. Pat Borge: Good morning, Mr. Chair, and council members here. My name is Pat Borge. I've been in the Makena area over 30 years and there's some issues I'd like to just to remind you that, you know, I'm not against, you know, Roy's a good friend of mine and, you know, what they're doing there they're trying to do their best and -- but Maui is suffering growing pains right now so we really gotta watch on what we're doing and everybody is impacting this south side, it's really, really -- it's getting out of control out there. There's so many people. Big Beach is packed everyday; Black Sand Beach; there's so much traffic out there. You gotta be out there to experience this, and I mean I'm out there every day dealing with is stuff out there, it's pretty bad, I mean you guys can sit here and say, oh, you know, but you gotta see it everyday I mean -- but why I'm here today is in the 1980's, during my younger days, we protested the closure of the King's Highway running the Maui Prince Hotel, and there was a group that was formed called Makena Hui Aloha, I think their name was at the time, and part of the settlement with the Maui Prince Hotel, which I know and if I'm wrong, and Roy was part of the settlement, that this group, you know, and I was backing up this group all the way, there were a lot of young guys, we were going to all the public hearings ...(Inaudible)... and Ann Molina was there, I think, at the time, and we were really going after the King's Highway, the closure, the -- you know, but there was a settlement that was made between this group, over, I think, half a million

dollars and a couple of acres of land to build a cultural center across Makena Big Beach, and it's been 20 years now, and I think if we had that cultural center built today, I don't think we'd have the problems we have right now about archaeological sites and preserving the Hawaiian culture and what Makena was -- is really all about. And I also trying to figure out a way here, I've been -- I sit on a advisory committee trying to protect the natural area reserve system out in Nahiipinau natural area reserve area, there's several trails out there, you know, we stopped the commercial use out there, and there's several trails out there that we've been trying to tell the State, which already included archaeological sites, some ...(inaudible)... ponds that's so unique, it's not found anywhere else in the nation, and we have all these people that's walking out there, and we've been trying to tell the State, the Department of Land and Natural Resources, to close these trails until they have a plan and, for some reason, it's been over a year, we've been discussing this matter for six years and that's why I'm coming to you today so maybe you can have some kind of input, with the Governor or Peter Young, why is this trail still open. You are destroying all the archaeological sites out there everyday; everyday we wait, it's being destroyed, and we have numbers, you'd be surprised how many people go out there, and that's why I'm here today. It's so frustrating to see it happen everyday. I mean we're talking about, yeah, this guy doing archaeological studies, here's an area that's already intact, you have a shoreline, you have archaeological sites where people are using it as restrooms, I mean it's degrading. You have lady that lives out in cave out there over a year. The State can't get her out. I mean what's the problem here? That's an old burial site out there. I mean you guys wanna talk about respecting cultural, you know, archaeological sites, here you have it right there in front of you, and all it is is somebody's gotta say, "Eh, no, you're out." Or, "This trail is closed." And that's the way it's gotta be. There's so much people on this island right now and we need some kind of control and I would like to see those trails used for educational, for the Hawaiians, for their gathering rights or whatever, but it was a natural area reserve for 30 years. What are we doing here? You know what I mean? That's what I don't understand. Thank you.

Mr. Kalalau: Thank you, Pat. Thank you for coming to this committee for your concerns about the impact of that area out there. I really hope that maybe someday the County and the State can work together because it's a DLNR jurisdiction and stuff.

Mr. Borge: You know the road issue right now, it's a big issue, you know. The State said they don't own the road. The County don't own the road. But, in the meantime, you people gotta realize that area has been destroyed and someday we're gonna be here and you're gonna say, "Eh, now we gotta go out there." But it's all gonna be gone. The reason it's so nice out there, it's been protected for 30 years. The locals never went out there cause out of respect for the area, you know, and -- I mean what's -- to me, it's so frustrating because to see it just being destroyed everyday, and all somebody's gotta do is step to the plate and say, "Eh, this is the way it's gotta be." Thank you.

Mr. Kalalau: Thank you.

Mr. Kapu: Mahalo.

Mr. Kalalau: Okay, our next speaker will be Lucienne deNaie.

Ms. Lucienne deNaie: Thank you, Chair and members of the committee. My name is Lucienne deNaie. I'm speaking on behalf of Maui Tomorrow. We did ask for additional time. We didn't hear until Friday that the way to do that was to sign up five people and have them give you their time. We don't feel that's appropriate right now. There are people who want to speak their own mana`o and so I'm just going to use the time that you're kind enough to give me.

I've studied this area for a while and read the 15 studies that have been put forward by Seibu and commend them on the scholarship that's been done in the area. However, I wanna make a couple of clarifications.

Last year, in July, this Commission sent a letter, and I did drop a copy off on Wednesday to Ms. Cua but she was off-island, and that letter, hopefully, you might have it, you asked several things when this report was brought back to you and one was that the historic component would be better developed and, truthfully, I don't see that in this plan this -- I don't see anything talking about the historic era, per se, that's the time from contact, you know, the 1770's until our, you know, modern time. In fact, I think that you'll see that most evidence of those times is considered a very low value and is eliminated. There are a few mixed use sites that have prehistoric and historic function and, of course, some of burials are historic, but I think your request is not being served by this report and you should ask for better.

Also, SHPD sent a letter in -- last year, 2004, in March, and they asked for a number of very specific things, one of them being something that's very important. They asked for a list of all the known existing sites in this area, and in the original draft report that Makena Resort put forward, on Page 1, I don't know if any of you have your old copies or not, they promised too that they would do a listing of all extant sites, that means all existing sites, this is not included in this report, and I understand that this is a difficult challenge, but this report, I believe, should be deferred until those sites are there because, otherwise, you're asked to make a decision based on the sites that have been selected by the developer, they may have been selected, as Mr. Sinoto said, on the basis of these criteria, they may have been selected on convenience, but you, I think, would be the body that would be voice for these sites, and I think you would need this information in order to make that decision. I did speak to Melissa Kirkendall recently and she said, absolutely, her office needs that list in order to track this better. So if you folks are expecting that SHPD, further along, is going

to take care of this, they're going to need that information and it really should be in this report before you give a recommendation on this report.

Also, I would really recommend that you ask how many sites are planning to be destroyed. We know about the data recovery sites. We know about the sites that are recommended for preservation. We don't know how many sites are recommended to be mitigated or wiped off the face of this earth, or what stories they tell. I did submit on Wednesday a series of comments to your folks, I don't know if anybody got them, thank you, but it reviewed, by ahupua`a, how many sites are going to be preserved. Some ahupua`a, none. Some, one or two. Some, extensive sites. Mo`oiki has a lot of sites being preserved, including 227 of the 300 features will be in one site, that's great that we're having this four acres that we're going to know about a farming village, but our coastal areas, including the areas that are just mauka of an existing fish pond, the fish pond isn't even referred to in this study, it's like no one cares about who lived around it and who used it. It's really a very, very incomplete process here.

So I would urge you to support SHPD. To ask if this plan be redone. To look at their letter, look at the conditions that they ask for, and make sure that those conditions are met by this report. I would also urge you to go and do a site visit yourself of both sites that are planned for preservation or data recovery, and sites that are slated for destruction. I don't see how you can give good advice unless you really see for yourself what is going on out there. This area does contain hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of sites, not just features, and some of them have multiple features. It is a treasure trove, it is the last part of this south Maui system that we still have in fairly, fairly good shape, and the preservation plan should be very carefully formulated for this area. Thank you for your time.

The map that you have, may I make one more point? On Page 6 of your report that the Makena Resort cultural preservation management plan, you'll see a map that attempts to show you when surveys were done by whom. I found it a little confusing. So I made this colored map and the colored map shows you that everything in yellow has not been surveyed since 1981, everything in orange has not been surveyed since 1974, the areas in blue have been surveyed in the last ten years, and that is very much what the cultural -- what SHPD asked. They asked that anything that hadn't been surveyed recently, and some of these have been surveyed and resurveyed, the areas in blue have all been surveyed and resurveyed, that's great, but what about those areas in yellow? A lot of those areas already have zoning. All they need is an SMA hearing and they can have building on them. They could be sold off. They already have zoning. They already have entitlements. Forty-five acres of the coastal areas. They haven't been looked at since 1978 or 79. Really, we need more information here and it shouldn't be your burden, I think, to be asking for everything, but I urge you to get the information you need and to defer any acceptance or recommendation on this until you get your needs met about a historic era preservation plan, and also SHPD's needs met by having updated studies of these areas

that haven't been looked at for many years. The areas, by the way, in blue have all been done within the last ten years, so those areas probably are fairly thoroughly covered.

I will say one other thing too, two of the sites disappeared from the first survey, the first recommended preservation plan to this one, Sites 29 and 31 in Papa`anui. There's no explanation given why they're no longer considered significant. I just find that very disconcerting and perhaps Mr. Sinoto can address that. Thank you.

Mr. Kalalau: Thank you.

Mr. Kapu: I get one question. These Sites 29 and 30 --

Ms. deNaie: 31.

Mr. Kapu: Part of --

Ms. deNaie: Yes.

Mr. Kapu: Part of this?

Ms. deNaie: They were in the original preservation draft plan that was issued in January 15 of 2004, and if any of you have a copy of that, they're listed as, you know, some of the -- there were 16 sites listed at that time, and Site 2 was 29 terraces and platform of permanent habitation, and Site 31, which was the third listing of the 16 proposed, is a kauhale, it composed of 20 plus features. Now, perhaps, more worthy sites have been found, but we should have -- there's a process under the State Historic Preservation Code where if a site is deemed significant and all of a sudden it's not significant, there's an explanation given, so I don't know if that process has been followed. I don't have privy to all the letters that go back and forth between SHPD and the applicant, although Maui Tomorrow did request, a year ago, to be a consulted party and we have a file on -- a letter on file with SHPD that I included a copy of for you folks to have too.

Mr. Kapu: Do we have a copy of the prior 2004 Cultural Resource Management Plan for Makena?

Ms. Cua: The draft?

Ms. deNaie: Yes.

Mr. Kapu: Yeah.

Ms. Cua: Yeah. Right here. You need to see it?

Mr. Kapu: No.

Ms. deNaie: Oh, so I didn't Site 31 on any mitigation data recovery plan. In the original study, no data recovery was done because it wasn't -- it wasn't planned to be destroyed and since it was not planned to be destroyed in the draft in 2004, perhaps some data recovery has been done in between, but you should know whether it has or not, I mean I hate to get detailed oriented, but that's what it comes down to. You have to look into this to see if history is really being served. Thank you.

Mr. Kapu: Mahalo.

Mr. Kalalau: Thank you, Lucienne. Our next speaker is Maile Lu`uwai.

Ms. Maile Lu`uwai: Please bear with me, I got a herniated disc in my back, so I'm in choke pain. Aloha, my name is Maile Lu`uwai. I'm a lineal descendent of the Makena region. Is preservation of cultural sites by Makena Resort Property being determined by what is convenient for developers and their development plans? Or should preservation of cultural sites be determined based on what is significant to Hawaiians and what is critical to the historical and cultural landscape of the Hawaiian people and of this island? Who is deciding what history is important?

As Cultural Resources Commissioners, your answer should be that preservation of cultural sites must be determined by its significance to the Hawaiian people, our Hawaiian history, and the cultural and historical landscape of this island. Without an accurate inventory of sites, we are allowing Makena Resort and Seibu Corporation to determine significance. And when you allow a corporate entity that is focused on profit to determine significance, this is the result. A handful of sites scheduled for preservation. More crumbs thrown at the Hawaiian people. Sites once deemed significant by archaeologist and their reports are no longer significant and not deemed worthy of present preservation in this plan because if you preserve those sites, they will be in the way of condos, pools, and parking lots, and there are other sites that have disappeared.

This plan that you are looking at will only preserve one heiau complex, and that is Site 9. The complex is on a low ridge a few hundred feet of the Makena-Keoneoio Road. Winslow Walker and Inez Ashdown, in their research, identify the heiau complex as onipa`a heiau. The heiau complex was recommended for preservation by two surveys, one was by Clark in 1974 and one was by Haun in 1978. If you look on Page 35 of your management plan, you'll see Site 9 there. Haun, in 1978, said that this heiau is in relatively good state of preservation and idea for public orientated stabilization, restoration, and interpretation. Haun also recommended preservation of related square pre-contact site structures, and one of the structures is in a sketch on one of the pages in there, and it is a small bubble cave beneath the surface. A circular enclosure near that site was also recommended for

future research. If you look at the diagram that I gave you, you will notice that in the blue, see that little blue kinda triangle? Only Site 9 is identified in Makena Resort's management plan for preservation. There are two more sites in there, Site 84 and 85, that was recommended by Haun, in his archaeological report, for preservation that is not being preserved under this plan. Haun also stated because he was being rushed in his – if you read Haun's 1978 archaeological report, he also stated that additional data recovery was needed in those other sites, where you have the other red circles, but no additional data recovery was done. But in that archaeological report, he recommended more data recovery.

What has happened? You know I hear Aki Sinoto go, "Oh yeah, based on our review of prior archaeological reports and on new information, these are the sites," and I'm only giving you a small example of the big picture because I only get three minutes, but he's saying, "Oh, and so these are the sites we're preserving." So based on this archaeological report, for this small area, they're not preserving what the archaeologist recommended for preservation, and they didn't do additional data recovery on the areas that the archaeologist asked for additional data recovery. So what new information we have? He's standing here telling you, "Oh, we just went review 15 archaeological reports." Where's the new information? Where's the additional data recovery recommended by one of their archaeologist? You know, this is the kind of issues that I have and other lineal descendants of the area have with what we're seeing today in Makena. Who is determining significance? Are we going to allow them to determine it?

One more quick point. When they are looking at consultation from the community, you know, they should ask, you know, some of me and my family members who have backgrounds that could have assist. I have a cousin who is a professor of Hawaiian Studies at U.H. Hilo who knows protocol, who was one of the first PhD candidates in Hawaiian Studies who could be a consultant. I have a cousin who has a Masters Degree in Archaeology. I have a cousin who works, and she has a Masters Degree, at Bishop Museum. I, myself, have a jurist doctorate, I could help. You can consult with me. You know why they don't consult with us? Because I would look at that report and I would not approve it. I would say, "Where's the additional data recovery? Where is the new information? How come get all these pukas? These archaeological reports say more needs to be done in this area. How come you guys --" That's why they don't want people like me as a consultant because they wouldn't be standing with that report today and they wouldn't have submitted it you cause I would have told them, "go do more work." I mean they've got the financial resources. That is an important document. So much is going to be based on that and if that is approved, more archaeological sites destroyed and disappeared, and there goes the rest of our history in Makena and the history of my family. Thank you very much.

Mr. Kapu: Question. You get one little area circled on here in yellow. Can you explain that?

Ms. Lu`uwai: Oh, that's a mistake. Sorry.

Mr. Kapu: Okay.

Ms. Lu`uwai: Just look at the ones in red, so those other two red ones he recommended additional data recovery, on those other two circles, and none has been done, and this is the archaeologist saying we need more work in this area cause I'm not really sure, but it looks like all this stuff is interconnected, and what you guys gotta know is all of that entire area is very close to the fish pond and other heiaus and sites. You know, what they're not saying is there's this interconnectedness of all of these sites and, Kalei was right, okay, there is, you know when you talk about abundance, yeah, how come get all these terraces, you know? How come there's all these heiaus, you know? How come there were all these fishing shrines, you know? This was not a temporal little community. If you look at all the sites and connect them together, there was a huge community of people who lived in Makena, and they're all related to me, and so my job is to try to preserve what I can for my ancestors and for future generations of my family because they have already bulldozed a lot. They bulldozed the Oneuli Heiau, which was an important fishing shrine that my father remembers that was above my grandfather's favorite fishing spot but they went bulldoze it for to make the oceanside golf course. Anymore questions?

Mr. Kalalau: Anymore questions, commissioners?

Ms. Lu`uwai: Thank you.

Mr. Kalalau: Thank you.

Ms. Lu`uwai: Thank you very much.

Mr. Kalalau: Our next speaker is Puanani Lindsey.

Ms. Puanani Lindsey: Aloha, Chair and Commission members. When is enough enough? Today, you are here and you're going to have to make a decision, an important decision for our Hawaiian people, our Hawaiian community, our Hawaiian culture, and to keep those things that Maui special. Afterall, we're the best island in the world, and what do we have to show? We are losing too much of our Hawaiian culture, of our archaeological sites. It's being bulldozed. It's behind the kiawe trees. I want you to be sure to go on a tour. You need to see the sites, not from the golf course, but get off and walk the land. It's important. And it saddened my heart, because I did the walk a little over a year ago, to see golf balls all over the archaeological sites, beautiful archaeological sites. You even have to dodge

them sometimes because they're hitting in the wrong areas. But it is so important; that's why I'm here today to make sure you do the walk, feel the mana of this land. Honuaula is the fourth most populated place on Maui. One being Lahaina, two being Hana, three being the Hamakualoa coast, and number four is Makena; this area here. It's so important. We have our industrial agriculture that destroyed most of the land and we have to go up into the valleys now to see what terracing that we have left. We need to keep things here for our children so they know what the culture was like. We can't be bulldozing everything to make room for these huge buildings and for what? To bring in people with money. My concern here too is especially the section that is below the road, the parking lot that goes toward the Maui Prince Hotel, that 11 acres there. It's so important that you take a look at it. They talk of building in balance, but there is an unbalance here.

A short story that my husband and I were able to hear from these businessmen, not knowing that we were on their backside, they called Maui a whore, that's right. It hurt in here to hear something like that. A whore. No one ever says that. Why? Because they bring in their leer jets, they go out, they wine and dine, frolic in the sun, enjoy our beaches, and then they leave. This is what they call -- Maui's a place to enjoy and then they can leave. Not so. We live here. We need to take care of our culture. So, again, I want you to take a close investigation of this area and do and make the right decision. We need to build in balance. So building in balance, I see, is to preserve our cultural sites, our cultural resources so we have something to leave for our children. It's not only disseminate, but let's save, preserve what we have. Thank you.

Mr. Kalalau: Thank you. Questions, commissioners? Okay, if not, our next speaker would be Roselle Bailey.

Ms. Roselle Bailey: Aloha ta`tou. My name is Roselle Bailey, and it's been a long time since I've been in this room. I don't relish coming here, but indulge me as I find my way to culturally express my thoughts. You are the cultural resource committee. I don't know if you know what that means. Cultural means your land, your plants, your animals, your insects, your micro-organisms, your environment, your history, your mores, the cause and effect of everything that you do. Resources. Ah, that's a very interesting word. As defined in the dictionary, the first one, that which resorted to for aid or support. Second one, plural, available means or property, a supply that can be drawn on, any natural advantages, or products as natural resources. Three, the capacity for finding or adopting means a power of achievement. Four, fertility in expedience; resourcefulness; skill or ingenuity in meeting any situation. The synonyms are alternatives and property. The origins, old French, Latin, re as again, and ...(inaudible)... to rise. Why am I telling you this? Because in your hands, you have to be resourceful and think outside of the box, and not think in the sections that you think have been trapped, have been there to trap you into going into one direction.

Science is not the last word. Science has been proven wrong even in our time and have taken an apology approach to what they thought, in their time, was correct. So don't believe everything you see and hear from the scientific world because there is that other world that belongs to the indigenous or aboriginal people who were here. I don't want to be thought of -- as a whore. I'm a little olelo noeau. Pele said to Kamapua`a, "If you want to discuss things, don't stand up there. Come down and discuss it with me eye to eye." And I say take that to heart.

There's a song written in Hawaiian -- I mean in English but it is based on Hawaiian thought. It starts out and ends with the pahu beat. I'll attempt to sing it. *This is Hawaii. It's my paradise. Misty rains caress the rainbow way up in the sky.* Yes, this is Hawaii. It's my paradise; it is the paradise of our ancestors; it is your paradise, but we look at paradise differently. It is now their paradise. Their paradise for money. *This is Hawaii. In the moonlight, neath the waterfalls, fragrant ginger blossoms bloom in the mountains tall.* We are reminded Hawaii in the moonlight. Hina, she is Hawaii at night. The water, the elements, both kane and kanaloa, they give life, that is the water cycle, and if we don't take care of our land, something happens to that water cycle. Ah, ginger blooms. Ginger, awapuhi, bitterness that spreads, but there is hope because the blossoms are blooming in the mountain, something that is hard to achieve. Mountains are difficult to climb. You have a difficult climb. *This is Hawaii. Legends say that the gods gave us our land from the heavens down to the golden sand.* And here is the truth of the pudding. The gods. They gave us our land. What does that mean? It means that it is sacred; that we are obligated to take care of the land and all that live on the land, and that obligation is for the land's sake. If we take care of the land, the land will take care of us. Money cannot take care of the land. *These are my people, from the land of love, sharing all their blessings from above. This is Hawaii.* The aboriginal people, the indigenous people did not think in terms of little sections, but in the big picture and its effects. They also crossed over ethnic lines and made the new ethnicity who are here welcome and how to live in a foreign environment. The land of aloha, the State's motto; aloha; the islands of aloha; the state of aloha. When we do not practice the aloha for the land, then we are not practicing the aloha for our ancestors, for us, and for our future.

Hawaiian was looked at historically as stupid, lazy, fat, ugly, and our things were only sticks and stones, not worth anything. But that thought is now being erased from us after generations of thought. We are not stupid. Our ancestors were not stupid, nor were they fat or lazy. We just knew how to work with the elements, and in the elements, and it's time for you to do that. Thank you.

Mr. Kalalau: Thank you. Any questions, commissioners? Before we close the public testimony section, does anyone in the public wanna come forward and testify? Okay.

Mr. Roy Figueiroa: My name is Roy Figueiroa. I'm with the Makena Resort. I depend on my experts to explain the plan but had been involved in, you know, trying to get it done. And we welcome, actually, you walking the property, as you said you wanted to do. We've been open to that. It's not something that we would worry about. We'd like you to come out to see what the sites are like and to understand it better as I'm trying to understand it better myself. I'm born and raised in Hawaii, over half my life on Maui, and still I'm trying, I have to learn. Once we stop learning, we lose. Isn't that right?

Now, in going through this process, as even I've discussed with Mr. Sinoto, you know I look at this Cultural Resource Management Plan myself, as an individual, I'm not an expert, and then I look at, well, what more do we do even if the plan is accepted. And so when I look at the plan, and I read it for myself, I can see, and as I've consulted with Mr. Sinoto, that as time goes on, we assure, we make sure that developments that come onboard are consistent with this plan, they're consistent with the objectives of the plan, and so we can see that more, as time goes on, more information will be assimilated into the plan, and that's the way I look at it. And I think it is a good idea, I think Ms. Barbara Long, I think she was on the panel before, and she wanted me to do -- include all of Wailea and I think the rest of the coast, I said, "Well, we can be responsible mainly for our section of the world, in that particular area, and then we'd be welcome to doing as much as we can to incorporating other things that come onboard," and I look at that in this way that we can incorporate what becomes apparent in this particular area and to this plan and then, even as protocol is developed with Na Kupuna O Maui, we'd be glad to share that, what the development of that protocol is with this committee, and I think you should be made aware of what specific protocol is made. But, as Mr. Sinoto brought up, this is done as we examine each site even more specifically. And then when other sites are developed and there is a data recovery plan, as Mr. Sinoto explained, some of that is put into preservation, and so protocol is developed with those sites also, and we'd be glad that, you know, to continue to make the committee, here, aware of what that is because we're interested in keeping the story of our past alive and then also its significance to how we are today, and that's what archaeology and the study of history does.

Now in developing this, I'd to also continue to look at, you know, working with those who are very respected in this area. When I look at this though, as I said, born and raised in Hawaii, I also try to balance with -- this with those who are also respectful, not only respected, but respectful of the efforts of others in the same direction. So in that case, I do have sometimes a difficult time, personally, in dealing with those who lack on of these components, and so that's why we do enjoy working with the Makena residents and the -- that we have worked with, the Na Kapuna O Maui in trying to develop a protocol in the study of these sites and how we're going to manage them in a way that would be respectful for the people in the community and for those in the past. That's what I wanted to say. Any questions I'll be open to.

Mr. Kalalau: Questions, commissioners?

Ms. Deldrine Kapuni: I do. I have a question. Would you be able to work with these people who have come forward and I think would prove valuable? I understand where you coming about being respectful. I come from Molokai. I was just flying over this morning and, as a child, I remember nighttime, from the east side of Molokai looking over to Maui and there was not a single, well, maybe Lahaina, Kaanapali had a light or two, and Maui has grown so quickly, I think I can understand why people are, what's the word, unsure, maybe even afraid of growth that can be too quick, too soon without the proper variables in place, so I was just wondering if you could work with the community that came forth today and perhaps you'll solve a lot of your problems too by having that input.

Mr. Figueiroa: In response to that, I have to admit that sometimes I'm an idealist, and I look at ideals, and I have difficulty with those who continue to label the efforts of others as perhaps shoddy, unprofessional, and so I have a difficulty with that, and so I prefer that being open to coming back to you as I develop our relationship with those that are gonna establish the protocol. If you allow us to be the judge and then you be aware of who they are, and you judge for yourself as who we bring forth in developing this protocol for these sites.

Mr. Kalalau: Anymore questions? Kalei, you got a question?

Mr. Moikeha: Mr. Chair, well, my thoughts are we live in Hawaii. We live on Maui. I don't think we live in Nebraska or Texas or anything as such, and so as you talk about protocol, I don't think we can go back to a Texan and ask about protocol for Makena. I think as you talk about protocol, I'm sorry I missed out on some of the testimonies and things as such, but I think what we need to possibly do or a recommendation would be is that to be able to work with those that who live there, who have lived there, who have genealogy there that really respect the area also, and although I do, like I said, I missed the testimonies and I am coming in halfway, but I think it's something that we should be able to recognize. I mean changes on Maui are very subtle. You can turn on the radio and Maui is no longer Maui, it's Maawee, you know, I mean it's how they pronounce it on the radio, I mean Kamaole I, II, and III, is no longer Hawaii, it's a Chinese park, you know, it's now Kam I, Kam II, I mean all these real subtle things that are changing, and unless somebody says that, it'll keep on occurring. I mean we gotta take a look at this and as we talk about, I mean you can't just talk about it, there's something that has to be done, but I would think that would be respectful and we start to recognize that perhaps, just perhaps those that do speak, speak with emotions who live there, who died there, where the iwi still remains there of their family, to me, that's real important. There's a lot of respect that's there and maybe the words that we use in English are not correct, you know, I don't know, but I think that's something to consider though, you know, and that you would take that into consideration.

Mr. Figueiroa: Can I respond?

Mr. Kalalau: Okay, Roy.

Mr. Figueiroa: Okay. Well, as I said, when we're developing this protocol, we are developing it with the Makena residents and Na Kupuna O Maui as one of the main Hawaiian groups. We've also asked Hui Alanui O Makena to comment and that will be included. So we're not going back to any place else. We're doing that right here on Maui, in the local community, so that's what I meant by establishing -- we're talking about the protocol as to how we handle each site and the recommendations and the direction by these groups. That's what I meant.

Mr. Kapu: I get one. In this Cultural Resource Management Plan, do you also want to possibly incorporate some kind of oral testimony from people of the area? I think that's important because there was one person that spoke about her family being from the area, Aunty Lu`uwai I think it was, that she pointed out pertaining their kanakas background and values and I don't know whether or not, because you did mention that -- about respect, about respectful, I get this tendency that there's some fire in there, and if there is, that I think, in fact I wouldn't say I think, I'm sure that the resources that her and her family has will definitely benefit this if there isn't any oral history that has to do, even with just one regular ko`a, once you take down one ko`a, you just took down somebody's flag for their fishing grounds, yeah, cause each ko`a points out an icebox pertaining to where their fish comes from, so those kind of oral history that is included in this would be even more valuable, not just for your portion, but would also be more valuable for just the elemental idea of why these places were put there, what's the importance of it, it's a whole mo`olelo, it's a history, it's background that we need to admit that we're still learning ourselves, right? Yeah? So what struck me was when you said that, based on respect, you going give respect as long as you get respect back. I don't see it that way. I don't think respect -- respect is sort of secondary based upon the integrity of the land and a lot of spokesperson also said that we look too much of the book pertaining to our decision makings that we, basically, what I got out of that is we need to look at a commonality in our life to make decisions. So my question to you is, pertaining to the oral history that should be included, is it important, and, at the same time, feel that you should also allow yourself in regardless that these people are disrespectful to you should also still be included because they are the hiapo, they are the storytellers of the place, and I think you should take that into consideration.

Mr. Figueiroa: Can I respond?

Mr. Kalalau: Yes, Roy, go ahead.

Mr. Figueiroa: Okay. Whether they're respectful to me, that's irrelevant. I was referring to disrespectful for those who have done work, have gone forward in this area before. That's what I was referring to. Okay now, as far as the oral history as I've discussed it with Mr. Sinoto, I think even previous studies, I believe if I'm correct, have included interviews with Boogie Lu`uwai, and you've referred to that also, who is the father of Maile Lu`uwai, but despite what has already been done, this is something I've already discussed with Mr. Sinoto because it's something I became interested in more as you get into this and what we wanna do is to continue to pursue that oral history part about what more can be found out and that what we wanted -- that's why I said if you could leave it to us to then bring it back to you, that's what we're doing because we really want to discuss the way that we can do this with the local community group first and with Na Kupuna and be able to present to them how we intend to do this so that we can bring it back to you, prepared for your review, but that would be a further development of this plan, which I say, to me, the plan will continue to grow, that's how I look at this plan.

Mr. Kapu: I get one question, probably to the Planning Department. Is this up for review and approval?

Ms. Cua: You are being asked to provide comments.

Mr. Kapu: Provide comments.

Ms. Cua: The approval comes by the State Historic Preservation Division.

Mr. Kapu: Okay. Once the recommendations are made from both sides, does this come back to our -- to the Cultural Resources Commission for also to be approved too?

Mr. Kalalau: Supposed to. It's part of -- it is part of our past recommendations.

Ms. Cua: I'm sorry?

Mr. Kalalau: I believe it's supposed to come back to this -- to this Cultural Resources Commission because it was a recommendation, in the past, that when it's gone through the State and stuff that it comes back to the Cultural Resources Commission.

Mr. Kapu: Yeah, that's what I asking if it is this one or after the final review from the cultural -- I mean from the State Historic Preservation Division.

Ms. Cua: My understanding is that it comes here for your review and comments. Your comments go to the State Historic Preservation Division for their approval. It can come back to you, but I believe they're the approving agency.

Mr. Kapu: Then it comes back to us?

Ms. Cua: It could.

Mr. Kapu: It should. Didn't we make that in one of our recommendations back in 2004?

Ms. Cua: No, it would come back to you as an informational document to see what was approved, but not for approval.

Ms. Rotunno-Hazuka: Okay --

Mr. Kapu: Not for approval?

Mr. Kalalau: Right.

Ms. Cua: That's my understanding, unless I'm wrong.

Ms. Rotunno-Hazuka: So, again, if this is a document that's going to change and evolve --

Ms. Cua: Right.

Ms. Rotunno-Hazuka: It will be coming back to us.

Ms. Cua: Right, and that's no question. I think, you know, when updates are made to the study, the applicant has indicated they wanna get your input, but the approval process is with --

Mr. Kalalau: The State.

Ms. Cua: The State DLNR with consultation or with comments from this body.

Mr. Kalalau: Right.

Ms. Cua: And so that's why we're here.

Ms. Rotunno-Hazuka: And so the CRC then can make comments today and part of those comments become the record, and then we should have on the comments that as new information becomes available as new studies are done, that it comes back to the CRC. A condition.

Mr. Kalalau: One condition. I have just a question for Roy. You know, Roy, based on Pat Borge's testimony about the 1980, the closure of Makena Road and there were some settlements made, he talked about a cultural center, do you have any information on that?

Mr. Figueiroa: There was a site that we did give, I think it was three acres across Big Beach.

Mr. Kalalau: And that's about it? Nobody's --

Mr. Figueiroa: It was donated to -- it was given, as part of the settlement.

Mr. Kalalau: You know what organization got the three acres or --

Mr. Figueiroa: Tax map records, I'm not sure what they would indicate, but probably Honuaula O Keahou.

Mr. Kalalau: At that time?

Mr. Figueiroa: No, at that time it was, I believe, Hui Alanui O Makena, that was the first, but they have a non-profit, I believe, organization called Honuaula O Keahou.

Mr. Kalalau: Okay, yeah, because part of my concern it was in 1980 and seeing that nothing has been done in putting a cultural center out there, I think, which is kinda important, but, anyway, also some of the other people who testified today, even yourself, you know, you said you were okay with a site visit. There were several other people that mentioned about a site visit, especially for this Cultural Resources Commission being that today's meeting is for recommendations. And before I close this portion of the public testimony, anymore questions for Roy? Thank you, Roy.

Mr. Figueiroa: Thank you.

Mr. Kalalau: Anybody else from the public?

Mr. Keoki Santos: Howzit. My name is Keoki Santos. I'm nobody, really, I'm just a local boy from Kihei, and I'm deeply saddened about what's happening to Maui. What's happening in our community. I really think that it's a matter of question of what's more important here, I mean where the decision is let them take care -- take away all of our cultural resources to build -- to build these resorts for outside people. It's just gonna constantly change Maui. It's going to constantly change, you know, what Hawaii is all about, and I don't think it's right, and I think it should be really clear to the people in charge what needs to be done with correct decisions to be made, so that's all I have to say.

Mr. Kalalau: Anybody have questions for Joe. Joe, I have a question, maybe a comment. I don't think you're a nobody now because you was in *Maui News* and you became very famous to stand up in what you believe is right and what you believe is proper for the areas that you guys, you know, that's your guys playground, I mean, anyway, that's all I wanted to say. You're a nobody, like that lady Lindsey came up here, not -- Mrs. Bailey, she said not stupid, not fat, not lazy, but it's just a way of life, so, you know, just keep holding up your head and believe in what you believe. Thank you.

Mr. Santos: Thank you.

Mr. Kalalau: Okay, Ann, do you have anything? If not, we'll close this portion of the public testimony.

Ms. Cua: So, at this point, I just need to get the comments that you would like put forth in a letter that goes to applicant and to State Historic Preservation Division, and if you wanna conduct a site visit, we can talk about that.

Mr. Kapu: Yeah, Mr. Chair, definitely I would like to see if it would be possible if we could have a site visit and, at the same time, if it would be possible to also, during the site visit or maybe after the site visit, if can, the Cultural Resources Commission meeting would be to be convened in Makena as well to accommodate a lot of other families who, basically, couldn't come here to share. I mean a site visit and after, possibly, meeting. Would it be possible?

Mr. Kalalau: I'd like to hold our regular monthly meeting too in the area.

Mr. Kapu: Or a special meeting --

Mr. Kalalau: Or a special meeting.

Mr. Kapu: Yeah.

Mr. Kalalau: Okay.

Ms. Cua: We can look at scheduling that. Are you looking at having this done before you actually provide comments on this document?

Mr. Kapu: Yeah.

Ms. Cua: Okay. So the letter, at this point, would basically say that at this meeting, in your review of the document, you decided to defer any comments until you're able to conduct a site visit and an additional meeting in Makena and, possibly, at that next meeting in

Makena you would be able to offer your comments on the study. We'll have to do some coordination of your schedules, I mean later on we can call you to decide if, you know, if your next meeting would be the meeting, I don't know if -- we might be -- I don't know if we're too close to December, if you wanna do it in December, you know, we can talk about that.

Mr. Kalalau: Okay, how does the commissioners feel about this?

Mr. Whelchel: I'm in favor.

Ms. Cua: Do we have the date of the regularly scheduled meeting in December? December 1? So we could maybe look at a morning site visit with a meeting to follow in the day -- daytime?

Mr. Kalalau: Yes. Yes.

Ms. Cua: Okay.

Mr. Kapu: I get one question. How long would it possibly be? How long is the site --

Mr. Kalalau: To walk the site?

Mr. Kapu: I mean, yeah.

Ms. Rotunno-Hazuka: Couple hours.

Mr. Kapu: Two to three hours, four hours.

Ms. Kapuni: Two to three hours.

Mr. Kapu: I like see everything you got in this book.

Ms. Kapuni: Five days.

Mr. Kapu: Hey, I got the time. I don't know about you guys.

Ms. Cua: Okay, that'll be four hours then.

Mr. Kalalau: Yeah, four hours, right?

Ms. Cua: So like from nine to one.

Ms. Kapuni: And after that the meeting?

Ms. Cua: And then I guess a lunch break and then the meeting maybe starting at --

Ms. Kapuni: Two?

Mr. Kalalau: Two-thirty?

Ms. Cua: Maybe three?

Ms. Kalalau: Three.

Mr. Kapu: Would the County be able to get a place in Makena for the meeting there?

Ms. Cua: I don't know.

Mr. Kapu: A community center?

Ms. Cua: I think we'd probably go to the -- probably the Kihei Community Center maybe. I don't know if we could -- oh, maybe at the Prince Hotel, unless anybody else can think of another place.

Mr. Kalalau: We need a motion to --

Mr. Kapu: Okay. I'd like to make a motion to defer the Cultural Resource Management Plan until after the site visit in Makena on the date specified by the County Planning.

Ms. Cua: Okay.

Mr. Kalalau: Do I hear a second?

Mr. Whelchel: I second the motion.

Mr. Kalalau: It has been moved and second. Any discussions?

There being no further discussion, the motion was put to vote.

It has been moved by Mr. Kapu, seconded by Mr. Whelchel, then unanimously

VOTED: to defer the Cultural Resource Management Plan until after the site visit in Makena on the date specified by the County Planning.

3. DEMOLITION PERMITS - none

D. COMMUNICATIONS

E. UNFINISHED BUSINESS - none

F. NEW BUSINESS

G. SIGN ENFORCEMENT PROGRAM IN THE LAHAINA HISTORIC DISTRICTS - none

H. DIRECTOR'S REPORT

- 1. December 1, 2005 meeting agenda**
- 2. Administrative Permit Reports**
 - a. Historic District Approvals Report - none**

Mr. Solamillo: Continuing under C, Permit Review, under Demolition Permits, there are no permits presented before this Commission. Under Communications, you've been given communications in your packets, and there are no communications that are specific to this meeting. Under E, Unfinished Business, there are no business items that are being presented as well as under New Business, no business items. Under Sign Enforcement Program in the Lahaina Historic Districts, there are none that are being brought before you. Under H, Director's Report, we've already set the item for the December 1, 2005 meeting agenda. We'd ask whether there are additional items to be brought on that or placed on that agenda?

Mr. Kalalau: Commissioners, are there any items that we should have on the December 1 meeting agenda?

Ms. Rotunno-Hazuka: I would think if we're going to do that site visit that'll be enough. Right?

Mr. Kapu: Yeah.

Mr. Kalalau: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Solamillo: Then the only item that'll be placed on that agenda will be the site visit and then our meeting to discuss our recommendations. Under Administrative Permit Reports, and Historic District Approvals, there are none being brought before this Commission. The next item is for all commissioners, it is Commissioner's Announcements.

I. COMMISSIONER'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Kalalau: I just wanna thank all the commissioners. I know it's getting close to the holiday season and there's lots of things to be done, you know, and giving up your times to come here and -- and show up at these meetings is kinda difficult so I just wanna thank all of you very much for attending the meetings. Thank you.

Mr. Kapu: Mahalo. I like to make one announcement. You know, if anybody get time, I get some young boys working down Kihei, yeah, Kihei Fishpond, so this is like the first fishpond, I mean massive, and it's like 1200 feet and we're about almost 200 feet.

Ms. Kapuni: Clearing? Cleaning?

Mr. Kapu: Constructing. Restoring.

Mr. Solamillo: Restoring.

Ms. Kapuni: Restoring.

Mr. Solamillo: Yeah.

Mr. Kapu: In Kihei.

Ms. Kapuni: No more mangrove?

Mr. Kapu: No. So if anybody would love to take the time to come and see what basically is being done down there, I think the younger generation would much -- they like to meet new people and give them an opportunity to share the things that they found in the area, basically.

Mr. Solamillo: How long would it take?

Mr. Kapu: They said about a year.

Mr. Solamillo: No, but how long would it take, if we included it in the tour.

Ms. Kapuni: Yeah, I was just thinking.

Mr. Welchel: That'll be good.

Mr. Kapu: Oh.

Ms. Kapuni: On the way to Makena.

Mr. Kalalau: Next year. I'm outta here next year.

Mr. Kapu: Nah, you're looking at about maybe ten to fifteen minutes.

Mr. Solamillo: You wanna do 30 minutes there?

Ms. Kapuni: That'll be nice.

Mr. Kapu: Yeah.

Mr. Solamillo: Yeah.

Ms. Kapuni: In December.

Mr. Kapu: Yeah, would be good.

Ms. Kapuni: And then out to Makena. That'll be nice. Just get the lomi o'io ready.

Ms. Rotunno-Hazuka: North Kihei.

Mr. Kapu: It's further down.

Ms. Rotunno-Hazuka: Menehune Shores, yeah? Menehune Shores.

Mr. Kapu: Yeah.

Ms. Kapuni: And bring the poi.

Mr. Welchel: How many is that?

Mr. Kalalau: It's right by the ...(inaudible)...

Mr. Moikeha: The whale foundation?

Mr. Kapu: Yeah.

Mr. Moikeha: Yeah?

Mr. Kalalau: Right there, yeah?

Mr. Kapu: Right after the whale sanctuary, where the whale foundation --

Ms. Rotunno-Hazuka: Right.

Mr. Kapu: No, it's a whale sanctuary.

Mr. Moikeha: Right, right by Kalei's house. Right across the street.

Mr. Kapu: Right there.

Mr. Kalalau: Wait, wait, wait. Hold on, hold on, hold on. We need to close our meeting officially. Anybody wants to move to --

Mr. Whelchel: I make a motion that we adjourn.

Ms. Rotunno-Hazuka: Second.

Mr. Kalalau: Okay, it's been moved and second that our meeting is to be adjourned.

Mr. Kapu: Okay, mahalo.

Mr. Kalalau: Okay.

J. NEXT MEETING DATE: December 1, 2005

K. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business brought before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 11:10 a.m.

Respectfully submitted by,

SUZETTE L. ESMERALDA
Secretary to Boards and Commissions I

RECORD OF ATTENDANCE

Present

Samuel Kalalau, III, Chairperson
Lon Whelchel
Keeaumoku Kapu
Deldrine "Kauai" Kapuni
Lisa Rotunno-Hazuka
Kalei Moikeha {Excused from meeting from 9:50 a.m. to 10:25 a.m.}

Excused

Nani Watanabe
Perry Artates
Dorothy Pyle

Others

Stanley Solamillo, Planning Staff
Ann Cua, Planning Staff
James Giroux