1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	MINUTES
11	Planning and Land Use Committee
12	Council of the County of Maui
13	Council Chamber
14	March 18, 2004
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	RECONVENE:	4:43 p.m.
2	PRESENT:	Councilmember Wayne K. Nishiki, Chair Councilmember G. Riki Hokama, Vice-Chair
3	- war	Councilmember Robert Carroll, Member Councilmember Jo Anne Johnson, Member
4		(lv 3:20 a.m.) Councilmember Dain P. Kane, Member
5		Councilmember Danny A. Mateo, Member (1v 3:20 a.m.)
6		Councilmember Michael P. Molina, Member (1v 3:20 a.m.)
7		Councilmember Joseph Pontanilla, Member (1v 3:20 a.m.)
8		Councilmember Charmaine Tavares, Member
9	EXCUSED:	None
10	ABSENT:	None
11	STAFF:	David Raatz, Legislative Attorney Yvette Bantilan, Committee Secretary
12		Ken Fukuoka, Director of Council Services
13	ADMIN.:	Alice Lee, Director of Housing and Human Concerns
14		John Buck, Deputy Director of Parks and Recreation
15		Ann Cua, Planner, Department of Planning Michael Foley, Planning Director
16		Ellen Kraftsow, Chief of Planning Division Department of Water Supply
17		George Tengan, Director of Water Supply Brian Moto, Corporation Counsel
18	OTHERS:	Roy Figueiroa, Makena Resort Corp.
19		(applicant's representative) Gwen Ohashi Hiraga, Munekiyo & Hiraga, Inc
20		(applicant's consultant) Aki Sinoto (applicant's archaeologist)
21		Additional attendees (25)
22	PRESS:	Ilima Loomis, The Maui News Tim Hurley, Honolulu Advertiser
23		Gary Kubota, Honolulu Star Bulletin Akaku: Maui Community Television, Inc.

- below has another paragraph in it that says
- essentially that we will treat you like any other
- 3 corporation, if there's water available you will get
- 4 service, if there's no water available you will not
- 5 get it, or some -- something to that effect.
- 6 COUNCILMEMBER MATEO: So there's no guarantee.
- 7 MR. MOTO: Not as -- not as I read it.
- 8 COUNCILMEMBER MATEO: Thank you.
- 9 MR. MOTO: But, you know --
- 10 COUNCILMEMBER MATEO: Thank you, Mr. Moto. Thank you,
- 11 Mr. Chair.
- 12 CHAIR NISHIKI: Okay. Any other discussion as to language
- on the water condition? If there are no objections,
- 14 we'll include that language.
- 15 VICE-CHAIR HOKAMA: Object.
- 16 COUNCILMEMBER JOHNSON: No objection.
- 17 CHAIR NISHIKI: Thank you.
- 18 VICE-CHAIR HOKAMA: Objection.
- 19 CHAIR NISHIKI: Oh, I'm sorry. Okay. We'll have that
- 20 discussion when we deal on the vote. Is that okay,
- 21 Riki?
- 22 VICE-CHAIR HOKAMA: That's fine, Chairman. Thank you.
- 23 CHAIR NISHIKI: Okay. Thank you. We'll move -- maybe
- this is a good time because we asked Roy to address
- what Charmaine had proposed in regards to parks and

PLU 3/18/04 110

1	whether the developer tonight has any language in to
2	offer. What what perhaps, Roy, you've thought
3	about in regards to parks.
4	Also you have that letter from the Parks
5	Department that was submitted to us from Mr. Correa
6	here also, yeah. Okay. Yeah.
7	Is Parks Director here or his representative?
8	COUNCILMEMBER KANE: Deputy right there.
9	CHAIR NISHIKI: Oh, there you are, Mr. Buck. Thank you.
10	Do you have anything to pass out to us or is
11	it pretty clear? Roy?
12	MR. FIGUEIROA: Me? No.
13	CHAIR NISHIKI: Nothing?
14	MR. FIGUEIROA: I do not have anything at this time.
15	CHAIR NISHIKI: Okay. Go ahead.
16	MR. FIGUEIROA: Okay. Are we on number from 35 on?
17	Well, I'm
18	CHAIR NISHIKI: Yeah. You know, the last time
19	Charmaine
20	MR. FIGUEIROA: I'm not sure where we're on on the
21	list.
22	CHAIR NISHIKI: had a

COUNCILMEMBER TAVARES: Thirty-five.

23

24	CHAIR	NISH	IKI:	Charma	ine l	nad	a re	esoluti	ion	to a		a
25		swap	between	giving	you	the	25	acres	for	hot	el,	and

1	then as part of the parks assessment the 10 the
2	10 acres fronting the proposed hotel rezoning would
3	be park. And so then I guess the Committee asked
4	you if to take into consideration perhaps another
5	proposal that we may look at that you can we can
6	rely on from where you stand. Go ahead.
7	MR. FIGUEIROA: Well, we did take a look I must say
8	that I actually I do have some pictures of the
9	area that I do have that I could pass out now that I
LO	recall as far as the particular area we're talking
L1	about as far as perhaps expanding the existing park
L2	on the south end of Maluaka Beach.
L3	We do not think it's we do not think it's
L4	fair that there be a for the condition of
15	approval of the 28 acres for hotel, H-M Hotel-zoned
16	property, that we trade in our existing 11 acre H-M
17	Hotel-zoned property. Saying that, we did look at
18	an area that perhaps could be used to enhance the
19	public's use of Maluaka Beach and adjacent to the
20	south of that by lateral access reaching to the
21	Oneuli Beach or going into that direction.

22	So what I did was try to look at what area
23	was available in the area that's being rezoned. And
24	part of the area that's being rezoned is the PK-4,
25	which is the golf course zoning along the beach.

1	And at the north end of that particular area there
2	is a a portion of the property that perhaps could
3	be developed further for park use. We do not have
4	much area there, but it is a a significant
5	picturesque site that could be used to extend that
6	particular beach park.
7	If you'd like I could pass out the the
8	picture of that area, plus the area along which the
9	lateral access could extend. We did have someone
10	from the State DLNR walking that property today. It
11	belong to the portion of the DLNR that does trails.
12	I'm trying to remember the exact name of that
13	particular part of the DLNR forestry division.
14	VICE-CHAIR HOKAMA: Na Ala Hele.
15	COUNCILMEMBER TAVARES: Na Ala Hele.
16	MR. FIGUEIROA: Na Ala Hele, that's right. Okay. So we
17	walked that area to see where that trail lateral
18	access could be. And so there were some good ideas
19	that they shared with us, and we can see how it

20	would work through a portion of that property along
21	the golf course. So by the extension of that beach
22	park further south to take in the point out there
23	toward the ocean, and then from that point have a
24	lateral access to the sand area at the south
25	toward the south end of the golf course.

PLU 3/18/04 113

When you reach the very southernmost limit of
the area to be rezoned, then there is a problem with
the grade in that area, sharp drop-off from the golf
course hole. So therefore, in that area we'd
recommend as Ms. Nohara did, recommend that that
trail go until the sandy area, stop there, and then
you could travel along the sandy area and continue
that access toward Oneuli Beach. So that was
another component of what we would propose.

In the area of -- I -- I still believe that the idea we had of providing a -- a plan for the State Park at Makena, recreational plan that would include some parking, I thought it was a good idea. And I presented that to DLNR representatives, and they said they would encourage and support that idea of creating a -- a plan whereby that plan would designate where the parking areas could be.

18	Because right now as even as we looked at
19	Oneuli Beach, you could see cars that were driving
20	almost to the sand on that beach because there's no
21	set parking area for them for that particular beach.
22	And then we believe that when they as the each
23	project comes on, at that particular stage by having
24	that plan as a basis, then it could determine what
25	improvements could be assessed each project toward

RALPH ROSENBERG COURT REPORTERS, INC. (808) 524-2090

PLU 3/18/04 114

1	the implementing of that particular plan for that
2	Oneuli Beach.
3	And as I said earlier, it was if it was
4	determined and and we would be doing this plan
5	for DLNR. In other words, it would still be
6	something that they would have to adopt and
7	implement. And then the County could, as I said,
8	judge each project and see how much they would
9	contribute judging on the the scope of that
10	project toward the development of that plan, whether
11	it'd be parking or facilities that could be applied
12	to that lot.
13	And if there weren't enough space there, ther
14	then that plan should look at other areas that
15	could be developed beyond that park or across the

16	screet, as Mr. Nishiki mentioned.
17	There is an area further down that is within
18	the community plan that is not part of this
19	application yet, and I think that also could be
20	satisfied as far as creating an opportunity for
21	beach use. And this is mainly for the fishing area
22	further to the south before you reach La Perouse.
23	believe we have set in the community plan about 2.2
24	acres in that area.
25	I haven't gotten the response. I I guess

PLU 3/18/04 115

1	I forgot to run that by the Parks Department, so I'm
2	not sure how they would react to that particular
3	lot, but that could also be available.
4	There is an area that you're looking at as
5	far as park use that we designate I believe it's one
6	a little over one acre at the south end of our
7	change in zoning. If someone could point that out,
8	I'd appreciate that. Yeah, right there.
9	Now that the reason we only ask for that
0 - 10 - 1	much is because that's the only part within the
1 Mola Sw	urban boundary. However, that even that could be
.2	expanded to what the community plan says would be a

13 4.4 acre parcel eventually in the community plan.

14	So that's another area that could be used.
15	In response to the Makena Landing, I we
16	still have a difficult time understanding that that
17	would be a practical suggestion to implement. We've
18	talked it over with the Parks Department. They have
19	the same concern we do. As far as increasing the
20	ability to use that particular park or in that
21	particular beach is very limited in size.
22	So you may want to ask the Parks Department
23	again how they feel about that. As I said, it's a
24	a suggestion that we feel will not be to the
25	benefit really of the general public.

	1		So those are the areas, as I said, that we
	2		could increase, for example, what's on the beach
	3		side. If you'd like I can pass out the pictures
	4		that I do have for that area, including a view of
	5		where the lateral access would be so you could have
	6		some idea of what it is.
	7	CHAIR	NISHIKI: Questions for Roy? And and and
	8		maybe we should go area by area or I don't know how
	9		this Committee wants to proceed so we don't jump all
1	LO		over the place.
-	11	VICE-C	THAIR HOKAMA. May we request to see the photos

12	Chairman

- 13 CHAIR NISHIKI: Sure.
- 14 COUNCILMEMBER KANE: Mr. Chair?
- 15 CHAIR NISHIKI: Yeah.
- 16 COUNCILMEMBER KANE: Just real quick.
- 17 CHAIR NISHIKI: Go ahead, Dain.
 - 18 COUNCILMEMBER KANE: Does Mr. Figueiroa have a copy of the
 - 19 March 18th letter that, I think, Director Correa of
 - 20 Parks has sent to you and this body, Mr. Chair?
 - 21 CHAIR NISHIKI: I'm not sure. David, is there an extra
 - 22 copy from Parks?
 - David, we have any other pictures also of the
 - 24 -- these areas for Committee?
- 25 MR. RAATZ: Yeah, I'll check.

- 1 CHAIR NISHIKI: Okay. Maluaka first then, Roy, we have
- that. There's a picture there fronting Maluaka.
- 3 MR. FIGUEIROA: Okay. If we could start from the --
- 4 CHAIR NISHIKI: King's Road.
- 5 MR. FIGUEIROA: Okay.
- 6 CHAIR NISHIKI: Okay.
- 7 MR. FIGUEIROA: That is the area of -- of what we're
- showing here. You see where the -- just beyond that
- 9 sign that is shown there in the middle of the

10	picture? The beach access begins there coming
11	toward the south, and that's the public restrooms
12	that we built there on that picture numbered number
13	seven.
14	Then the next picture of the park is what we
15	developed as a park. That to is to the makai
16	side of the public restrooms. So that's the
17	existing area that we're asking for the change in

and part of it was, I believe, open space. And so

we're asking for the change in zoning to the PK-1

21 designation for this particular park.

18

22

23

24

25

Now you see in that picture number nine, you see there's a wall right about the middle of the picture level with the bottom of that tree, see the -- the crown of that tree? Okay. That wall is the

zoning. Part of this was hotel on the former zoning

RALPH ROSENBERG COURT REPORTERS, INC. (808) 524-2090

1	southernmost boundary of this particular park.
2	So then when you look at the next picture,
3	that would be the area which is number 11, that
4	would be the area to the south of that particular
5	park where you're getting close to the golf course.
6	And that is where we would say we would extend that
7	park into this area where you could develop this

8	again. And we would look at developing it in a
9	similar way to what you see in picture number
10	nine numbered nine where you have grassed area.
11	And then you're looking at picture number
12	11. If you look to the right edge, see, that's sort
13	of like a point going out toward the ocean. So we
14	believe right now that would expand this particular
15	park to one-and-a-half acres. We'll probably create
16	not only we wouldn't recommend taking down the
17	wall that was built there, but we'd probably
18	recommend creating an opening that we would do.
19	And again, this is something that we would be
20	doing because I don't believe the Parks and
21	Recreation Department would like to inherit this
22	undeveloped. And we recommend being able to do it
23	and then maintain it again as we do the existing
24	park area.
25	As you can see, it is a a beautiful area

PLU 3/18/04 119

1	that that could be used for additional as it
2	shows here some kind of picnic area. And and as
3	I said, that would increase that particular park to
4	one-and-a-half acres.

Now if you look at the tree in the middle of

6	number 11, that keawe tree right about in the middle
7	of the picture, the park would extend to about that
8	area. And so the lateral access then would continue
9	from that along the shoreline.
10	The next picture is continuing southward.
11	You can see how people are walking you see that
12	path in picture number 16? There appears to be a
13	used path between that stake and the keawe tree
14	toward the bottom right side of the picture.
15	But we believe by creating the park, we could
16	continue the access, the lateral access, closer to
17	the shoreline, which would alleviate our concerns
18	about being too close to the golf course. And right
19	now that would require some work along the shoreline
20	so we could get them closer to the beach.
21	Now if you look at the next picture, number
22	23, as we discussed with Ms. Nohara, this would be
23	probably the area she believes and and we believe
24	that the lateral access would come right to the
25	beach itself. And that beach connects to Oneuli

L	Beach to if you look in that picture number 23,
2	you see the stake with the white white stake with
	the blue ten would be around that area take it

right to the beach. And then from there you'd be walking along that beach as a lateral access, and that would take you right through to Oneuli Beach.

If we look at the next or even -- yeah, it would be the next picture, number 28, this is where if we did not stop the lateral access at the beach itself and took it up above into the vegetation, we get close to the golf course and then there would be a sharp drop to come back to the beach because of the -- the elevation difference. And that's why we concur that it would probably be best to stop it at the sand beach, the beginning of that north end of the beach.

If you look at number 30, picture number 30, the shoreline looking back, that shows you the type of beach that you would be walking along in order to continue the access toward Oneuli Beach. So in looking at picture number 30, you're looking northward, the opposite direction.

And number 41 again shows you the -- going back to the makai side of the park that was already developed. And that wall is now between the area of

RALPH ROSENBERG COURT REPORTERS, INC. (808) 524-2090

PLU 3/18/04 121

2	But it does if you see on number 41, the shoreline
3	does jut out toward the west. So there's a point
4	out there that it goes out toward that you would be
5	able to utilize for the beach public area.
6	As far as Maluaka also as the parking, I
7	believe there was concern that there was not enough
8	parking. We do have 30 stalls, and we believe that
9	probably another 30 could be constructed in that
10	particular area. And that would alleviate well,
11	not alleviate, it would encourage use of that
12	particular beach.
13	As I said, combined with well, if you want
14	me to stop at Maluaka, I'll I'll stop right
15	there.
16	CHAIR NISHIKI: Yeah. I think we want to we want to
17	stop there and and ask questions. So then you
18	could put 30 more parking stalls and also address
19	the lateral to Oneuli that was asked of and also a
20	path.
21	Questions from Members?
22	COUNCILMEMBER TAVARES: I'd like to hear comments,
23	Mr. Chair, from the Parks Department.
24	CHAIR NISHIKI: Parks?

- the -- what is some of the conditions. However, the 1 way the conditions were brought or -- or part of some of the conditions we had a comment on because 3 of the fact that it's inconsistent on what we're doing now at other parks and recreation facilities --COUNCILMEMBER TAVARES: Wait, wait, John. MR. BUCK: -- and parking lots. 8 COUNCILMEMBER TAVARES: John, excuse me. Just on this 10 proposal. MR. BUCK: Oh, on this proposal? 11 12 COUNCILMEMBER TAVARES: Yes, uh-huh. MR. BUCK: I think it's a -- a good plan, workable. It 13 gives us access. I think the only concern I have is 14 as far as what type of develop it's going to be. I 15 mean, is it going to be a natural path or a -- a --16 17 a six-foot wide developed concrete paved or we're 18 going to just kind of try to leave it in a natural state. Because when you start cutting -- I think 19 one of our concerns may have been concerning the 20 developer, if you start cutting into banks and 21 things, there might be the concern of erosion. 22

MR. FIGUEIROA: Well, we looked at the area with

CHAIR NISHIKI: Go ahead, Roy.

23

24

25

Ms. Nohara and we feel that there -- there could be

PLU 3/18/04 123

_	areas that could be as wide as six reet. However,
2	if it were a hard path we don't know if that would
3.	be the best. We'd like to work with them, with the
4	 DLNR, as to what type of path it it would be.
5	The other concern I forgot to mention is that of the
6	keeping it open 24 24 hours a day, seven days a
7	week because there was concern about the liability
8	in that area.
9	I believe she referred me to something in
10	Lanai about a memorandum of understanding as to how
11	the the fishermen's trail, for example, she was
12	going to get me a copy of that memorandum of
13	understanding. But I understand in that one it's
14	not a hard trail, but it does provide access. And
15	she was more accustomed to something like a
16	four-foot wide, around four-foot wide trail.
17	But as far as the areas I pointed out that it
18	would be difficult is where I have that sharp bank.
19	In other areas, it looks like as long as we are able
20	to and and this is something the Planning
21	Department can clarify because it it would be
22	within the shoreline setback area. And also, I

don't know if it would require an SMA permit to do

23

24

it.

1		is to how long we had to do it because I think your
2		condition said about six months and I don't believe
3		that's possible. Well, let's put it this way. It's
4		probably possible, but I shouldn't even use the word
5		probably possible. I'll let them comment. It's
6		it's very difficult. I can't see it happening in
7		six months.
8		I'm not saying I'm not willing to work hard
9		to get it done, but I don't think I can control
10		where it could happen in six months doing the
11		because of the process involved. So maybe they can
12		comment.
13	MR. FO	OLEY: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Figueiroa is correct, it
14		would require a shoreline setback variance and an
15		SMA permit. However, we would be very supportive of
16		increasing shoreline access. But in addition to
17		processing those two permits, it also needs to be at
18		least preliminarily designed. So six months isn't
19		very realistic. They'd probably need, oh, a little
20		longer than that. Maybe nine months would be
21		accurate for design and approval.
22	CHAIR	NISHIKI: Charmaine

- 23 VICE-CHAIR HOKAMA: Chair --
- 24 CHAIR NISHIKI: -- any other questions from --
- 25 VICE-CHAIR HOKAMA: Chairman? Oh, I'm sorry. I am sorry.

PLU 3/18/04 125

1 COUNCILMEMBER TAVARES: No. Go ahead.

- 2 CHAIR NISHIKI: Riki, go ahead.
- 3 VICE-CHAIR HOKAMA: Chairman, since Mr. Figueiroa did
- 4 mention a memorandum of agreement as we -- we call
- 5 it and use it on Lanai, I would just ask the Members
- if they would look at page 11, which is under the
- 7 subheading just Park, if you look at the bottom of
- 8 the middle of the photograph, that -- that sandy
- area, that would be pretty close to what we have on
- 10 Lanai regarding the -- the Hulopoe area which fronts
- 11 the Manele Hotel.
- 12 It is an existing fishermen's trail, so it is
- 13 very rugged. It's maintained, but you need to be
- careful of what you're walking on. It's -- it's
- very much in its natural state. So again, you know,
- I -- I -- I've heard the comments from Mr. Buck,
- 17 there is limited access because of the natural
- 18 condition and that if you're not careful you
- 19 definitely can get hurt.
- But it works for us on Lanai. It's part of a

21	a resort development amenities. It is something
22	we we still use as residents for to get to
23	certain fishing spots, which I won't share with
24	you. But we use it still yet as as locals also.
25	So I think if the Parks Department, DLNR
	RALPH ROSENBERG COURT REPORTERS, INC. (808) 524-2090
DT.II	3/18/04 126
110	
1	works with the Planning Department, I can see this
2	being a very work workable option for this site,
3	Mr. Chairman. Thank you.
4	CHAIR NISHIKI: Any other questions, comments?
5	COUNCILMEMBER TAVARES: Comment.
6	CHAIR NISHIKI: Charmaine, go ahead.
7	COUNCILMEMBER TAVARES: Yeah, Mr. Chair, I I like this
8	particular plan and effort so far that's been taken
9	to get input from DLNR. I think as we heard through
10	the testimonies, there were a number of testimonies
11	regarding access to shorelines, and I am in total
12	support of what Mr. Foley is saying about increasing
13	shoreline access.
14	But I think not only increasing shoreline
15	access because as you look at these pictures with
16	the nondeveloped area, the wall, it's already
17	screaming keep out, kapu. And I think we heard that

people want to have what they had before, ability to

19	access without feeling like they were trespassing.
20	And I think with working together with the
21	Parks Department, DLNR, and Planning Department,
22	that a it can be developed to a point, not
23	overdeveloped, but developed to a point where it is
24	at least welcoming and and encouraging and not
25	giving people that feeling that they are in a place
	RALPH ROSENBERG COURT REPORTERS, INC. (808) 524-2090
PLU	3/18/04
1	they shouldn't be.
2	So for for those reasons, I I like the
3	proposal and thank the developer for putting in the
4	effort in a rather short period of time to come up
5	with this.
6	CHAIR NISHIKI: Any other comments, Charmaine, that's it?
7	COUNCILMEMBER TAVARES: That's it.
8	CHAIR NISHIKI: Jo Anne?
9	COUNCILMEMBER JOHNSON: As Chair of the Parks and
10	Agriculture Committee, I think that any opportunity
11	we can take to try to address the concerns that have
12	been expressed is really important.
13	The there was one letter that we received

and -- you know, about whether the path should or

should not be developed. And the letter that we

received was -- was from the Department of Health.

14

15

16

17	And it doesn't say specifically Clean Water Branch,
18	but, you know, I know that in this statement that
19	was made, June Harrigan Lum, who's the Environmental
20	Planning Office, wrote that they regretted they
21	didn't have enough notice or information about the
22	matter to be able to be you know, to respond.
23	And she stated that again, the same things
24	that Planning has stated that in this case she's
25	saying an EIS, EA, or Land Use application documents

PLU 3/18/04 128

were ordinarily provided.

2

3

10

11

12

13

14

So my concern and my only concern about her letter is that whatever's done in terms of whether it's a developed path, undeveloped path, I -- I just hope that we can provide that data so that we can get a response back from the Department of Health.

And also I didn't, and correct me if I'm wrong, I didn't see and I may have just missed it, I was looking for the OHA comments too because with the PASH rights and all of the access rights that native Hawaiians have, those two issues would be really critical.

I -- I really defer to Mr. Buck and the Planning Commission about some of the other issues

15	regarding what is appropriate, the amount of traffic
16	that can be handled in that area, because they know
17	the area much better than I do and they know what
18	the usage is.
19	But I just those would be my concerns,
20	Mr. Figueiroa, in those two areas, try to get some
21	kind of a response back both from the Department of
22	Health and also from Office of Hawaiian Affairs with
23	regard to the area being kept open for the practice
24	of native gathering rights.
25 MR. F	IGUEIROA: If I may comment or ask a question. Are

100	you referring to being open 24 hours a day, seven
2	days a week, is that the
3	COUNCILMEMBER JOHNSON: Well
4	MR. FIGUEIROA: condition?
5	COUNCILMEMBER JOHNSON: with regard to PASH, basically
6	when people want to go fishing, I mean, they go at
7	all hours of the night. Sometimes there's other
8	cultural practices that may take place during
9	certain times of the year for religious ceremonies.
10	I think that in consultation with Na Kupuna or othe
11	organizations and particularly OHA, I think that
12	they would have to look at whatever access was

13	open.
14	And I'm not saying necessarily that to all
15	other people it would be open 24 hours a day because
16	I don't want drug dealing and other issues, plus
17	just the visibility in that area, we don't want to
18	put lights all along that area, I mean, so that it's
19	it's really creating other problems with our
20	nearshore waters.
21	And I know that Mr. Molina's committee is
22	dealing with the the lighting near the ocean and
23	some of the shorebird issues. So just to have some
24	kind of comment I think would be really helpful in
25	looking at this.

1	MR. FIGUEIROA: We would welcome the input from the
2	different groups you mentioned and the agencies.
3	And that's why perhaps I'm not as optimistic as
4	Mr. Foley about nine months would be enough. I
5	believe if you gave me a year, I might say it's
6	possible. I still might not be comfortable, but
7	that's why I I believe the nine months is
8	probably very optimistic given the comments you've
9	just you've just made.
10	COUNCILMEMBER JOHNSON: And and I would say that as

11	long as you begin the process within that period of
12	time, I think that's basically what the purpose and
13	intent of putting that condition in. Because just
14	from recent rulings we've had, even with our own
15	Parks Department with regard to our ocean recreation
16	activities, we're having serious concerns about even
17	being able to accomplish some of the charges that
18	we've been given by our own Council Members.
19	So it's not easy and Mr. Buck knows what he's
20	having to go through. Just ask some of the you
21	know, even our school which we thought might not
22	have as long a period of time, we're having
23	difficulty even completing that. So I think if some
24	language could be put in there that in working
25	towards this, that at least the process is embarked

1	on within a reasonable period of time.
2 MR.	FIGUEIROA: Thank you. And I I think the Parks
3	Department as far as being able to we'd like
4	after we do this work that the Parks Department or
5	the County of Maui does accept dedication of this
6	area to the County.
7	And as far as the lateral access would also
8	be we would like to dedicate that easement of the

9	lateral access to the County. Maybe you'd like to
10	get the Parks Department's response on that. It
11	would be a requirement of the County, and we do have
12	some concerns on that liability.
13	You know, it's different from just allowing
14	how people just walk to the beach now, and it's
15	different from giving them an invitation by
16	establishing a hard surface toward that beach. I
17	think the liability, the the attorneys would have
18	to answer that, but it's I think they'd make a
19	distinction between people just climb over rocks or
20	whatever, rough trail as Mr. Hokama brought out,
21	it's different from if you invite them to take that
22	path as to who has the liability on that.
23	But we would like to cooperate in having this
24	done, and as I said, we would like the County to
25	accept the dedication of the area once it's done.

1	COUNCILMEMBER JOHNSON: That basically would be from my
2	understanding, correct me if I'm wrong, Mr. Moto,
3	acceptance of any land dedication would be in the
4	Council's purview, is that correct?
5	MR. MOTO: Mr. Chairman, yes, the Council would have
-	nurquant nurquant to Maui County Code Provisions

7	the the County Council would have to accept any
8	conveyance of an interest in real property.
9	COUNCILMEMBER JOHNSON: Okay. Thank you.
10	CHAIR NISHIKI: Riki?
11	VICE-CHAIR HOKAMA: Thank you, Chairman.
12	Mr. Figueiroa, so we can understand an
13	earlier condition that we we've discussed quite a
14	bit, but I want to bring it up again because since
15	this subject matter regarding your proposal because
16	I I have listened to Ms. Johnson's concern about
17	PASH, OHA, and so would this be part of your
18	Cultural Resource Management Plan as part under
19	the cultural component?
20	When you say access to specified sites, that
21	you're also including whether it'd be lateral or
22	beach shoreline access, that that would be part
23	would this be also a part of your Cultural Resource
24	Management Plan that organizations like Na Kupuna,
25	our County Cultural Resource Commission, our Burial
	DAI DU DOCEMBERO COURT REPORTERS INC

PLU 3/18/04 133

Councils would be part of the comment and review

2 process?

3 MR. FIGUEIROA: Right now this is part of our property and

4 our -- our study would include this area also. And