

LINDA LINGLE
GOVERNOR OF HAWAII



**STATE OF HAWAII
DEPARTMENT OF LAND AND NATURAL RESOURCES**

STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION DIVISION
601 KAMOKILA BOULEVARD, ROOM 555
KAPOLEI, HAWAII 96707

ALLAN A. SMITH
INTERIM CHAIRPERSON
BOARD OF LAND AND NATURAL RESOURCES
COMMISSION ON WATER RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

PETER T. YOUNG
DEPUTY DIRECTOR

KEN C. KAWAHARA
DEPUTY DIRECTOR - WATER

AQUATIC RESOURCES
BOATING AND OCEAN RECREATION
BUREAU OF CONVEYANCES
COMMISSION ON WATER RESOURCE MANAGEMENT
CONSERVATION AND COASTAL LANDS
CONSERVATION AND RESOURCES ENFORCEMENT
ENGINEERING
FORESTRY AND WILDLIFE
HISTORIC PRESERVATION
KAHOOLAWE ISLAND RESERVE COMMISSION
LAND
STATE PARKS

**MINUTES
HAWAII ISLAND BURIAL COUNCIL**

DATE: THURSDAY, JUNE 21, 2007
TIME: 10:30A.M.
PLACE: NATURAL ENERGY LABORATORY HAWAII AUTHORITY
73-4660 QUEEN KAAHUMANU HIGHWAY
KAILUA-KONA, HAWAII 96740

ATTENDANCE:

Members: Charles Young, Chair
Ululani Keliikoa-Sherlock, Vice-Chair
Ronald Dela Cruz
Leningrad Elarionoff
Winifred Pele Hanoa
Roy Helbush
Ku Kahakalau
Melvyn Kaleo Kualii
Cynthia Nazara

Absent: Anna Cariaga
Dutchie Saffrey

Staff: Melanie Chinen, Administrator
Hinano Rodrigues, Cultural Historian
Pamela Matsukawa, Deputy Attorney General

Guest: Kalae Wheeler
Violet Mamac
Henry Akana
Chester Koga
Bruce McClure
Curtis Tyler
Gregory Chun
Josephine Keliipio

Charles Flakerly
Lynette Awaya
Merry Anne Stone
Bobby Command
Lily Kong
Moanikeala Kauoiko
Bob Yanabu
Arthur Ovatic

Nani Langridge	Ruby McDonald
Kapua Kane-Huihui	Kaimi Judd
Joe Root	Doreen Kahaialii
Raenette Kahaialii	Roslyn Peterson
Lawten Kipapa	Mikahala Roy
Geraldine Olszowka-Martinez	

OPENING REMARKS:

HIBC Chair, Charles Young (Young) called the meeting to order.

Pele Hanoa (Hanoa) offered a *pule wehe*.

HIBC members, SHPD staff and Deputy Attorney General introduced themselves.

BUSINESS

A. BURIAL TREATMENT PLAN FOR SITE 23242 HOKULIA PROJECT PHASE 1, LOT 222, KALUKALU AHUPUAA, SOUTH KONA DISTRICT, HAWAII ISLAND, TMK: (3) 8-1-30:20.

Information/Recommendation/Determination: Information presentation of the revised burial treatment plan by Pacific Consulting Services, Inc. HIBC determination to preserve in place the burial identified in the burial treatment plan. HIBC recommendations to the Department on appropriate short and long-term preservation and protective measures for the burial site identified within the burial treatment plan.

Byron Moku (Moku) said there was an informal site visit at Hokulia this morning. Moku said the site numbers in the appendix would be corrected. Preserving the burials in place with a 20 foot buffer was the proposed recommendation. The burials would be in a preservation easement and recorded with metes and bounds descriptions. A rock wall would demarcate the boundaries of the buffer. Landscaping and maintenance would be the responsibility of Hokulia. Access would be provided to [recognized] cultural and lineal descendants. Byron said recordation of easements and fulfilling the requirements of the burial treatment plan (BTP) would occur upon SHPD's acceptance of the subsequent BTP.

Young also mentioned an informal site visit was conducted at Hokulia. Young suggested council members that attended the meeting share their observations with those council members that did not attend the meeting. Young said the house was well into construction. There was concern the overhang from the house may infringe into the buffer area. A cultural monitor had been present during construction phases for the house. Young thought a cultural monitor would be in place at Hokulia during all phases of construction. Young reiterated the council's request to be consulted during all inadvertent burial discoveries at Hokulia in addition to consultation with SHPD and recognized descendants.

Moku said the subject BTP was a unique stand alone plan. Moku said the HIBC and SHPD would be consulted prior to the development of future BTPs. Moku assured the council that Oceanside 1250 would comply with the proper policies and procedures. Hokulia had multiple archaeological firms involved with development project that would help advise each individual lot owner.

A council member asked if there was anyway a person could start construction without consulting an archaeological firm. Moku said every lot owner with the intentions of constructing a house needed to go through a design review process. The design review process would identify sites which may be present on a lot and required lot owners to design proposed construction around sites that may be present. Moku said lot owners would still be guided should inadvertent discoveries occur.

A council member asked if future inadvertent discoveries would also be “unique situations.” Moku said the landowner had gone through numerous efforts to identify and record all cultural and archaeological sites. Moku said individual lot owners would be guided through the necessary process should a lot owner encounter an inadvertent discovery.

Ku Kahakalau (Kahakalau) wanted to know why a BTP had been approved without concurrence from the HIBC.

A council member wanted to know what SHPD’s policy was, pertaining to expeditious reviews for lot owners with “unique circumstances.” Melanie Chinen (Chinen) said she would check with [former SHPD staff] Keola Lindsey to how similar situations were dealt with in the past. Chinen explained the department determined whether or not to accept or reject a plan. Chinen said the council could make any recommendations pertaining to a plan which would be considered during the department’s determination. The council member wanted to know who granted an expeditious review. Chinen said she did not personally review the subject BTP and could not comment further.

Someone said short-term preservation measures needed to be in place before construction could begin.

Kahakalau said the HIBC should have been afforded the opportunity to comment on the subject BTP prior to construction activities occurring.

A council member wanted to know if preference was given to certain projects that were being reviewed by the department. Chinen said she could not answer the question. The council member was concerned because a plan had been approved without comments from the HIBC. The council member felt plans submitted to SHPD should also be submitted to the HIBC which would give council members a better understanding of what was discussed.

A council member cited Hawaii Administrative Rules §13-300-33 (10) and said the council had the right to request plans related to a BTP.

A member from the audience who claimed to be a descendant said she and others wanted to be recognized and consulted with. Someone said all the information was presented in an information packet and mailed to all [recognized] lineal and cultural descendants. The descendant claimed she did not receive the information packet. The descendant reiterated her request to be included in the consultation process along with the HIBC and SHPD. Moku wanted to be sure there were good working bylaws with the HIBC and SHPD since both entities granted certain approvals. Formal dialog would be communicated with descendants after the proper approvals have been obtained. The descendant felt she was being left out of the consultation process and wanted to be included in both the informative and formal stages of consultation. Someone said a list of descendants was initially provided by SHPD. The descendant said she and other family members have not received any mailing pertaining to the subject agenda item. It was suggested the developers may have incorrect contact information. It was further suggested by the developers that the task of providing up to date contact information was the responsibility of descendants. The descendant was in agreement to preserving burial 23242 in place.

Curtis Tyler (Tyler) a recognized descendant introduced himself. Tyler said there were other instances where the HIBC and members of the public were not given the opportunity to comment on projects/plans that had already been approved. Tyler thought expedited approvals were a violation of the law. Tyler also wanted to know if SHPD had a policy in place which permitted expeditious reviews. Tyler said the item being discussed was an “after-the-fact” incident. Tyler requested a copy of the approved BTP to be mailed to him. Tyler also requested an additional 10 feet be included to the existing buffer for the burial. Tyler wanted to know why recordation of easements for the subject agenda item had not been filed with the bureau of conveyance [prior to acceptance of the BTP].

Young said burial 23242 was initially treated as an inadvertent discovery. Young said a court order determined the burial be treated as a previously known discovery which was why the situation was considered a “unique stand alone” incident. Young also reiterated Moku’s commitment to carefully monitor the Hokulia development to prevent similar situations from occurring. Tyler wanted a written document of Moku’s commitment to ensure no future “after-the-fact” incidents would occur. Tyler felt consequences should be imposed upon any action which did not comply with the law. Tyler felt rules and procedures needed to be established for the HIBC.

Geraldine Leimoni Olszowka-Martinez (Martinez) of the Kaleikau *ohana* introduced herself. Martinez also felt some form of consequence needed to be imposed. Martinez said California had strict penalties for individuals who are not in compliance with established guidelines. Martinez suggested uprooting and relocating the house.

Moanikeala Kaupiko (Kaupiko) introduced herself and said she agreed with the comments made by Tyler. Kaupiko also requested a copy of the approved BTP. Kaupiko wanted to know what the proper procedures were and how often the

community was consulted. Kaupiko wanted a clear explanation of why the situation was “unique” and if she would be privileged to “unique” conditions in the future. Kaupiko did not want to see other “unique” incidents in the future. Kaupiko wanted to know the total number of burials at Hokulia and the location of each burial.

A male testifier (MT) said the elders were fools because they referred to themselves as bones. MT was upset because he had filed complaints with the police department to no avail. MT said he filed a complaint with the state which also did not produce any results. MT said he voiced his complaint to the HIBC years ago. MT said rules and laws were pointless if there was no enforcement. MT said he had complained to the state for years and still has not seen any of his complaints addressed. Young suggested discussing the issues raised by MT as a separate agenda item at a future HIBC meeting. Young said the council was currently not in a position to address any of MT’s concerns because the issues being raised had not been agendaized.

Adachi Kaleihua Makanoenoe Eaton (Eaton) introduced himself and said he was one of the founding members that lobbied to establish the burials laws for Hawaii. Eaton said burial councils were established through inspiration of a Native American and the eventual creation of NAGPRA (Native American Graves Protection Repatriation Act). Eaton said the intent of the burial councils was to protect *iwi*. Eaton said it has always been his family’s responsibility to protect burials. Eaton said protecting burials and cultural sites was much more important than developing land. Young said the council could only make a decision pertaining to the current agenda item being discussed. A council member said an effort was in the work to have all inadvertent burials reclassified to be previously known burials.

MT said his elders cared for him as a child and it was his responsibility to care for the *iwi* of his *kupuna*.

Luna Kanawai Hauniu (Hauniu) introduced himself and said he informed SHPD in writing in October of 2005 that Hakulua *heiau* was being desecrated. Hauniu read his written testimony addressed to Chinen. Pam Matsukawa said the burial council did not have authority over land use issues.

Charles Flaerty (Flaerty) introduced himself and said he was disturbed the burial council was not informed of the settlement agreement by which the court ordered all inadvertent discoveries be treated as previously known burials. Flaerty said DLNR signed the agreement and it was the responsibility of the department to have informed the council. Flaerty said a provision needed to be established to allow the HIBC to compare archaeological inventory surveys against subdivision plat maps. Flaerty said such a comparison would allow the council to determine whether or not proper protective measures and easements were in place. Flaerty thought such a provision or rule would have prevented the subject agenda item from occurring. A council member cited HAR §13-300-33 (4) and thought the rule covered the suggestion made by Flaerty. Flaerty was not sure if the rule covered plat maps submitted to the county. Flaerty said the court order to have inadvertent treated as previously known burials occurred in 2003.

Roslyn Peterson (Peterson) was upset because he felt that Oahu staff did not care about the Hawaiian culture. Peterson said the lands needed to be respected. Peterson was saddened because he felt money and developers were given greater precedence over Hawaiian people. Peterson did not think the land was being properly protected. Peterson wanted to know why SHPD did not have staff or an office for Hawaii Island. Peterson was upset because SHPD was not preserving and protecting sites. Peterson wanted Hawaii Island to remain culturally intact. Young said the council understood the point being made by Peterson. Young suggested Peterson request to have his issues agendaized to be discussed at a future meeting. Peterson wanted SHPD's respect by simply responding to letters he had written.

Josephine Keliipio (Keliipio) introduced herself and said it was an insult to have the house constructed in close proximity to the burial. Keliipio did not want any precedence set as a result of the unique situation which occurred.

Kahakalau asked Moku to address some of the concerns raised by the public relating to why the situation was unique and why certain procedures were not followed. Moku said Oceanside 1250 was asked by the landowner to help obtain the necessary grading permits. Moku was informed by a former archaeologist that protective measures needed to be in place.

A female testifier (FT) asked who the landowner was and how the landowner was able to get an expeditious review. The same person also said the situation was not unique. Moku said Oceanside 1250 did not purposefully try to circumvent and/or bypass any process or the HIBC. Moku said Oceanside 1250 submitted a request on behalf of the landowner. FT asked if Oceanside submitted requests for review for all landowners at Hokulia. Moku said the circumstances relating to burial 23242 would not be repeated in the future.

A council member said the review was expedited in accordance with HR §13-284-9 (d) as explained in the subject BTP. FT did not want the unique incident to set any form of precedence. FT wanted some form of consequence imposed in order to address the seriousness of the situation. FT wanted to know what plan of action the council would take in order to ensure the situation being discussed would not happen in the future.

Lily Kong (Kong) introduced herself and said Hawaiians often sold land to developers because taxes were too great and/or because there were too many heirs to a property. Kong said Hawaiians needed to do more than pray for burials. Kong said Hawaiians needed to check and help with maintenance for burials as well. Kong said it was up to the people to work with the developers in order to properly care for burials. Kong wanted to know how the burials would be cared for in the future. A council member did not think land should be sold because a family was too big.

A council member suggested the revisions in the BTP be highlighted so the council would know what changes were made. Someone said highlights would not show on xerox copies.

Young asked if the developer proposed to preserve burial 23242 in place with a 20 foot buffer area to which Moku answered yes. Tyler asked about the additional 10 feet buffer. Young said the house was already built and the additional 10 feet buffer was not practical. Young said the burial was in an easement and not a lot. Young said the landowner was issued a construction permit prior to the council's review of the subject BTP.

A motion was made to preserve in place and accept the buffers for site 23242 within Hokulia Phase 1, lot 222, Kalukalu ahupuaa, south Kone district, Hawaii island, TMK: (3) 8-1-30:20. (Kualii/Dela Cruz)

VOTE: ALL IN FAVOR.

A motion was made recommending SHPD provide in writing to the HIBC the specific events with dates on any determinations made and cite the relevant rules and laws applicable to the agenda item discussed, as well as clarification on the basis of the BTP's expeditious review and what consequences are appropriate if violations occurred.

Hinano Rodrigues (Rodrigues) asked if the motion made was bifurcated. Rodrigues asked if the motion was to preserve in place as well as recommending acceptance of the BTP. Young said the motion was to preserve in place as recommended by the BTP. Rodrigues suggested the council move to recommend acceptance of the BTP.

A motion was made to close agenda item IV. A.

VOTE: ALL IN FAVOR.

HIBC chair called a short recess.

B. SITE TREATMENT RECOMMENDATIONS FOR BURIAL AT SITE 2079, FEATURE B, KAHALU'U AHUPUA'A, NORTH KONA DISTRICT, HAWAI'I ISLAND, TMK: (3) 7-8-10: ROADWAY RIGHT-OF-WAY.

Information/Recommendation: Presentation by County of Hawai'i of a treatment plan which details the short and long term measures of preservation plan in place of Site 2079. Recommendations by the Hawai'i Island Burial Council on the short and long term preservation details within the final preservation plan.

Bruce McClure (McClure) the director for department of public works for Hawaii County introduced himself.

Leslie Kimura (Kimura) said he had a power point presentation. Kimura said cultural descendants were consulted. The archaeological issues were updated and three alternatives were to be presented which were also discussed with the cultural descendants. A recommendation from the council agreeing to one of the three alternatives was being sought. Kimura said the proposed roadway was formerly known as Alii Highway, stretched 4.5 miles and dated back to 1970s. The corridor was the area studied by the archaeologist which measured 300 feet in width. The right-of-way varied in width between 100-180 feet. The paved path which included the shoulder and a bike pedestrian path measured 54 feet in width. Kimura said a two lane road with six feet shoulders and ten feet bike paths on both side of the road was being proposed.

Kimura said an MOA (memorandum of agreement) was developed in 1987. The MOA outlined eight phases of archaeological studies and the subsequent catches which needed to occur. Currently the project was between phases 4 and 5. An AIS was conducted by Paul Rosendahl in 1998 during phase 1 in which 177 sites and 1548 features were identified. 153 sites were currently in the proposed road alignment. Phase 2 consisted of assessing the significance of the 153 sites which resulted in the development of a BTP. Phase 3 consisted of conducting archaeological data-recovery for 82 of the 153 sites.

Kimura said site 2079 consisted of three features; a lava tube, petroglyph and a human burial. The burial was determined to be in the road alignment in the summer of 2003. The attorney general's office in February 2004 said the burial needed its own specific BTP. The HIBC recognized 18 cultural descendants for site 2079.

Kimura said three alternatives were suggested. The first was to create a viaduct. The second was to preserve the burial within a median. The third was to relocate the road *makai* or *mauka* of the burial. The design solution was to construct a short span bridge over the site.

Glenn said the proposed bridge would be 80 feet in length. The bridge would have adequate buffers which would be large enough to reduce vibrations which may disturb the burial. Glenn said descendants were concerned people may travel beneath the bridge. Glenn said walls could be constructed to deter people from entering the area of site 2079. An access door could be constructed as part of the wall should descendants want to visit the site. An advantage of the short span bridge would prevent the lava tube from collapsing. A disadvantage was that the road would still pass near the burial.

Glenn said another alternative was to relocate the road *mauka* of the burial. An advantage would be the complete avoidance of site 2079. A disadvantage would be the impact on other sites and burials. Another disadvantage would be securing an additional right-of-way as well as engineering challenges. Glenn said the realignment would require somewhat extensive grading further increasing the possibility of impacting sites and burials. Glenn did not think the alternative was feasible.

Glenn said another alternative was to relocate the road *makai* of the burial. An advantage was the road would not pass directly over the burial. A disadvantage was the road would still pass over the lava tube and require a larger retaining wall be constructed.

Kimura said a list of cultural descendants was obtained from SHPD. Letters were mailed out to the descendants and a group meeting was held on May 1, 2007. Concerns at the group meeting consisted of; how a person became a cultural descendant, failure to recognize important spiritual and cultural values within the archaeological studies and SHPD's lack of consultation with descendants. Descendants were concerned if the proposed road would be two or four lanes. Kimura said constructing a two lane road was strongly supported by the mayor, but did not discount the possibility of expanding the road to four lanes in the future.

Kimura said contact was made with 10 of 18 cultural descendants. Descendants seemed to favor the viaduct concept. Descendants wanted the lava tube protected to prevent collapse and protection of the burial.

Kimura requested concurrence from the HIBC on either alternative 1 or alternative 3. Kimura mentioned the mayor supported a recommendation to conduct a supplemental study of the corridor which served to revalidate and re-verify the results of previous archaeological studies. Descendants suggested Kehau Abad (Abad) conduct the supplemental study. Contact was made with Abad who agreed to assist with the supplemental study.

Kimura reiterated his request for a recommendation from the council. Kimura said the next step would be to design the road and revise the treatment plan to preserve the burial in place which would be submitted to SHPD for review and approval. Kimura said a suggestion was made to the mayor to create an advisory council which would be given the opportunity to review and make recommendations pertaining to the project. A preservation plan would need to eventually be developed which would discuss interpretations for each site. The advisory council was to serve as the voice for the recognized cultural descendants.

A council member asked if the supplemental study was to resurvey the entire project area or if the supplemental study was to resurvey to specific area where the road would be constructed. Kimura said the study was to revalidate previous archaeological work. The council member felt the supplemental study was being conducted because representatives of the project may have doubts about previous archaeological work. The council member wanted to know why the HIBC was being asked for a recommendation if there were any doubts with the project.

Kimura said the BTP was adopted by the HIBC in 2001. The issue today was a request which pertained only to site 2079. Kimura said the supplemental study was to revalidate the sites in the area for the roadway. A council member wanted to know if the representatives for the project could guarantee no new sites would be identified to

which the answer was no. Kimura said the representatives for the project were simply trying to put forth their best efforts to ensure the least amount of impact to sites.

Kahakalau said the MOA outlined an eight page mitigation program. Kahakalau said Kimura used the words archaeological studies. Kahakalau wanted to know the difference between an archaeological study and a mitigation program. Kimura thought an archaeological study was the examination of physical remains on/within an area which included habitation features, topography and history. Kimura thought an archaeological study served to create a historical picture of an area. Kimura thought a mitigation plan involved the archaeological evaluation, interpretation and assessment of each identified site. Kimura thought the mitigation plan outlined the treatment of each site.

Kahakalau wanted to know how many other discrepancies similar to site 2079 may exist. Kahakalau was concerned about the consistency of previously documented sites and what was currently present. Kahakalau requested SHPD provide statistical data pertaining to the number of inadvertent discoveries in areas where previous archaeological studies have been conducted.

A council member questioned the location of the burial in a handout for alternative 1. A representative for the project clarified the handout in question. The council member wanted the burial's location clearly identified on the handout for alternative 1.

18 cultural descendants were identified, 10 of which were contacted, 3 of which were non responsive. A council member wanted to know the status of the remaining 5 cultural descendants. Kimura said 5 descendants wanted to be represented by 1 person. Kimura said 1 of the 10 descendants contacted is actually representative of 6 people. Kimura said the 5 descendants being represented were in favor of alternative 1 or alternative 3. 10 descendants were in favor of alternative 1 or alternative 3, 4 descendants were against the project, 1 descendant was neutral and 3 descendants did not respond.

A council member was unsure what the next step was.

Kimura said a BTP was approved in 2001 by the HIBC for the entire project corridor. Upon further evaluation, site 2079 was determined to be in the roadway alignment. The attorney general's office said site 2079 needed a separate treatment plan. A recommendation by the HIBC in support of an alternative regarding treatment of site 2079 was being sought. The county originally wanted to relocate the burial but the council had declined the request.

Kahakalau said she was confused because she remembered the HIBC declining the county's request to relocate the burial and could not understand why the matter was being discussed again.

Kimura said the HIBC had recommended preservation in place and the county had to figure out a way to accommodate the council's recommendation. Kimura said the proposed alternatives were the county's solution to the council's recommendation. A recommendation by the HIBC on which alternative was favored was being sought.

Kahakalau was concerned because she thought once a decision to preserve the burial in place was made the burial would be preserved in perpetuity. Kahakalau did not think the integrity of the burial would be protected if construction was to occur above or next to the burial.

Young said preservation in place meant no disturbance in any nature which included construction above and next to a burial.

Melvyn Kualii (Kualii) asked if the council ever requested an AIS of the entire project area. Young said an AIS was not requested in 2001 during acceptance of the BTP. Young said the council was led to believe in 2001 that the archaeological studies at the time were as complete as could be. Young said descendants at previous HIBC meetings had testified that burials were likely to be present in the proposed roadway corridor. Young supported the supplemental study for the 54 foot wide roadway corridor. Young was corrected and informed the supplemental study would cover an 80 foot width. Young thought the supplemental study would help to increase the council's comfort levels pertaining to the project. Young requested to be informed as to who would head the supplemental study.

Tyler said he was a recognized descendant of site 2079 and other burials associated with the roadway project. He did not feel problems associated with the project were addressed. All the burials were not displayed on the cross sections of the presentations. There were a lot more than 153 sites. Tyler was adamant of the fact there were more burials in the area which had not been identified. He strongly believed the highway would be widened in the future to a four lane highway. Tyler wanted to know how other burials would be impacted if the highway was eventually widened. He thought there were at least 18 burials in the lava tube identified as site 2079. Tyler said there were more than 18 recognized cultural descendants. No interim and permanent buffers had been identified.

A BTP had been requested and Tyler was informed a BTP could not be provided until after the council had made a recommendation. The issues of access were not clearly worked out. Tyler thought parking may be a problem should descendants want to visit the burial site. Tyler was concerned about storm water runoff and how sites may be impacted. Tyler said more burials were in the roadway at other areas and wanted to know how those burials would be dealt with. Tyler opposed approving any BTP until the concerns raised were addressed. All the concerns raised were documented in the BTP. Tyler wanted to be clear that although a BTP was approved in 2001, part of the BTP had been rejected and misleading. He felt the supplemental study was an attempt to obfuscate the truth. Tyler said the supplemental study was a waste of tax payer's money. Tyler asked the council to postpone making a recommendation until the council

had all the facts associated with the project. Tyler said the council was entitled to information as provided by HAR §13-300-33 (4) (10) (11) (13) & (14).

Based on a statement by Tyler, Young wanted to know how/why other known burials had not been included in the BTP. Tyler suggested asking the individuals that prepared the plan. Tyler said he sent McClure a detailed email in July of 2006 identifying the location of some of the burials he was aware of. Young asked for a copy of the email provided to McClure to which Tyler said he would provide.

Tyler said he would not show the county where some of the burials he knew of were, because he did not want any burials to be further disturbed.

A council member wanted to know if more obstacles would be encountered if the HIBC was to recommend acceptance on the treatment for site 2079. Tyler said he had no doubt more obstacles would be encountered. Tyler estimated 5-20 more situations similar to site 2079 would be encountered. A council member wanted to know if any archaeological studies documented the burials Tyler were referencing. Tyler said some of the burials were documented and some burials were not documented.

Violet Leihulu Mamac (Mamac) introduced herself and said she had little trust for SHPD. Mamac said a lot of information pertaining to the Alii Highway project was inadequate and misleading. Mamac said there were lots of *anas* and sites including burials that were not shown in recent archaeological studies. Mamac also thought the road would eventually be expanded to four lanes in the future. Mamac said many sites would be impacted if the road was expanded to four lanes. Mamac was not in favor of the roadway project. Mamac did not think any of the alternatives presented were feasible because of the impact the project would have on sites. Mamac wanted the *iwi* of the *kupunas* to rest in peace. Mamac did not want the roadway project to happen. Mamac felt a lot of money was being wasted on the project.

Lawten Kipapa (Kipapa) introduced himself and said he was descendant. Kipapa wanted burials protected and did not want any burials disturbed. Kipapa did not support the roadway project.

Keliipio said she was part of a citizens group that planned for a cross section in the proposed roadway project back in 2000-2001. Keliipio said the cross section was originally planned to be 100 feet in width. Keliipio thought the 54 feet road may be too small. Keliipio wanted to know if a revised environmental impact statement needed to be prepared. Keliipio also voiced her belief that a four lane road would eventually be built. Keliipio said the presentation by the representatives of the roadway project was very confusing.

Mikahala Roy (Roy) introduced herself and urged the HIBC to not support the roadway project. Roy said Kahaluu was a historic district and did not understand why a roadway was being built in the area. Roy said the presentation by the representatives for the roadway project was inaccurate. Roy agreed with many points stated by Tyler. Roy

wanted to know if the road would be constructed if the council voted in favor of the roadway project.

A motion was made to defer a recommendation by the council on the subject agenda item until the council receives further information on the project.

A motion was made to close the agenda item.

VOTE: ALL IN FAVOR.

A motion was made to defer the remaining agenda items.

VOTE: ALL IN FAVOR.

A motion was made to adjourn the meeting.

VOTE: ALL IN FAVOR.