

STATE OF HAWAII  
LAND USE COMMISSION

Minutes of Public Hearing  
and Meeting

Land Use Commission Hearing Room  
Honolulu, Hawaii

February 18, 1967 - 9:10 a.m.

*Approved*  
*6-16-67*

Commissioners  
Present:

Myron B. Thompson, Chairman  
C. E. S. Burns  
Shelley Mark  
Jim P. Ferry  
Robert Wenkam  
Leslie Wung  
Goro Inaba  
Shiro Nishimura

Staff Present:

Ramon Duran, Executive Officer  
George Moriguchi, Former Executive Officer  
Roy Takeyama, Legal Counsel  
Ah Sung Leong, Draftsman  
Dora Horikawa, Stenographer

Chairman Thompson opened the meeting with a short prayer, followed by an introduction of the Commission members and staff.

It was announced that the agenda was being rearranged to take care of the action items first due to previous commitments of one of the Commissioners.

The Chairman swore in all of the persons testifying before the Commission on all matters being considered today.

ACTION

PETITION OF JERRY J. NEVILLE (A66-137) TO AMEND THE LAND USE DISTRICT BOUNDARIES FROM CONSERVATION TO URBAN AND FROM URBAN TO CONSERVATION INVOLVING AN 8.1 ACRE PARCEL LOCATED AT PACIFIC HEIGHTS, HONOLULU

It was recommended by Chairman Thompson that the Commission accept the request submitted by Mr. Edward Berman, Attorney representing Jerry Neville, to delay decision on the petition until he was able to contact Mr. Neville, presently at sea, to gain his approval for monies to be expended on the necessary drawings to be submitted as additional evidence. Mr. Stebbings, realtor also representing Mr. Neville, agreed that it was all right if the delay resulted in exceeding the time limitation for action on this petition.

Commissioner Ferry moved to accept the request, seconded by Commissioner Burns. The motion was passed.

PETITION OF KAUPU RANCH (A66-138) TO RECLASSIFY 2 ACRES LOCATED AT KAAPAHU,  
HANA, MAUI

Mr. Ah Sung Leong read the staff memorandum recommending denial of the petition due to the lack of substantiating proof of need for the reclassification (see copy of report on file).

Mr. Leong agreed that the proposed house could be regarded as ancillary to the ranch operation since it would also be used as ranch headquarters.

Commissioner Wenkam offered that he had personally visited the site under discussion and had found that indeed this was the only possible place the ranch could build a house within a couple miles of the area. The petitioner had also tentatively marked the location of the proposed house where it would not be visible from the road.

It was also established that although a residence could be built in a Conservation District under the provisions of Regulation 4 of the Department of Land and Natural Resources, the ranch was desirous of deeding the land to Dr. Burgess with first option to purchase the land and improvements at the cessation of his employment. Therefore, they found it necessary to request the change in boundary for subdivision purposes.

Commissioner Wenkam moved that the petition be approved on the basis that the property adjoins an Agricultural District, the house can be considered ancillary to the ranch operations, and therefore is a proper agricultural use. Commissioner Nishimura seconded the motion and it was carried with Commissioner Mark casting the only dissenting vote.

Commissioner Burns excused himself to attend another meeting.

HEARINGS

PETITION OF WILIWILINUI RIDGE SUBDIVISION (A66-140) TO RECLASSIFY APPROXIMATELY  
10 ACRES FROM CONSERVATION TO URBAN AT WILIWILINUI RIDGE, WAILUPE, OAHU

The staff report was presented by Mr. George Moriguchi, former Executive Officer of the Land Use Commission, who had conducted the research and field investigation of the petition (see copy of report on file). On the basis of the lack of need for reclassification of conservation lands and the threat of a major potential danger from falling rocks, it was recommended that the petition be denied.

Mr. Moriguchi identified landmarks and developments in relation to the lands under petition on the map and also the portion of petitioner's lands presently covered under the grandfather's clause, an area of approximately 7.8 acres. The petitioner's request was for urbanization of these lands plus an additional 3 acres for a total of approximately 10 acres. It was reported by Mr. Moriguchi that the City had recommended approval of the entire petition on the basis that the subdivision was considered non-conforming and the additional area would provide a logical district boundary.

The rocky nature of the slopes and the large boulders precariously set on the ridge could well develop into an explosive situation if heavy equipment

were allowed on the ridge for grading purposes, etc. Even in the absence of development, the rocky slopes posed a potential danger, Mr. Moriguchi added.

Mr. Vincent Esposito advised that he was replacing Mr. David McClung as representative of the petitioners. Mr. Esposito also requested that the first paragraph of the petition be amended to delete the name of Duke T. Kawasaki and that Koichi Imai be substituted as one of the two petitioners.

In brief, Mr. Esposito submitted that the petition involved two parcels of land in a Conservation District, the first parcel having already been granted a non-conforming use. The request was for the urbanization of both of these parcels. Mr. Esposito emphasized that this request was not a matter of philosophical intent but a business request because obviously an urban classification of the development would result in a greater market value for the developers. It would also allow for better-shaped lots plus a few additional lots and make more money for the developers.

Mr. Esposito addressed himself first to what he felt were the problems facing the staff and the Land Use Commission in an effort to quieten their minds. He pointed to the "exceedingly stormy" history suffered by the Commission of such short duration. Due to the very nature of the problems which come before the Commission and the job demanded of the Commission, Mr. Esposito stated that there will never be a time when the Commission would not be plagued with the question of "whether you're on it or not on it". It will always be a highly emotional, stormy, controversial Commission.

Mr. Esposito continued that he was familiar with the history of this particular Land Use Commission and also reasonably familiar with the way it and its predecessors determined the boundaries and, in particular, the boundaries involved in this petition and the Aina Haina areas below.

Without casting any reflections upon this Commission, there were many decisions made, particularly by its predecessors, which did not make very much sense, Mr. Esposito observed, decisions which were based on history and not on logic. For example, the watershed history goes back to the 1800's and a great deal of land was put in watershed for tax purposes and not as an attempt to preserve forests or watershed areas.

Mr. Esposito pointed out that the preliminary decisions made by the Land Use Commission were not particularly 1) sacred, nor 2) founded on any logic and never have. The question now was one of whether the Commission as a body was willing to change this boundary over the outcries of the people below who are "genuinely in danger of either their lives or limbs or property". Also, according to the staff report, apparently a couple of business decisions were made here which he supposed were not part of the Commission's business. It was not the obligation or duty of this Commission to determine whether this is good business or whether this<sup>is</sup> going to be profitable.

Referring to the staff report dated February 18, 1967 (see copy on file) Mr. Esposito took exception to the analysis contained therein with respect to what slopes were proper for land development. He questioned whether the writer of the report was a business man knowledgeable in the field of land development. He argued that the preference to build a house on high lands or

in the valley was an individual's prerogative and that everyone was entitled to buy land wherever he chose, that there was no law, rules or regulations that dictated to a citizen of America living in Hawaii at what heights he is permitted to live, or that any rule or law existed that gave the Commission the right to advise businessmen on how to run their businesses.

Chairman Thompson interrupted at this point to request Mr. Esposito to pinpoint the source of his accusations.

Mr. Esposito referred to page 3 of the staff report questioning the validity of the petitioner's arguments that the amendment was suitable, will not adversely affect surrounding properties, not contrary to the Land Use Law and make the highest and best use of the land, doubts based on the rocky, steep topography of the subject lands. The report also mentions "such doubt apparently occurred with the Chief Engineer of the City, prompting him to write to the petitioner's engineer, suggesting that these steep lands be eliminated from the subdivision, or plans for proper safeguard be submitted."

On the matter of the major potential danger to the people living in Aina Haina, Mr. Esposito commented that it was difficult to speak on this point with justice. However, in defense of the petitioner's point of view, Mr. Esposito argued that the petitioners did not create the hazardous conditions existing on the slopes, that when the people below built their homes this already existed. The salesman who sold the land sold a bill of goods, and in all fairness the residents in Aina Haina should consider this point also.

Mr. Esposito submitted that the petitioners were authorized to develop the subdivision under the grandfather clause even if the petition were denied. Therefore, in essence, nothing would be accomplished by disapproving the petition.

On the other hand, if this petition were approved and certain conditions were imposed, the petitioners would abide by these restrictions in the presence of some competent government engineer. They would see that the dangerous boulders were rendered less harmful by crushing or smashing and probably make the slopes 60 or 70% safer than it is now, improving the situation of the people below.

Mr. Esposito wondered whether it was not the obligation of the State to consider that this was a good and proper use of the property and to instruct the City and County engineer to do his duty and impose reasonable conditions on the petitioner.

Chairman Thompson enumerated the following facts to clarify three points raised by Mr. Esposito:

1. The Land Use Law does not allow the Commission to set any conditions on any of the petitions.
2. The author of the staff report has had 11 years' experience in private business.
3. Over the past years, 75% of the petitions that have come before this Commission have been granted.

Therefore, it would be very helpful if the petitioners would come up with some alternative plans, Chairman Thompson added.

Mr. Ivan Fujinaka, a practicing professional civil and structural engineer, testified that he was commissioned to provide the subdivision construction plans for this project. As a rebuttal to staff's reference to the "problem of the steep slopes" Mr. Fujinaka offered that he had prepared a report and sketch to the Chief Engineer, outlining their plans on how they proposed to cope with the problem, and that he was in possession of a letter from Chief Kunimoto to the Planning Commission attesting to the fact that the steep slopes were developable. He was also in receipt of a letter from Planning Director Skrivanek which gave them permission to develop subject lands.

Mr. Fujinaka described in detail, on the blackboard, the proposed construction procedure which took into consideration the potential threat to the residents below as follows:

1. The Lands will be graded toward the road in an effort to channel the water away from the hillside.
2. Excavation of the land will be conducted in increments with the fill material knocked off into the urban valley on the left side where there was no development. The fill material will be gathered and brought up to the second increment where this was possible.
3. A stipulation was included in their job specifications to minimize the danger to the residents below, namely that a representative from the Chief Engineer's office, Mr. Fujinaka, and the contractor would walk the site and break up or remove any loose rocks within the petitioner's boundary. It was felt that any rocks outside of the petitioner's boundary were not the responsibility of the developers and would work an economic hardship. It was also felt by the engineer that trucks and construction equipment could not generate enough motion to loosen or move the rocks.

Mr. Fujinaka submitted that he had copies of several correspondence between Chief Engineer Kunimoto of the City and Mr. Skrivanek, City Planning Director, and also some addressed to Mr. Fujinaka, outlining various requirements that would have to be met by the developers, and attesting to the developable nature of the steep lots, etc. He offered to send copies of these letters for the record. Mr. Fujinaka added that the construction plans had received City approval.

Mr. Fujinaka agreed with Commissioner Ferry that the percentage of slope going toward the road would be approximately 35%.

Commissioner Wenkam pointed to the discrepancy between the petitioner's sketch on the blackboard and the staff's cross-section map. Mr. Fujinaka replied that the only way to determine the proper exhibit was to present the petitioner's cross-section map showing the measured topography from which they worked and showing the location of a typical house. The setback from the road will be about 30' and the construction of the homes will be confined strictly to the left side of the ridge, similar to the Waiialae-iki subdivision.

Chairman Thompson summarized the two major points evolving from the foregoing discussion as: 1) drainage would be directed towards the road, and 2) petitioner will remove all loose rocks up to the proposed boundary line.

Commissioner Wenkam observed that if the setback from the curb were 30' and the depth of the house 50', about 80% of the house will be hanging on the Aina Haina hillside.

On the matter of developing the valley on the left side, Mr. Fujinaka advised that they would not be able to meet the city requirements for the maximum road grading.

Mr. Fujinaka submitted that the Board of Water Supply Chief Engineer would not have approved nor signed their construction drawings if provisions for adequate water facilities had not been met. He spoke of the capacity of the present reservoir, and of another one presently under study by the City proposed by the Bishop Estate. Provisions had been made in the plans to tap this resource to provide for water services.

Mr. Fujinaka read the notes with regard to water supply from the Board of Water Supply as requested by Mr. Moriguchi as follows: "Approval of these plans by the Board of Water Supply is subject to the condition that water service will not be available to the lots above the 300' elevation until such time as a booster pumping station, a reservoir at elevation 640' and connecting pipelines are constructed and placed in service."

Commissioner Wenkam argued that all of the petitioner's proposals to remove the loose rocks and to deposit the excavated material on the opposite side did not solve the problem. He further commented that as soon as anything is built on the slopes, the rocks that had existed there for perhaps hundreds of years could roll very quickly. He also expressed his feeling that the petitioner's responsibility did not cease at the property line, that if he really wished to eliminate this problem he would remove the rocks on all the slopes all the way down.

In reply to Mr. Fujinaka's comment that a flow would have to be quite extensive to cause any storm damage, Commissioner Wenkam suggested that perhaps Mr. Fujinaka had not been out to Aina Haina during a heavy storm, that the water actually flowed down the hillside. And intercepting only a very small percentage of the flow was not going to alter the drainage in this area.

Mr. Fujinaka spoke of a hydraulic report submitted to the city which pointed out that a considerable amount of water presently flowing down the hillside would be channeled away from the area. Chairman Thompson suggested that the report be made available to the Commission.

Commissioner Wenkam expressed concern over the statement made by Mr. Esposito earlier to the effect that whether a person desires to build on a hillside or not is an individual's business only and not the Commission's business. Commissioner Wenkam felt that it was also the community's business.

Mr. Esposito countered that he did not say that--that he had said that we should not substitute the business judgment of the staff member for the

business judgment of people who want to be in business and the preference to live up or live below, whether a person desires to build on a hillside is the individual's business, an individual's business right.

Commissioner Wenkam objected to the inference made by Mr. Esposito that the boundaries established by this Commission were vague. He defended that the boundaries of the lands under petition were very carefully considered and specifically placed in the Conservation District. In addition to the possible damage that may occur due to flooding and soil erosion, the consideration of aesthetics and scenic aspects of the open hillside was very important, affecting all of the residents of Aina Haina. Conservation Districts specifically included the preservation and protection of scenic amenities. Since the petitioners were authorized to develop the subject lands within the Conservation District under the grandfather's clause and subject to the purview of the Department of Land and Natural Resources, Commissioner Wenkam felt that this should properly remain within the Conservation District. He also expressed shock over the statement made by Mr. Esposito that the sole reason for the petitioner's request for change of boundary was for the purpose of realizing more profit.

Chairman Thompson opened the floor for comments from the general public but requested that only new testimony be presented.

Mr. Andrew Salz, attorney representing Dr. Thomas Murphy and a group of residents living in the Aina Haina area, called on Mr. John R. Evans, registered professional engineer and a staff member of the University of Hawaii, and Mr. Agatin T. Abbott, Professor of Geology, University of Hawaii, to present reports of their findings and investigations of the subject lands in their respective capacities.

#### Mr. John Evans' Testimony

There were 4 basic problems involved in this petition:

1. Excavation problem and the technique to be used.
2. Embankment construction.
3. Erosion.
4. Aesthetics.

Removal of material would necessarily have to be done by blasting which could not help but create vibrations which will not only disturb loose existing boulders but could also cause loosening of other boulders. Mr. Evans expressed extreme doubt that any equipment operator could adequately move material longitudinally on this slope to accomplish the desired fill operations without dislodging material down the slope. He added that these slopes ranged from 55 to 100% and should a combination of the fill and slopes of greater than 60% occur in the same location, it would be almost impossible for the fill slopes to encounter the natural ground slopes since the recommended minimum slopes of the City and County grading specifications (for rock fill) are  $1\frac{1}{2}$  to 1 which is about 66.7%. Erosion is entirely significant since it is doubted that the

runoff could properly be conducted to the street, but rather would be permitted to go down the Aina Haina slopes, causing accelerated erosion and creating danger to the residents. Mr. Evans also added that it was not the purpose of the Land Use Commission to insure profit for the developers. The conservation boundaries were improperly shown on the construction drawings according to Mr. Evans.

Mr. Evans spoke of a cut-off ditch for drainage purposes located just up the slope from Hema Place which has served a dual purpose--preventing floods and as a boulder interceptor. In spite of this there have been 3 known cases of boulders rolling down and causing damage, attesting to the fact that it is almost impossible to police this slope to remove all the dangers to the people below. Therefore, the greater the number of agencies participating in the control of this development, the better it will be.

Mr. Evans quoted from the City and County grading requirements which allowed the subdivider to proceed with the grading any way if the inspector did not appear within three days after notification to make an investigation.

Mr. Evans appended a strong second to the staff's recommendation for denial of the petition. Written summary and report together with snapshots of the subject lands were submitted for the files.

#### Mr. Agatin Abbott's Testimony

Mr. Abbott made a personal survey of the slopes and explained that the slopes on Wiliwilinui Ridge were composed of dozens and dozens of lava flows, with alternating layers of hard and soft materials. Erosion from runoff water down the slopes resulted in the scouring out of the softer material underneath, opening up cracks and rolling down unsupported rocks down the slopes. There are boulders located in all kinds of attitudes all the way down to Aina Haina, some of them completely disconnected from the original flow to which they belong, posing a certain danger.

In order to build houses on the top, blasting would be necessary. Any blasting in this section will set shock waves throughout the entire Aina Haina hillside. Aside from these boulders precariously balanced on the hillside, there are many broken sections of flows of tremendous size that could possibly be disturbed by blasting.

Mr. Abbott summarized that any blasting close to the edge of the ridge or any disturbance of the natural ground condition on the Aina Haina side of the ridge would distinctly pose a danger, and in order to minimize the danger construction should be restricted to the upper sections of the Wiliwilinui Ridge. Mr. Abbott also submitted a written report and snapshots for the records.

Several residents residing in homes below the proposed subdivision spoke against the petition as follows:

#### Mr. Irving Wong

Mr. Wong stated that he resides at the very end of Hao Street where the elevation was the steepest--70%. He has had rocks roll into his property and



lives in fear of larger rocks. However, his greatest fear was for the elementary school located across the street and the threat of a major disaster.

Mr. C. J. Lillie, Jr. - 204D Hao Street

Mr. Lillie stated that an 18' cliff projects over his property and if any construction takes place above, he feels that he and his wife would be forced to move out. Mr. Lillie added that they were aware of the potential danger living under the cliff and they would be willing to accept an act of God, but could not accept an act of man helping things along.

Mr. John Kamm

Mr. Kamm stated that he lives at the bottom of the proposed subdivision. If the petitioners were permitted to proceed with the 27-lot development, all of the people in Aina Haina will be living in fear during the time of construction and for about 5 years after that. Should the development take place, Mr. Kamm wanted assurance that necessary safeguards would be taken to protect the homeowners in Aina Haina.

Mrs. Audrey Yeoh, 340 Hema Place, wondered whether life wasn't worth more than the realization of a few extra pennies to the developers.

Mr. Clyde Yoshioka, 1336 15th Avenue, asked whether the developers had taken out any insurance or bonds as a means of protection for the Aina Haina residents. Mr. Esposito replied that he did not know the answer.

Mr. Harold Jambor

Mr. Jambor submitted that they were not here today as residents of Aina Haina only but as members of the Hawaii community concerned with preservation of the lands in terms of aesthetics, conservation and the well being of all. If this project were allowed, all slopes will become fair prey for developers. There was a far greater issue here at stake than whether or not this little piece of land should be used for urban purposes.

Chairman Thompson thanked Mr. Jambor for clarifying one of the purposes of the Land Use Commission.

Mr. Salz referred back to the statement made earlier by Mr. Esposito that the petition was not a philosophical request but a business request. Mr. Salz defended that the entire philosophy of the operation of the State, the Department of Land and Natural Resources' conservation program, and the plan that established the Land Use Commission pretty clearly demonstrate that the philosophy that operates in this State is a very important one.

Also as a rebuttal to the suggestion by Mr. Esposito that some of the boundary decisions by the Land Use Commission did not make sense, Mr. Salz pointed out that in Mr. Skrivanek's letter to the Land Use Commission, it was clearly pointed out that generally lands on slopes of greater than 40% were not recommended for subdivision use. However, since a prior approval was granted for the subdivision plans and now comes under the Land Use Commission grandfather clause, part of which were on lands of over 40%, he had recommended

moving the conservation line back to conform to the approved subdivision boundaries. Mr. Salz offered that Mr. Skrivanek's letter clearly suggested that if the boundary change plans were submitted to the present Planning Commission for the first time, there was grave doubt that it would be acceptable.

When the people in Aina Haina built their homes they never dreamed that anyone would possibly build on the steep hillside and the very suggestion that the Land Use Commission should allow the State to desert these householders and leave them only to the legal recourse of getting an injunction against the builders was just unthinkable, Mr. Salz argued.

The building plan as suggested by the developers will be one of the "major horrors" of Honolulu, that there was nothing Mr. Salz could think of that would do more to destroy the beauty of the hillside.

Mr. Fujinaka commented that contrary to Mr. Evans' remarks about the fill on the right side of the development, there will be no filled area there. All of the fill material will be deposited on the left side of the ridge and everything on the right slopes will be left as it is. After consulting the cross-section map, Mr. Evans agreed that this was so. Chairman Thompson directed that the records note the correction.

Mr. Clyde Yoshioka, property owner in Aina Haina, brought out that the inference was made that regardless of the ultimate decision by the Land Use Commission, the petitioners were authorized to proceed with the development of the subdivision under the grandfather clause.

Commissioner Ferry elaborated that under the grandfather clause the authority for any type of development within a Conservation District rests with the Department of Land and Natural Resources, subject to Regulation 4 as adopted by the Board of Land and Natural Resources, and would be restricted by the standards contained therein. In other words, Commissioner Ferry continued, the developers might come up with a plan for 27 lots but the Board might see fit to approve only 2 or 3 lots.

Since there was no further testimony, the hearing was closed.

---

PETITION OF LEWERS & COOKE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION (A66-145) TO AMEND THE LAND USE DISTRICT BOUNDARIES FROM AGRICULTURAL TO URBAN FOR APPROXIMATELY 56 ACRES OF LAND LOCATED AT WAIMANO, OAHU

Mr. Ah Sung Leong presented staff report recommending approval of the petition based on the favorable findings as outlined in the report (see copy of report).

Mr. Funaki, attorney representing the petitioner, submitted the following salient facts:

1. The subject parcel was at one time within an Urban District under the temporary boundaries established in 1962.
2. Subsequent to the establishment of the temporary boundaries, the petitioners had entered into an agreement to purchase the subject parcel,

including the Pacific Palisades Subdivision. They were unaware that the urban boundary at that time was only a temporary one and had failed to take note of the subsequent action for permanent boundary.

3. The General Plan of the State of Hawaii prepared in 1961 fully realized the necessary encroachment into agricultural lands to meet the demands of the massive development in the Aiea-Halawa-Pearl City districts and projected that "it is possible that the military will yield gradually some lands suitable for urban growth and that at least 4,000 acres of plantation crops will be replaced by urban growth".
4. To further substantiate this expected and contemplated urbanization into cane lands in this area, the General Plan reported "present plans call for a population increase in this area from 32,000 to 111,000 in 1980 which will be supported by the westward expansion of Oahu.

Mr. R. G. Rietow, Executive Vice President of Lewers & Cooke, testified that Pacific Palisades was moving along very rapidly, and that 1,600 homes had been built, there were 51 sales in December, 58 in January and 33 so far this month, proving that the demands for homes in this area were very great.

Mr. Rietow further added that insofar as growing of cane on subject parcel was concerned, since they will not be ready for the development in the next two years, he had notified the Oahu Sugar Company of their willingness to extend the present arrangement for another whole cycle of cane. A letter to the Land Use Commission had been prepared with respect to the feasibility of this arrangement and will be forthcoming in the mail.

Commissioner Wenkam suggested that it might be in order to solicit some statement from the Oahu Sugar Company confirming the acceptability of this arrangement.

Commissioner Ferry commented that the petitioners had a very marketable item in the proposed subdivision, and that he was amazed at the success in sales, considering that we were in a depressed construction period.

Since there was no further testimony, the hearing was closed.

#### MISCELLANEOUS

#### Hawaii Congress of Commissioners and Directors Meeting

It was announced that the 1967 Hawaii Congress of Planning Commissioners and Directors meeting had been set for February 23, 24, 25, 1967 at the Naniiloa Hotel, Hilo, Hawaii. The necessary arrangements for registration, flight and hotel reservations, have already been taken care of for staff and the Commissioners.

### Letter from William Douglas

Mr. Duran read a letter from Mr. William Douglas (A66-132) dated January 29, 1967, expressing his view that Commission's denial of his petition was unfair and that he had been denied his constitutional rights without satisfactory reason. (See copy of letter on file).

Mr. Takeyama advised that staff should prepare a Findings of Facts, Conclusion of Law to submit to the petitioner as required by law under the Administrative Procedure Act.

### Tentative Schedule

Mr. Duran announced that the next hearing and meeting date was tentatively scheduled for March 17, 1967, Friday, in Hilo, Hawaii. He also suggested the possibility of working in field trips and investigations for the Commissioners on pending petitions. Chairman Thompson thought perhaps a trip to Wiliwilinui Ridge this afternoon should be arranged.

### Hearing on Diamond Head

There was some discussion as to the exact intent of the motion "that the Land Use Commission direct the Executive Officer to initiate a petition to hold a public hearing in Honolulu on the Diamond Head Conservation District at a time agreeable to the Department of Land and Natural Resources" as recorded in the minutes of November 23, 1966. Mr. Takeyama advised that "to hold a public hearing" implied a public hearing for boundary change petition and that a further motion was not necessary.

Chairman Thompson directed staff to set up a hearing date administratively following consultation with the Department of Land and Natural Resources.

Since there was no further business, the meeting was adjourned.