

Kalaupapa National Historical Park General Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement

Draft Plan Meeting Notes

<u>Meeting Location</u>	<u>Day, Date, Time</u>	<u>Page #</u>
Kalaupapa, Molokai	Monday, May 4, 2015 – 5pm.....	3
Kaunakakai, Molokai	Tuesday, May 5, 2015 – 1pm.....	7
Kaunakakai, Molokai	Tuesday, May 5, 2015 – 6pm.....	10
Kahului, Maui	Wednesday, May 6, 2015 – 6pm	14
Honolulu, O‘ahu	Thursday, May 7, 2015 – 6pm	17
Honolulu, O‘ahu	Friday, May 8, 2015 – 10am	21
Online Meeting	Wednesday, May 13, 2015 – 10am.....	24
Online Cult. Rsrcs Meeting	Thursday, May 14, 2015 – 10am	31

Location, date, and attendance at each public meeting.

Location	Date	Attendance
Kalaupapa, Molokai	May 4, 2015	24
Kaunakakai, Molokai	May 5, 2015	38
Kaunakakai, Molokai	May 5, 2015	25
Kahului, Maui	May 6, 2015	28
Honolulu, O‘ahu	May 7, 2015	66
Honolulu, O‘ahu	May 8, 2015	45
Online	May 13, 2015	10
Online: Section 106	May 14, 2015	13
Total		249

Note to readers:

These notes were transcribed as precisely as possible to the participants own words. For the vast majority of comments, names are not attached to the comment, but in some cases they are. In a few places in these notes, the meaning of a statement may be obscured or lost; this is a result of manual transcription and/or human error.

Brackets with a number at the end of some comments indicate the additional number of people who agreed with the comment.

The numbering system applied to the comments is for ease of identifying the comment for readers. It does not necessarily represent the comment in the order it was received.

The following acronyms were used in the transcriptions.

AC –Advisory Commission
ACHP – Advisory Council of Historic Preservation
ADA – Americans with Disabilities Act
AHA – Aha Ki‘ole
CR – Cultural Resources
DHHL – Department of Hawaiian Home Lands
DLNR – Department of Land and Natural Resources
DOH – Department of Health
DOT – Department of Transportation
EMS – Emergency Management Service
FTE – Full time Equivalent
GMP – General Management Plan
HHF – Historic Hawai‘i Foundation
HI – Hawai‘i
OHA – Office of Hawaiian Affairs
KALA – Kalaupapa National Historical Park
KPAC – Kalaupapa Patient Advisory Committee
MOU – Memorandum of Understanding
NNL – National Natural Landmark
NPS – National Park Service
RTCA- Rivers and Trails Conservation Assistance
UH – University of Hawai‘i
UN – United Nations
UNESCO- United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization

Kalaupapa, Molokai**Monday, May 4, 2015 – 5pm**

Location: McVeigh Hall

Attendance: 24

1. Staffing for visitor protection needs to increase, need more than 6 FTE
2. Where will EMS services be located?
3. What happens to patient beach houses near airport
4. Training School - Preservation, Electric, Plumbing, etc.
5. How will visitors be transported from airport to settlement to trail...how will that be facilitated?
6. Audio tour or radio / cell phone tour?
7. Can native Hawaiians be exempt from paying rent (in NPS houses or partner houses)? Like uniform allowance for shoes on DHHL Land?
8. The enabling legislation employment + training for native Hawaiians to administer Kalaupapa where does the training \$ come from and what is the plan to have native Hawaiians administer KALA?
9. Need road identification for visitors
10. Model park for renewable energy / sustainability
11. If a Hawaiian gov't is elected / comes into place, how will that affect the park? What happens when Kalawao County disappears? Maui County different players
12. Would DHHL / partners have a say in housing? (i.e. rents charged?) Partnership programs?
13. Energy conservation - solar powered (tie into education) for electricity, partnerships w/businesses
14. Employment is also from concessions - more jobs available with partners
15. Make topside a gateway community - visitors to spend \$ topside (hotels, food, cars)
16. Is GMP part of Molokai Community Plan? Plan should be part of it.
17. Do you want to have selective partners to limit their say in what happens in the park?
18. What happens when the park doesn't get the funding?
19. How often will barge come?
20. How was the preferred selected
21. In the long term, will patient's relatives be allowed to come? They have strong ties. Ka 'Ohana has been making connections with relatives.
22. Access should be controlled. Once open, people will go all over. Safety concerns
23. Auntie Winnie expressed that family of patients should have preference to visit
24. Visitor increase cap what/how was this determined?
25. How will the park increase revenues? Will we charge for entry?
26. How will revenue from concessions be used? Will it stay in the park or go to general fund? How will uses of the revenue be decided?
27. Visitor capacity = If the park makes investment in facilities, would this result in (300+) visitors?
28. Clarification on concessions / revenue generating services - DHHL Lease guidance, native Hawaiian second right of refusal?
29. Would there be an increase in rangers / with increase in visitors?
30. Prefers more controlled access

31. There should be some barriers / security at sensitive locations that visitors would be able to access for security & resource protection.
32. Prefers that children under age of 16 should not be allowed to visit in the long term because of safety issues.
33. Old Damien Road needs to be made more walkable in the long term if visitors can access for safety
34. Expectation that NPS would be here to oversee. Concern that NPS would be giving things up to partners. How is this going to work?
35. How much control are we giving to partners?
36. If NPS is depending on partner funding, projects may never get completed. There are some projects that haven't been completed.
37. Want buildings to be usable before partner comes in.
38. Be very specific on parameters of partnership agreements
39. Support "special days" where the cap is lifted, but have to respect the 'āina.
40. Support this over lifting the cap
41. Support visitor day use permit as long as process is followed
42. Patient families - also need permit
43. Permit process will need diff. levels - for general visitors, family
44. Do non-Hawaiian family members of patients have any rights to apply for concessions / businesses
45. Can workers family members stay longer? Would they be subject to the permit? (in the long-term)
46. Need First Aide Station (Manned) Location (2)
47. Patient family have first preference
48. Entry pass system must be or RFI band (can tell where you are in the park) (4)
49. Should pay an entry fee - control trail (Entry Fee \$3 - \$5) (2)
50. No hunting except for park pest control management (SAFETY)
51. Kama 'āina free / entry (2)
52. Limit one concession for one type of business
53. Special license/permit for hunting - outside engagement zone
54. Annual passes for locals
55. Barcode system / stamp
56. native Hawaiians (50%)
57. Haw'n Sov., Org. or Governance eventually (Laws & Regulations; Access/Cultural Rights/Gathering)
58. Permit system / special use permits for cultural access
59. Need interpretation at crater / guiding
60. Wrong wayside exhibit out to Kalawao need to change it
61. Alt "B" with access zones
62. Questions regarding Kalawao County (laws, regulations, patient rules) What's going to happen when DOH leaves?
63. Visitors for education vs Recreation
64. Concerns regarding plane access / overnight stays
65. Boat access
66. Phone app. For tracking (i.e. UH Manoa / safety)

67. Be able to have special mtgs. / dignitaries (charge) i.e. Aha Moku; hold special events / continue / wedding; big group events; also have service at the Mormon church; educ. / spiritual retreats / big events / how to achieve or requests, etc.
68. Sunrise to sunset / entrance and exit
69. Is there a time limit (who stay overnight); is there a limit of night stay; night access; night curfew?
70. Will AHA be invited to sit at the table?
71. F, H&G: What happens to laws-Kalawao County (status of)?
72. Kalawao County should stay and not do away
73. Likes Uncle Mac Poepoe's plan re: fishing & marine resources in general
74. Enforcement re: marine resources should be part of the plan. Work with partners - joint enforcement
75. KPAC rules re: resource extraction should be kept.
76. Increase solar (e.g., solar farm)
77. KALA should be example for alternative energy
78. No windmills
79. In Alt. C - can visitors go to the beach houses & beaches?
80. Vis. Use: if children under 16 allowed, they should be chaperoned by an adult. Adult held responsible if anything goes wrong.
81. Vis. Access: will ADA access change historic character of buildings? I hope not.
82. Green waste solution: put gasifier units behind 2 old reservoirs behind Kahaloko
83. Clarify who can hunt below 500' elevation
84. Accessibility to certain zones / areas should not affect the parks management purposes
85. What about hunting with dogs? Still allowed? Residents only?
86. Support preserve because preserve natural resources
87. Question @ Memorial - all of alternatives
88. Preserve - as long as it stays the way it is. Getting rid of deer.
89. Let children visit - Kalaupapa classroom
90. Have children hear from the patients & their stories.
91. Partnerships also brings \$, labor, learning, stewardship.
92. Fear of patients & others is opening up Kalaupapa and no respecting 'āina & rules
93. Want to ensure 'āina is kept and no rubbish.
94. At time of KALA establishment, focus on KALA lands & not other lands. Concern about Hawaiian people & their concerns for access and gathering.
95. Concern about resources & opihi & how much fishing and gathering would be allowed.
96. Preserve - good. Keep as preserve and conserve. Pu'u O Hoku doesn't allow access - if preserve then people, N. Hawaiian people can access and hunt, fish, gather.
97. Concern about access, trails.
98. Agree w/NPS proposal related to homesteading (2)
99. Not in favor of homesteading because history of KALA would be ruined. That's why we asked NPS to come here to preserve the 'āina.
100. After we're gone it's up to NPS + DHHL to figure out.
101. Pu'u O Hoku - OK- because conservation and allowing gathering
102. Pelekunu - one of original settlements / village sites
103. Homesteaders - all depend on lessees - they could be pillars of community or rotten apples. (interview process)

104. Homesteading could be allowed if have family here because they'd know the history and how precious the place is.
105. The more areas to preserve, the better.
106. Controlled access to preserve areas
107. Good idea, emphasize that lands would be part of preserve - as opt in. preserve them.
108. Emphasize access & gathering
109. Be transparent, listen to them
110. Emphasize 57# of jobs is only NPS. Other commercial services. Is more jobs.
111. Employment, access, \$, cultural rights, land issues
112. Family - kuleana lands, concerns about their lands and their rights.
113. Cultural practice to Native Hawaiian sites, allow in future
114. Little "n" is 50% or more, big "N" - them anyone
115. "Love it so far"

Kaunakakai, Molokai**Tuesday, May 5, 2015 – 1pm**

Location: Kalanianaʻole Hall

Attendance: 38

1. Pleased that NPS is honoring history of North Shore
2. Forests + cliffs have to be protected
3. Hunting rights have to be protected
4. Like the idea of Pu'u O Hoku Ranch coastal lands included in proposed boundary - conservation
5. Limiting visitors to prevent growth + unregulated #'s of visitors. Unintended consequences of opening the land to visitors.
6. Might not envision the kinds of numbers that might come about.
7. What is NPS role in curtailing drug problems in Kalaupapa?
8. Homesteading - NPS rationale for not supporting - resource protection, incl. T&E species protection. This is another restriction.
9. Section 106 consultation = what is NPS doing = just webinar and receive comments?
10. Park can meet with preservation officer and others if requested.
11. Requests assistance to navigate through Sec. 106 consultation. Does she have to engage with all agencies - DHHL, DLNR, and OHA?
12. Very taxing process - lots of consultations for future projects in the long-term
13. Keep it the same as much as you can
14. Limited access
15. Many challenges, stakeholders. Implementation might be daunting.
16. Very thorough study
17. Unlimited visitors w/overnight accommodations might pose some issues.
18. What is the capacity of facilities? Unlimited vs. 300 visitors.
19. Access depends on weather. Can be variable.
20. More CIP projects puts burden on DHHL for reimbursement.
21. If park will be open to more people, the resources could be damaged. Need security, something could go wrong; Preservation comes first; Beneficiaries/commercial use; pass-free - maybe should charge for beneficiaries; should have security to make sure resources are not damaged / lost.
22. "Unlimited" access needs to be changed. This needs to be clearly defined.
23. MOU only covers the trail access - not the entire Meyer lands w/in the boundary.
24. Explain why the Meyer lands were included within the park boundary.
25. Cost estimates + partnership costs are unclear. Does it include costs for native Hawaiian concession costs?
26. No one from NPS will be sitting down w/stake holders on Sec 106 - webinar is not enough.
27. Plan is complex - going to take a lot of effort to coordinate 106
28. Is someone from DOT, ACHP, etc. going to engage? With NPS + other partners
29. OHA not included in GMP
30. Commendable efforts to represent NPS
31. Goals are great
32. Overnight visitor accommodations don't seem appropriate.
33. Number of visitors depends on facilities - difficult if run into budget issues.

34. How does overnight housing play into revenue generation? It will be limited, but will housing be affordable for people in Molokai or only those who can afford like Lāna'i.
35. How many NPS staff are from Molokai?
36. Suggest to have a microphone - hard to hear
37. Beautiful mana'o
38. Didn't hear anything regarding CR related to native Hawaiians
39. Are NPS prepared for the transition?
40. Don't see Hawaiians included in the plan.
41. Hawaiian people should have special privileges
42. Tourism vs. protocol
43. Educate aloha; HI only people where aloha is taught.
44. Concerned about unlimited access, including on the narrow pali trail
45. Boundary study completed in 2000. Criteria were analyzed. Asked for clarification on designation.
46. NNL Designated in 1972
47. Concerned about multiple designations that can be acted on. Need to understand all these designations.
48. No new construction in plan. DHHL agreement - didn't include all improvements. Improvements would need to be reimbursed to NPS to get land back. Burden on DHHL.
49. Against land grab; against no special designations for native Hawaiians and their culture.
50. Not allowed for native Hawaiian voices to be heard. Support them in the process.
51. Plan does not include mention of connecting family members to loved ones.
52. Concerned about NPS expanding boundaries.
53. Don't want tourism in KALA; want more healing for family members.
54. Create small task force w/Meyer's, 'Ohana + other stakeholders for input.
55. What's the plan after Lionel leaves? Utility security for water, electric, infrastructure.
56. There was no process involving Hawaiians to discuss use of special areas, including Pelekunu. Cannot just preserve; we are a living culture.
57. There are no proposals to engage with families and others like Ka 'Ohana does.
58. Biggest issue = not allowing Hawaiian voices to be heard.
59. Need to be inclusive
60. Previously commented that do not want tourism / overnight accommodation.
61. Area could be good for "healing area" for beneficiaries.
62. "Kalaupapa Land Grab" - plan appears to be a land grab
63. Disappointed in NPS ability to listen to entire history at Kalaupapa
64. No efforts to find names and stories of kama 'āina
65. Sect. 106 June 2011 - lot of issues brought up, but not addressed in draft plan.
66. Unacceptable that future generations cannot use the lands. Protection is not enough.
67. Waikolu should be in special designation for food security.
68. Hawaiians have no future in this plan.
69. Is NPS considering a new overlook w/in the Meyer lands.
70. (Meyer's) Do not charge NPS or State for cell towers (on their property) etc., for benefit of patients.
71. Drug problem - what do we have in place to curtail this problem. Does NPS drug test its employees?
72. Appreciates that NPS listened to the patients

73. Relationship w/DHHL is appalling, including 106 consultation. There is a long history vs. Hawaiians living there at KALA; upsetting that the plan doesn't address access/use for Hawaiians / future generations.
74. How are your mālama i ka 'āina?
75. Find last living descendent and talk to them.
76. To educate people, find living descendants to tell you about Kalaupapa
77. Kalaupapa belongs to native Hawaiian families and people. They are connected to the land
78. Native Hawaiians should be hired/employed in Kalaupapa
79. Who is running Kalawao County? (Kalawao vs. Maui County)
80. Future of KALA makes native Hawaiians nervous
81. Must ask permission.
82. Need to include Hawaiians in protection and management of the lands
83. Marine resource management: 1) had a project to study decline in lobster population; including DNA 2) How are NPS going to sustain resources. Kalaupapa lobster - supplying rest of the island; 3) Mo'omomi = model for people taking responsibility for resources and food security.
84. How many people know that Kalaupapa is within Kalawao County? Who is running the county. Be aware that there are 2 counties in Molokai.

Kaunakakai, Molokai**Tuesday, May 5, 2015 – 6pm**

Location: Kalanianaʻole Hall

Attendance: 25

1. What kind of transportation will be available to visitors to get around in Kalaupapa?
2. Have churches been contacted about plan?
3. Would like to see churches have continued presence. Could contribute to community and give back to Kalaupapa. Grow food/gardens. Would contribute to sacredness and sense of place.
4. Noise pollution - start to track sounds to preserve soundscape.
5. Changes at Kalaupapa will affect everything else.
6. More topside community involvement to visit park. Topside folks have only been once.
7. Concerns about repeat tourists in Kalaupapa walking through settlement is spiritual; keep that feeling
8. Concern about children. Nothing for children to do in Kalaupapa. Middle school-aged children and up are preferred.
9. Concern about too many people at one time for emergency and safety concerns
10. Kalaupapa is different NPS site - not a park. Special place to be preserved.
11. Plan is too big - hard to read and get through too confusing need smaller, condensed plan.
12. People don't have the time to read 400+ pages.
13. Concerned that visitors could walk around Kalaupapa. Uncomfortable about opening up. People don't understand the sacredness. The spirit / mana, unmarked graves.
14. People of Molokai should have more input
15. Would appreciate more time
16. Concern that people will go off-trail, etc. Will be difficult to manage/police
17. Are there any restrictions on air travel? Helicopters wreck the sense of peace/quiet.
18. If access is not monitored carefully, there will be problems
19. Access / visitation should be for the purpose of the park, not as an "attraction"
20. Kalaupapa is a spiritual place, it's not a "park"
21. Overnight stays - no more than 50/day and allow more only on special occasions.
22. Upset that the enclosed area near St. Philomena w/unmarked graves - gate was broken and there were tracks - people drove over the area.
23. Would like to see mgmt. information for Pu'u O Hoku Ranch
24. The trail plan that RTCA worked on for Pālā'au Park is not mentioned in the GMP. Good opportunity to engage the community. Community was supportive. Includes visitor center (education center)
25. Concerned about the area being included, including the road to the lookout
26. Boundary - there was huge backlash during initial process / study in 2000; There was no community process - even though landowners have expressed their desires.; The community needs to participate in the process. Landowners are new comers - not enough for just them to make decision
27. Will NPS divert rivers - Waikolu, Waihanau?
28. Who is managing the rivers? Does NPS have an agreement with DLNR to manage the rivers.
29. Waihanau headwaters - how does water get to storage tanks / diversion ditch; Water is being wasted. Headwaters.

30. James: Diversion is outside the park boundary. DLNR land.
31. Beneficiaries / homesteaders need to partner with NPS.
32. Does not support surfing & homesteading at Kalaupapa
33. Fearful about what might happen
34. Oppose NPS plan, provided own proposal in writing
35. If continue to keep Molokai people out of Kalaupapa that is a bad thing.
36. Opposes every big landowner that stole land from Hawaiians
37. Impression that plan / discussion would take place after patient community is no longer there.
38. Who has deep pockets to run the park?
39. We need to be educated - Kalaupapa for so long has been seen as Kalawao County
40. The patient council has changed - legacy is up to the patient.
41. Why did NPS include RW Meyer land which has no connection to the park. There's no reason to include it in boundary or purchase of land.
42. Michelle: MOU was not to include 2 mile stretch RW Meyers land in park boundary. - ONLY TRAIL.
43. Sense of place - can we figure out a way to allow people to be there without feeling like strangers
44. Maha'oi (insolent, rude, brazen)
45. Niele (inquisitive, interrogate, nosey)
46. Will notes be posted on the website after?
47. Concern that the future, administrations change - will Hawaiians be considered?
48. Supports Hawaiian preference
49. Hamai & Kuahine families; Family (parents) at Kalaupapa
50. Visitors - agree with 100 people max; concerned about rubbish
51. Age limit - was able to work at Kalaupapa and experience the patients
52. Didn't understand why parents couldn't keep children.
53. Trying to understand boundary adjustment? Is NPS taking care of these lands - NNL. Can people still go there?
54. Educating children = supports this educating the people and Molokai is so important.
55. Keep age limit. Need to have respect. If allow schools to go in, have to keep group together - there are unmarked graves.
56. Plan lacks specifics: no long-term # of maximum visitors; Appropriate # is 100 / day w/increase over time to 150/day.
57. Thousands of people buried - kula iwi many unmarked graves.
58. No mention of Ka 'Ohana O Kalaupapa in plan or mention of memorial
59. Ka 'Ohana is a partner & asset to the park
60. Acquisition of additional lands does not fit into the park purpose - not in scope.
61. Any interest in Halawa Valley in NPS system? Could help local community better manage area.
62. The age cap should not be dropped or should be very low - age 12
63. Access - if not properly controlled, people will create their own access / social trails.
64. Does not support bike / motor bike trails.
65. Protective of this area, including marine wildlife
66. Does not agree with children visiting, but high school kids should be required.
67. Native Hawaiian / pre-history is important to preserve / understand.

68. Would like people of Molokai to understand "our history" before others.
69. Explain "partnership" "stewardship" - need to be able to trust NPS.
70. Clarify who is in control of Pālā'au State Park?
71. Art. 12 Sect. 7 - include in text where 6E and other State statutes 174C - state water code; add as part of analysis.
72. North Shore of Molokai is sacred to topside residents like Kalaupapa is sacred to patient families.
73. NPS can't handle Waikolu - have asked for plan for valley management; no response from NPS. Won't be able to hand more lands/valleys.
74. What is process for feds to designate North Shore NNL? What's the good/bad? How are you going to stop diversions of watersheds in valley? Ensure that water flows to ocean.
75. Concern about advice and consent so Molokai can have a say in planning and management. DHHL should be more involved in future of KALA.
76. Hawaii has smaller parcels of land so any acquisition of land has major impacts to landowners.
77. Hawaiians know sense of place better than anyone else.
78. Concerned about unsupervised access of visitors and taking of resources, soil.
79. Accidental taking of iwi from unsupervised visitors.
80. Archeological testing / inventory - don in KALA, not take out of peninsula.
81. Kalaupapa is seen as "the place where time stood still".
82. Fear of influx of people and changing the park. Time changes, administrations change.
83. Surfing should be allowed (Molokai residents); Kalaupapa historically known for surfing.
84. How will park regulate boats and off island boat traffic?
85. Does plan include ocean-based ranger patrol to regulate boat access?
86. Doesn't agree with plan since isn't allowed to be in park. No access to children under 16. Only been to overlook
87. Not a visitor's park - go slowly, be gentle
88. How many native Hawaiians are employed in park and management?
89. Should lower age to elementary. Disconnecting the kama 'āina; How can you build stewards; every Molokai kid should have a chance; organize such as ka 'Ohana could guide children - how to be culturally correct.
90. Are you mandated to have family days? Do federal laws trump state laws?
91. Clarification on who makes rules (age limit, activities allowed). "Is NPS mandated to provide family days?"
92. Ask the keiki for their opinions - what they would like - what they think about the future plans.
93. Would like to be able surf there.
94. NPS ideas are infringing on the rights of sovereign Hawaiians
95. Need the proper stewards managing the land in Kalaupapa
96. Why are we not supporting native Hawaiians while we are preserving native wildlife (monk seals)
97. Impressed with recycling, park is a model for how we take care.
98. Education support
99. Does not support lifting the age limit
100. They should go when they are ready.
101. Concerned about discipline - for field trips.

102. Children are different today - use electronic devices
103. Important to preserve records.
104. Integrity of KALA depends on Hawaiians being involved in park management
105. Haven't received emails about GMP in years.
106. Others had to wait until age 16 to go to Kalaupapa - should be maintained in future.
107. Families w/connections to KALA should have the right to stay overnight. What's the purpose of others staying overnight? Should not be a vacation.
108. Educating people (children of Molokai) about Kalaupapa and human rights, basic respect for one another.
109. If school groups allowed, need to have NPS staff to keep group together.
110. Respect the land; respect the people, even if they are dead.
111. Leave Kalaupapa, Kalaupapa
112. Family want to partner w/Kalaupapa to tell stories of kupuna
113. Want to see in books that people are being heard as part of GMP process
114. Does the park know about kama 'āina before patients?
115. Doesn't support children in KALA since children were taken away from patients.
116. Progress of time - Kalaupapa will change after patients leave.
117. Education of rules - difference b/t NPS + DOH. People don't understand the difference.
118. Legacy of KALA is left up to patients.
119. Where are the patients in the plan? Today? Were they included in the plan?
120. If Meyer property is included in the park boundary, could the NPS / State decide on the rules/regulations?
121. How can public access the comments of the patients?
122. Is the 'Ohana meeting notes available?
123. In the preferred alternative - if we are getting comments from others beyond KALA - they will support lifting the visitation cap, but need to consider the opinions of those on Molokai.
124. How many people are on the advisory group - differentiate between planning team and advisory commission.
125. Why is article 2 section 7 not in the plan - state hunting & gathering guidance?
126. Pālā'au State Park = huge asset for homesteaders. Do not want park under jurisdiction of NPS if not in DHHL Lease, why is this area included in the park?
127. Is it possible for patient families to have a foundation to have a majority say in Kalaupapa?
128. Hawaiians should not be considered visitors.
129. Concerned about access to patient comments on plan. Public should know what patients want.
130. People on other islands don't have the connection to Kalaupapa like Molokai does. Other might support the preferred alternative, which Molokai might not agree.
131. Request to insert additional docs in GMP: UN doc rights for indigenous people; ACHP doc that refers to UN doc
132. Do not want Pālā'au State Park as part of NPS park. Homesteaders view State park as important part of future. State Park Leases from DHHL.

Kahului, Maui**Wednesday, May 6, 2015 – 6pm**

1. Location: Kahului Community Center
2. Attendance: 28
3. Decision maker is not here. Need more involvement from decision maker
4. Concerned that comments are being sent to Seattle
5. NPS should work with Ka 'Ohana to use their resources and more recognition for Ka 'Ohana
6. Concerned about lowering age - maybe middle school (7th grade)
7. Concerned about unescorted visitor access - safety concerns
8. Concerned that even with increased staff, we wouldn't be able to adequately control visitors / drones - park is large area
9. Provide education about Kalaupapa elsewhere, even mainland because opportunities to visit are limited / expensive to go there - not for the average person.
10. Provide education about Kalaupapa elsewhere, even mainland because opportunities to visit are limited / expensive to go there - not for the average person.
11. PBS, internet
12. For long term history of Hawaiians especially as family members pass on
13. Hope funding can be found; need buy-in from everyone - Park needs to better known
14. Seek partnerships with tech companies, Hollywood = funding, media expertise; contact large foundations
15. Have visitor centers outside KALA. Broader access, raise awareness w/out disrupting / destroying it.
16. Regional director should sit-in both webinars
17. More than a Hawaiian site
18. UNESCO sites - guide, security, brochures
19. Thinks it is going to go on beyond HI, significance for the world. Need different languages, brochures, guides.
20. Need guided tours
21. It's good to have more access but controlling the numbers is the concern.
22. Keep a cap but allow different groups to come in, for example student groups.
23. Healing center, prayer center
24. Support homesteading if homesteaders are only living off land.
25. Need to have a living community there.
26. KALA could become very lonely after patients pass.
27. Marine access is a viable concern
28. Does NPS have authority to address marine access 1/4 mile off shore
29. Plan lacks detail about this (Marine access- in #26 comment)
30. Concerns relate to agreements, jurisdictions, and budgets. Suggest to remove the word "referred" = confusion with "selected"
31. Need a plan to be able to request funding
32. Cooperative partnerships
33. Internships to train native Hawaiians
34. Doing good job - patients support much of what NPS has been doing.
35. Safety equipment to airport - support no widening - preferred =9 seater plane, not 20
36. Suggest leaving cap at 100 until there is funding to rehabilitate buildings.
37. Memorial - will this happen without NPS involvement / review

38. Concerned about input into process
39. Is NPS suggesting the memorial to happen
40. Patients want the memorial
41. Without a native Hawaiian population there the place will be sterile
42. There should have been more advertising about meetings
43. Would like coop. agreement between NPS & Ka 'Ohana - they can do a lot of things NPS can't do.; can address lack of staffing; recognition
44. # of visitors / unescorted visitors defeats purpose of NPS being there. Need volunteers to help or don't allow control topside unescorted visitors
45. Torn about high visitation
46. Would like more people to have experience there, but doesn't think that
47. Orientation entry pass is enough to control visitor behavior / disrespect
48. Concerned about children under 16 allowed - could affect other's experience.
49. Concerned about allowing visitors to crater - safety
50. Does NPS have a policy on drones?; Would like it to be controlled.
51. Doesn't feel that bitter relationship between NPS & Ka 'Ohana will be productive
52. Terrific to preserve resources, but no detail regarding # visitors (mules, hikers, planes)
53. Will NPS be able to control access incl. watercraft, helicopters
54. DLNR & DHHL major landholders - tried to find out if they would participate in meetings. Would like to know what their plans are.
55. Lineal descendants have no representation except for Ka 'Ohana. Should be taking care of buildings - not the parks.
56. Seems that Valerie Monson / others have been marginalized there at Kalaupapa. Valerie improved relationship with park.
57. Feels that Ka 'Ohana was not adequately included in the plan. Rather than putting new staff - support Ka 'Ohana. Happy to keep doing work, outreach
58. Why were costs in 2012 dollars?
59. Commercial services - what assurances will there be for native Hawaiians / people of Molokai to get these contracts.
60. Decision - makers are from the outside - not here.
61. Why was Ka 'Ohana O Kalaupapa not considered a significant partner in the plan / preferred alt. Ka 'Ohana - has done much ground work. Not named.
62. Want to know intent of NPS decisions.
63. Management philosophy of NPS might not reflect descendants
64. NPS - recognize need for oversight. Contemporary kōkua = ka 'Ohana
65. If nothing has been decided, why is there a preferred alternative?
66. Who decided the preferred alternative?
67. Who will make the final decision?
68. Thinks that the native Hawaiians, Catholic church should make decision
69. This is Hawaiian land, a Christian place, sacred place
70. In the legislation, there is guidance for affording opportunities to patients.
71. What kind of assurances can be made to beneficiaries for opportunities
72. Education requirements vs. practical experience for staffing.
73. # of visitors / day allowed - why no cap stated?
74. Camping? Why not allowed
75. Does not want increased visitation

76. No unescorted tours
77. Who gets concession contracts
78. Where live & what rules do visitors / concessions / residence follow
79. Not good feeling about using ex-patient housing for other uses.
80. Reach out to university / Kamehameha & Hawaiian Schools: to assist with arch. sites; op to learn about the historic & native; High school & UH levels
81. Limitation of visitors coming down; Housing into visitors quarters very questionable. Not Pono!; Limited to student group & religious groups & 'ohana visitation.
82. System to filter out tours / visitors: for history, education; offer different tours / variety one for religious & spiritual) ; cultural tours; advent./quick tour; while on tour have time to experience the mana with longer time limits.
83. Age limit of 12 years & older
84. Preserve the spirituality of the place
85. Agree w/the orientation requirement
86. Interested in hearing what other partners have to say

Honolulu, O‘ahu**Thursday, May 7, 2015 – 6pm**

Location: Bishop Museum, Atherton Hālau

Attendance: 66

1. Concerned about Hawaiian Homesteads being in draft plan; concerned about lease expiration in 20 years.
2. Kalaupapa is a special place; hopes that volunteers will be allowed to still come & serve
3. Consider putting out a schedule for future meetings; some already know the plan.
4. 30 minutes too long for presentation
5. Plan appears to preserve and protect, but have concerns: 1) plan missed the mark; 2) letter from 2011: lack of emphasis on native Hawaiian special access and 'ohana family members
6. Concern about "visitor experience"
7. Opportunities for native Hawaiians through concessions and training are not enough given the number of people displaced
8. Task force for more Hawaiian involvement, including reps from Molokai, Ka 'Ohana O Kalaupapa, OHA
9. Were concerns from previous letters included in plan? If so, where?
10. Prefer not to include the boundary proposal and natural preserve in the draft plan
11. None of the alternatives are preferred
12. Need to incorporate more in to plans about missing Native Hawaiian concerns.
13. No mention of Kalaupapa Memorial in plan
14. Include Ka 'Ohana more in plan
15. Seems that Kalaupapa retirees are not considered "Kalaupapa Connection" can offer input
16. St. Damien stamp initiative - lots of signatures for support, but has not gone through.
17. Who will continue to run the tours?
18. We need everyone to continue to support Kalaupapa
19. Hopes that NPS will consider the plan on Ka 'Ohana website
20. Boundary expansion is not a land grab, its preservation
21. Sees destruction of money and resources in plan. Draft plan varies from original scope & reason of park.
22. Kalaupapa contains many family graves; families should continue to still have access. Families should be considered in any protective measures, changes to graves.
23. Family members need access
24. Consider strong partnership with Ka 'Ohana O Kalaupapa - Equal partnership
25. Concerns about national preserve. Why wait until after last patient passes? Why not do it now if so important?
26. Interested in NPS future plans, specifically for families
27. Why isn't Uncle Boogie and his partnership?
28. No tourist attractions; no people trampling graves.
29. Only in agreement for education
30. Should obey patient wishes on children
31. Shouldn't rush the process for 2016 Centennial
32. Include patient input and family members input on plan
33. Certain rights of family members need to be protected
34. Alternative B is more appropriate; limited access; less revenue generating commercial services

35. Concern about current residents and their voice and making sure kama 'āina voices are heard in plan.
36. Recognize Ka 'Ohana and their voice
37. Plans after GMP need collaboration and dialog with partners and patient descendants.
38. Plan needs to specifically articulate how to use the voice of kama 'āina and descendants. Otherwise, no integrity of park.
39. How are public comments included in planning process.
40. Voices are important to include in plan for future NPS staff and future descendants.
41. Not having a partnership with Ka 'Ohana would be tragic. Mahalo for acknowledging 'Ohana as a partner.
42. Allow for opportunities for cultural aspects, i.e. Hula
43. Outside exhibits (Ka 'Ohana) reach lots of educators and students. Good way to continue legacy.
44. Special visitor groups for descendants
45. Making sure visitors can't go into certain areas i.e.: arch sites
46. Still keep the age limit of 16 yrs.
47. Outreach programs in schools
48. Preference given to descendants of Kalaupapa regards to commercial use ops.
49. Here for family and kuleana
50. Concern - if these are residents at Kalaupapa, created organization, including kama 'āina, make sure they have been at it for years.
51. Organization integrity - concerned at it.
52. Voices of descendants
53. Draft plan to final, more detail at how to incorporate voices of descendants
54. If NPS really wants to really interpret and understand then plan will need to detail how to incorporate their voices. 'Ohana is right there. Can't see the 'Ohana in plan. Will make comment as descendent.
55. Need to put comments in writing. NPS needs to include comments in plan.
56. Would like to see volunteer service groups continue at Kalaupapa
57. Likes Alternative C
58. Preserve the place, no restrictions for native Hawaiians - including homesteaders, family of patients.
59. There should be a small budget from the federal government or type of assistance for the memorial. Ka 'Ohana would manage the funding for the purpose of the memorial.
60. Priority list for historic structures
61. Us public health service as partner for educational material - back ground of disease treatment (i.e. Lahaina Seamen's Hospital)
62. Bike share program
63. Consider intangibles of isolation and peacefulness in interpretation and education when evaluating visitor access and cap.
64. NPS I the best management agency for natural and cultural stewardship
65. Continue and expand use of historic structures
66. Descendants are not seen as their own separate group apart from service groups.
67. As a user, 'Ohana groups have different needs - e.g. might need to visit a specific site - grave, directions, etc. - Maybe have a different arrangement or program for visitation
68. Doesn't want to see traditional homesteading - it would impact cultural / natural resource.

69. Visitor service learning has been very beneficial - UH Botany / UH Manoa
70. Enhance - provide more opportunities for research
71. Consider lowering the age limit, but this needs to match interp. and education programs
72. Reclaim former pasture land using innovative approaches (e.g. paddocks)
73. Asked to simplify language
74. Next time provide an upfront outline of the presentation so people understand the time commitment
75. Question: kuleana properties - how will people be kept out of their property?
76. No need to extend boundary beyond the present boundaries
77. Concerns with boundary changes - private property rights (of the original landowners) should remain and shouldn't make changes - if sell the land, then agreements to work with NPS policies would happen.
78. Agreements that preserve land in perpetuity is better. Believe boundary adjustments are good for long term.
79. No homesteading on the peninsula
80. No boundary adjustment (big group comment)
81. Form a task force with Hawaiian representation (big group comment)
82. Volunteer service groups, should be encouraged to continue working at Kalaupapa
83. History and valuing the past is essential (big group comment) - too little info about Kalaupapa in our education system.
84. Kalaupapa 'Ohana org - request review of plan (big group comment)
85. As a partner with NPS, include in the NPS plan Ka 'Ohana Kalaupapa organization
86. Don't let revenue decide the outcome of Kalaupapa
87. Keep the descendants of the patients involved with the planning of the park
88. Recommend alternative B
89. Concerned with timing of boundary adjustment and the public perspective - keep simple, smaller and no boundary adjustment (general comment)
90. Education focus, keep age limit (good comment)
91. Need more time, 2016 too soon to finalize (general comment) - get more info
92. Concerned that descendant voices will not matter (general comment) GMP should detail out how the detailed planning (next phase) will work with descendants and continue into the future.
93. Need to put comments in writing and include in the plan - this is part of the history
94. Hula and cultural practices should be allowed and encouraged (general comment)
95. Ka 'Ohana Kalaupapa needs to be a formal partner and be in the plan (general comment)
96. Access for descendants always needs to happen
97. Keep visitor numbers at 100 - low
98. Needs to have dedicated funding and funding to maintain the memorial (general comment)
99. Would like descendants to have a place to stay overnight
100. Concerned with word "Park" - can we take "Park" word out? - Just Kalaupapa NH Settlement such as Arizona Memorial and not park
101. Haleakala - public comments appended to plan. Do it for Kalaupapa plan, have it online and in plan.
102. Kanaka maoli from Molokai - grandfather buried at Kalaupapa
103. Boogies comment - fishing, traditional access, Kalaupapa Nat'l Historical Park - 1901

104. Hopes everyone comes together to take right path. Do it slowly. Put heart and minds together.
105. Mauna Kea issue in Hawaii
106. Mano - grandmother, great grandmother - not sure @ how she'd feel about having to pay for visiting. Lonely, ache for her.
107. 2016 - need more time. Concern @ access, overfishing, walking around on graves.
108. Anna Akamu - grandparents at Kalaupapa, Lucy, Elizabeth relations
109. NPS I the best management agency for natural and cultural stewardship
110. Ohana - giving around islands for education, done so much, need to be in words in plan.
111. Patients - get memorial built
112. Need more time
113. Access for descendants
114. Keep cap for #s
115. Concern about funding. Need permanent dedicated funding for Kalaupapa. Include funding for memorial.
116. Kupuna were silent, they'd want us to speak now
117. Founding member of Ka 'Ohana
118. Seems like retirees don't count
119. Formed organization.
120. Damien Stamp
121. 14 ministers - talk w/ priest
122. Dynasty among patients for tours
123. Ohana seems to be excluding people. Nicole Marks grandfather - wants to preserve and share
124. Kalaupapa not in education
125. Tour is expensive
126. Hike, fly - expensive
127. Important to get there and learn
128. Kalaupapa designated visitor spot
129. Plants important for learning
130. Damien tours LLC @ gmail.com Pauline Hess
131. By mentioning Ka 'Ohana means a lot, recognition
132. Pelekunu - not a land grab. It's because wants to conserve lands.
133. Richard Marks - purpose of Kalaupapa to preserve history and patient community.
134. Additional lands would be a distraction to purpose of Kalaupapa
135. Wants people to learn about history of patients
136. Wally Englis - Housing organization. Housing group up at Hale Mohalu.
137. Appreciate flexibility for meeting format.
138. 25 minute presentation too long, unusual, shame on you folks; very angry about kupunas having to sit that long to give their mana'o

Honolulu, O‘ahu**Friday, May 8, 2015 – 10am**

Location: Bishop Museum, Atherton Hālau

Attendance: 45

1. Who is the plan put out to, once final? 30 day comment period before record of decision
2. What is the cost right now for those who work / visit - cost for recycling / trash removal?
3. Orientation films don't work to prevent people from breaking the rules and respecting the 'āina.
4. Grandma Ella Bridges - 'ohana / topside homesteader Molokai: Glad to see that NPS is hearing the people.
5. Agrees w/Alt. C
6. Need viable management plan to spread the lesson to others
7. With Memorial & GMP, finally feels that its ok to talk about Kalaupapa and Hansen's disease
8. Need more than Damien Museum in Waikiki
9. Need people to come to KALA to experience it.
10. Would like to see advisory panel as part of policy where ALL voices have a seat at the table.
11. Present hana 'ino / desecration
12. Mahalo for recognizing Ka 'Ohana O Kalaupapa in ppt.
13. pg. 21, cost estimates - plan does not guarantee, is a red flag
14. pg. 21 - cost includes partners / non-federal
15. Where exactly does \$ come from to implement? How can State be accountable to assist NPS in management, maintenance and care?
16. Dad born there / 'ohana / Grandma was sent there. Recognition from NPS to Ka 'Ohana in plan
17. Get legacy for future generations and Ka 'Ohana
18. Pauline Hess / mom & dad patients; 1) mom was human rights activities; 2) spoke to many people/groups about human rights and how to reconcile with family; 3) KALA goes beyond the boundaries of land - it goes further. Spread the news and faith far. 4) Recognized 'Ohana members - Bernard, Ku‘ulei, Boogie; 5) Will NPS enter into some written agreement w/Ka 'Ohana: Please give response to President Uncle Boogie.
19. Grandpa was patient; 1) Appreciates work that's gone into draft plan; 2) concern about access/preferential treatment for family members to get to stay in Kalaupapa
20. Priority ranking for 'Ohana members over tourists.
21. Family members felt tour was elevated for them to give a better tour. Goals of family members different than tourists.
22. There are happy stories about people meeting in KALA and making friends.
23. Mark: 1) How do we make the memorial happen so families and others can honor the people of Kalaupapa?; 2) Memorial is key; 3) Need to remember the voices of our kupuna - honor & respect; 4) Show respect and the plan will work out.
24. Thinks plan is great; would like to see it done before retirement.
25. Descendent of patient: 1) descendants will share patient voices in future; 2) listen carefully and honor with their voices - greatest gift to give back.
26. 100 / day cap is enough. Doesn't want to see KALA change from what it is now

27. It is a very special experience / opportunity to go there. We have enough "tourist" places already.
28. Concern on the 6 million annual cost being low.
29. Daily cap should be quantified.
30. No homesteading - choosing people to live there would be difficult doesn't serve purpose of Kalaupapa
31. Lower age limit to ~ 10-12
32. Increase cap, but no more than 500
33. HHF Comments & also sending formal letter: re: Sec. 106 - is there a park specific programmatic agreement for KALA (& NOT NATIONAL), mat or concern: demolition by neglect (due to not enough funds or no guaranteed funding)
34. If there is homesteading in future, does any DHHL action or action by homesteaders have to go through Sec. 106?
35. Supports collaboration with Ka 'Ohana O Kalaupapa and pacific historical parks and Malama Makanalua (Kerri Inghish)
36. Update NHL nomination
37. Thought if family - auto access
38. Lopaka Hoopi'i 'Ohana: Final draft 2016 - what does it entail? Does it become law? Who signs it?
39. Uncle Joe: 1) Is anyone here from DHHL; 2) grandmother was Pi'ianaia commissioner DHHL; 3) KALA should be a place of refuge, not a tourist trap, no garbage 4) He's not a park; it's a settlement. 5) People were banished there; 6) Can get history from Damien museum - not at KALA; 7) NPS jurisdiction - fee - (misunderstanding - "free")
40. People talked to Patsy Mink to preserve this area
41. Concerned about desecration, disrespect. This is a place of cultural history, the only one on the planet.
42. Should not be a walk-through museum
43. Sisters of St. Francis: 1) historical place; 2) need limits; 3) museum is a good idea for those who can't get there; 4) spiritual experience - you have to be there; 5) people are awesome; 6) need regulations; 7) so important to understand the history
44. Kale 'Ohana: both mom & dad were patients: 1) don't forget about story / patients; 2) mom asked her "don't" let them ever lose their voice; 3) It's what you believe and grow up with - not just the place; 4) not raised to feel shame; 5) need love and respect, including from and for children.
45. Milo: 1) wonderful place, so much history, including Hawaiian history; 2) different cemeteries, unmarked graves; 3) to go there is a privilege - got to stay in different patient's houses; 4) Keep the place open to the public; 5) worried if the place would not be preserved and open to the public; 6) worked on cost estimates to restore buildings; 7) was concerned about some ideas, including camping; 8) good influence from Ka 'Ohana to preserve the place.
46. Descendent = also agrees that they should be considered differently from other visitors, including service groups
47. Jerome (descendent) - final EIS / GMP = will written comments be included? As an appendix or summarized?

48. Main issue is "you have to think Hawaiian" Kalaupapa is not about tours; children have to be a certain age to be able to understand the place; the Hawaiian people coming back and to see what's being done for their 'ohana is what's important.
49. Kalaupapa has come a long way; keep up the good work, including clean-up; listen to people of KALA - listen to their voices once their gone - they're gone
50. Pu'u honua is here
51. There has to be enforcement. Remind people to not be lolo about dropping rubbish
52. Place for healing, love for all people, no more banishment.
53. Parents were grateful for NPS to malama the place; take care of the people and the story
54. Paul - nephew of St. Marianne: 1) NPS has done good job; 2) Clean-up of invasive plants; 3) experience that all of us should have; 4) supports plan D
55. Robert Ho'opi'i: 1) 86 years returned to Kalawao - gave thanks to parents; 2) family members had the disease; 3) presentation is well done; explanation is very important; 4) first book of Kalaupapa is so good.

Online Meeting**Wednesday, May 13, 2015 – 10am**

Location: Go To Meeting

Attendance: 10

1. Will there be a transcript of the recorded meeting?
Answer: Anna: yes, during the comment session.
2. A few people are not on the webinar and are only on the phone line--due to technical difficulties.
3. Lori: Concern about accessing the webinar for those who are less used to using computers and who may have connectivity issues. This is a problem. Would like us to address this before the cultural resources meeting tomorrow (5/14).
4. Kealoha: Volunteers at school under the Hawaiian immersion program. Regarding the education portion, would like to see how Kalaupapa can get the high school involved in the restoration and education portion. Saw the presentation, and it was good.
Answer: You can send an email with suggestions for how the park can begin implementing that. It doesn't necessarily have to wait for the DOH to depart before something like this can get started. Contact the Superintendent.
5. Kealoha: Would like to discuss further what age is appropriate. Would like to see 5th, 6th graders go there. Would need more discussion to decide what materials would be appropriate.
6. DeGray: Page 226 of the GMP - lists Ohana under the category of "short-term agreements" instead of "long-term agreements." Is there a reason for that? You have cooperative agreements with the churches and they aren't landowners. The Ohana received a 65-year lease from the Land Board at Kalawao, and there is no mention of that. It was done after 2012, and may not have been updated.
Answer: This is an update that should be added to the long-term agreements. Long-term agreements were listed as the ones that are in place with landowners primarily, as well as churches.
7. My grandmother is buried in Kalaupapa, and I have to ask permission to go to her gravesite. In this general plan, if all the patients have passed away, if someone wants to visit a family member who has passed away, what will be the process?
8. In the long-term future, you would have the option of coming using a day pass--could fly, walk in on your own. Another option is to come through a partner organization to stay longer, overnight. The third option is that if there are general lodging options for visitors--this is in the very long term-- you would have the option to stay as a general visitor as well.
9. It is capped at 100 people to go there now, but if you are going to gradually lift it, I am concerned that you are going to have a big zoo there.
Answer: The way we have designed this is that first and foremost this is about maintaining the existing character of Kalaupapa; this is incredibly important. The NPS is looking at changing the visitor cap and allowing children because we want to design the visitor use to maintain character while allowing for visitors to come and

learn about the significance of Kalaupapa. We already have a facility capacity of about 300 people per day, so that is limiting in and of itself.

10. Does that 300 include the visitors and staff, or is it just visitors?

Answer: That's everybody: limited by toilet facilities, the number of people who can arrive by plane, etc.

11. DeGray: Page 117 talks about visitor use and talking about what a visitor is. You say that visitors do not have personal connections to Kalaupapa, but then there are the ones who do have connections. If there are going to be limited numbers of people allowed there, maybe family members and descendants of patients should have some preference for the lodging. I think that was mentioned in some of the comments that I have seen from earlier sessions.

12. Lori Buchanan: Interested in hearing what other people are thinking about the plan. Unable to access the webinar. Concern about tomorrow's online 106 meeting. I know that DHHL has asked NPS to extend the comment period, as it is a short turnaround period for a very large complex plan. We only have a few weeks to absorb. Difference between 2011 and now is the addition of the Preserve and the increase in acreage. Area of potential preserve is now huge. As a practitioner and representative of my Ohana, I would also like to ask you to extend the comment period. The word is just getting out via social media: I'd like to officially ask you to extend your comment period.

Answer: When the alternatives were presented in 2011, we did have a boundary proposal that included the Pelekunu Preserve and the Olokui Preserve. We did have a preserve included in the preliminary alternatives.

13. Lori: It is substantial to me that the previous alternative was absent the Wailau area. There are people who didn't even know this document was available. After 7 years, why can't you extend the comment period a few more weeks.

14. Lori: I am glad to hear about the grave sites. It is right that people are expressing concerns. I have been concerned about visitors walking over grave sites. When the commenter said it will be a zoo, I was hoping that the visitor center would shut down at an hour like 5:00, but visitors are allowed to continue going all around the site and they can cause damage to resources.

Answer: Also, so that you are aware, we always accept comments that arrive in the weeks immediately after the closing date of the comment period.

15. Lori: Is there a time period after the comment period closes when you have to present findings?

Answer: There is not, but we will provide a summary of public comments and explain how they are analyzed. There is no mandated timeframe.

16. Lori: Just a few days ago, DOI published DHHL rules governing Hawaiian homestead lands. While we are having this discussion, DOI is having a separate discussion to change the rules of how Hawaiian homelands are managed. Concern about not being included in these discussions and what it means for Kalaupapa management. What about the families?

17. At the 'Ohana's annual meeting a few weeks ago, someone from the Big Island asked why the NPS wasn't going to the big island. On page 310 of the GMP: in 2009 the NPS did go

to the Big Island and Kauai...has any decision been made to extend the comment period and the process.

Answer: It was a hard decision to not go to Kauai and the Big Island: constraints due to costs and logistics. We are in a different financial situation than we were when we went out to the public previously. When we were picking the venues that we could afford, we chose the ones that would be likely to have the most attendees. We try to schedule these webinars because we can't go everywhere: try to do what we can given the budget constraints.

18. Von: Comments were emailed.

19. Mary Jane: Will be helping with the SHPD review of the GMP, and is concerned about the outreach on Kauai. Is willing to help however she can. There are families of Kalaupapa patients on Kauai. Has there been an effort to include them on the webinars?

Answer: Yes, We have reached out, including by phone, to let them know about the webinar and how to comment, let them know they can reach Erika or Anna whenever they want to in order to comment.

Answer: Mary Jane is willing to make direct contact to help follow up. Anna can provide extra newsletters or whatever is needed.

20. Valerie: I mostly am participating today because I wanted to hear others' thoughts. In terms of adding on these lands of Pelekunu and Olokui. I attended four of those meetings in 2009 and 2011. We had Ohana folks at all of those meetings. I don't recall anyone ever supporting this. How will we be able to see all of the comments on the plan? How will be able to read them. I'm concerned that there doesn't seem to be public support for adding these lands? There wasn't support in 2009 and 2011, and now they are in the plan. I am concerned that the mission of Kalaupapa NHP will be lost if these lands are added, especially in the future. As new employees arrive, they may not have the chance to know those who lived there and will focus on these big majestic lands instead. Frustrating that we voiced support for one thing but are seeing something different in the plan. Thanks for efforts in terms of all of the meetings.

Answer: In 2009 there was no boundary proposal. In 2011 we heard support for it as well as people who were against it. When we totaled the comments, there wasn't a whole lot of comment on the proposal.

Answer: Re: how you can see the comments: the comments from the meetings have been posted on the PEPC websites from the past rounds of meetings, and once we are done with this session of comment period, we will post those comments as well.

21. Will we also be able to see the comments that were submitted?

Answer: when we're done with this session, we will also post the comments from these meetings online. {See above}

22. In 2009, the Ohana took the position opposing the lands addition.

Answer: There was a previous boundary study in 2000 that looked at the whole North Shore, but that study didn't go anywhere after 2000.

23. DeGray: earlier in the meeting, someone asked whether we should even include this in the plan. We know that your funding sources like all national parks are very limited. It seems

like there will be some costs involved in managing these additional lands, which could potentially take away from funds needed for Kalaupapa. Also significant when NPS needs to take over costs for managing after transition from DOH. It seems like the lands addition might be a detriment to your future funding overall.

Answer: Appreciate understanding as funding can be a struggle.

24. DeGray: On Special Mandates: the earlier foundation (2010 draft) had a definition of what a special mandate is. That didn't make it into this version, and it would be helpful to add it back in.
25. Page 226: Hopefully we can share a little rewrite on the Ka 'Ohana o Kalaupapa paragraph. We were formed in 2003, and there are some other corrections. There is a statement in there that is a new position we are just hearing now - the last sentence: "funding...will be through non-NPS fund sources." What is a non-NPS fund source? What would those represent?

Answer: We as a team have noted some of these edits that need to happen. Also the one you pointed out at the commission meeting: "funding for planning, design, and construction would be through non-NPS fund sources."

26. That's not what is in the legislation, it just says we will be responsible for raising the money for the memorial, it doesn't say the NPS can't contribute any money. The reason for the cooperative agreement like other partners is so that any congressional appropriations can be applied to non-federal projects, whether it be the church or other projects. If we have a cooperative agreement but you are saying you can't apply federal funding, I assume this means non-NPS fund sources.

Answer: Yes, for planning, design and construction. Those are details that we need to work out as the memorial project continues. The maintenance: we already maintain the grounds there, i.e., the mowing, work with the heritage trees. As far as the maintenance of the actual memorial, it would depend on what type of maintenance we actually need: these are details that need to be worked out later on. It would be difficult for us to get funding for maintenance work but we can't.

27. How do you work with other park partners to maintain grounds? Do you apply for funds?
- Answer: We utilize relationships with cooperating association (Pacific Historic Parks) and they have helped us to get some funding for the restoration of St. Philomena. Some comes from base budget. Additional project needs are individual and case-by-case.

28. Pacific Historic Parks is a non-NPS fund source?

Answer: Yes

29. Valerie: Would like to see in all the alternatives that the memorial is listed as a Common to All project.

30. Re: visitor cap, agrees that there should be a specific number in mind and that the park should have an annual review to assess impacts. At the Ohana in 2009 the recommendation was that after there are no patients and the DOH is out, it should be no more than 150 a day. NPS needs to show that they are sharing this important resource with the public and we hoped that this is a manageable figure. We also said no more than 25 could stay

overnight except with special exceptions such as events for St. Damien or something like that. Encourages NPS to have a number/target in mind.

31. DeGray: there's a reference to a lot of long-term agreements; we talked about the federal legislation that established the park, but if this is going to be something that someone could look at and get a big picture, would we attach other long-term agreements, such as the Kalaupapa Memorial Act, along with agreements with DHHL, the churches, and everything else?

Answer: Yes, good point. There are definitely revisions to be made that we are identifying through this effort. That is one that we would make.

32. Kealoha: I am going to e-mail Erika more of my comments. One last comment: the gravesites at Kalaupapa--need to be really carefully maintained, like Lori said, not be trampled, because there will be so many visitors in the park. Concerned about maintenance of gravesites that are there.

Answer: A very good point. For some background information, our crews spend hours and hours maintaining and engaged in cemetery preservation projects. It is an ongoing part of our current operation that would only increase in the future. We would not reduce maintenance levels.

33. One concern is that if you are going to lift a cap on visitors coming down, the traffic. Don't want to see it get congested.

Answer: Also helpful to think about the ways that visitors are arriving. For example, hiking in and out on the same day might not be possible for people. Limitations of geographical access will exert a limit on visitation numbers.

Answer: From an implementation level, we wouldn't want to make this change until we had the visitor/resource-protection coverage available.

34. One last thing: if Erika and the rest of the Kalaupapa hui can keep Kealoha in the loop on the development of the plan.

35. De Gray: There are a couple of places where it is mentioned that when there is no longer a living community at Kalaupapa, the Secretary of Interior might look into making changes to how the park is managed. Would there be a group of some of the stakeholders and others to look at what would be appropriate, and once the changes are considered, what is the process it has to go through to implement those changes?

Answer: The GMP process is part of that because we are proposing changes for long-term management.

Answer: re: groups of stakeholders who want to participate, there is an advisory commission that is operating right now. The plan doesn't really address recommendations for the advisory commission in the future. We hope it will continue and the composition will change. This is an avenue to make recommendations for who (generally) would be represented on the commission.

36. North Shore: there is a mention about the Nature Conservancy expressing willingness to sell interest in Pelekunu Preserve. Has there been a discussion about the price or how it would be funded if NPS wants to purchase the Preserve?

Answer: It is a long process. There would need to be legislation to establish a boundary and set aside funds. Usually purchases are done by fair market value. An

appraisal would be done. It would be funded through Land and Water Conservation Fund monies. We would need to get in line for funds to purchase.

37. There was some comment in the plan or earlier about the designation of the North Shore? What was it?

Answer: It is the North Shore Cliffs National Natural Landmark is a comparable designation to the National Historic Landmark at Kalaupapa. It establishes national significance. Does not impact private property rights, for example; doesn't control a lot in terms of regulation, rather it is about identifying its significance.

38. As far as the ranch on the east end, is there any benefit for them tax wise that might help them sustaining their lands on the east end from any type of designation?

Answer: Not at this time, but if a Preserve were established, and the landowner chose to donate his/her lands, there would be tax benefits resulting from a donation.

39. If the land were donated, would NPS have the full cost responsibility for managing it?

Answer: Yes.

40. This is Chris in Valleyford, Washington. I have a question about access: do family members have access rights above the general public?

Answer: Right now, any family member that wanted to come to visit the gravesites or visit Kalaupapa can contact the NPS. I believe that Ka 'Ohana is supportive of this as well. In the long-term, just to re-iterate, any family members/descendants could come in through the free day-use option. An orientation would be required that would provide information about history and background and available opportunities. Another option is to come through a partner organization. In the very long-term, if there were overnight accommodations for the public, you could come in and spend the night as well.

41. I have done a lot of research on family members sent to Kalaupapa, and have a lot of documentation, but I'm not going there personally because it is a national park. I am going there to pay respects.

42. Valerie: The Ohana has been helping family members visit. They have 3 Board members who live at Kalaupapa. They make arrangements for sponsorships, provide information to families, do research on families before they arrive and try to take them to places that would be meaningful for them as well as giving them free time. If people ask for help, they try to work out dates when someone with the Ohana could be there to help them, and when the 3 Board member Kalaupapa residents could be with them. Now it will be even easier for them to do that as they can use the facility for Headquarters when DOH moves out.

43. De Gray: Val mentioned the house at Kalaupapa. If NPS takes over from DOH and things are working out well, is there any reason that the NPS would continue to honor that commitment?

Answer: We see you as a partner already and we want to continue strengthening the partnership and relationship. It is one of the major partner entities that are there. We are trying to define uses for all of the structures and buildings, so it fits in perfectly with the vision.

44. Do you know if there is any transition schedule that shows in greater detail when responsibilities will be transferred between DOH and NPS?

Answer: There is an old agreement from 1990. Need to work with DOH to update that transition plan: next project after the general management plan.

45. DeGray: Regarding the technical process: computer is too old to run the software for the online meeting.
46. These webinars are very helpful because I am able to participate even though I can't attend an actual meeting due to transportation issues.
47. Logistics for tomorrow. NPS will post a link for tomorrow's webinar. Participants are asked to e-mail their addresses to the question box so that they can be sent the proper links.

Online Cultural Resources Meeting Thurs., May 14, 2015 – 10am

Location: Go To Meeting

Attendance: 13

1. Lori Buchanan: Molokai. Has a lot of questions about the process. Is happy to wait for others to ask questions first.
2. Walter: Wondering if any of their original questions were answered: are they going to be able to find a formal way for Hawaiians to get their questions submitted to the park? Requested a task force. Not convinced the process NPS has is working. Most of their concerns have not been dealt with. Concerned that NPS talks but doesn't react. Concerns about homesteading and about how resources are used. Concerned that they are making comments, and there is no reaction from NPS. Can they have a task force?
Answer: Task force issue: One of the ways we can incorporate that model is through our Advisory Commission. We have to listen to our AC: there is currently one non-patient seat that is open. We will have to determine what the composition of the AC will be in the long term once patients no longer occupy seats. In the short term, we need to determine the proper avenues for adding additional participants to the AC.
3. Walter: Not asking to be on an existing patient-focused commission. He wants a special task force for Hawaiian issues. We have been asking since 2009 for this. I was at the beneficiary meetings and raised all of these concerns. Why has nothing happened?
Answer: Need to get up to speed with the history of the conversations since 2009. Don't have an answer right now and will need to get back to you to see how these could be incorporated.
Answer: We can take down further concerns at this point if you would like.
Answer: We do have to comply with the Federal Advisory Commission Act with the process. We are consulting with FAC that is already in place. You have the opportunity to form your own task force and provide your comments through that avenue.
Answer: Erika is willing to make the same presentation and hear feedback and consult in that way. At a forthcoming beneficiary meeting we can review earlier comment letter and review what has and what hasn't been addressed. After the beneficiary letter arrived, the beneficiaries were represented on the planning team by Kaleo, planner for DHHL.
4. Kealoha: Concern about the settlement and the preservation of the cemetery. I hope that the NPS maintains the cemeteries and ensures that they do not become a "tourist attraction."
5. Lori: Concern about the stakeholder process and how it relates to federal standards. I also have questions about the section 106 presentation. The engagement with native Hawaiian stakeholders is currently not successful. If DHHL is going to represent stakeholders on Molokai, this won't work, because they are not representing us. Would like to know if someone from DHHL is on the line and who is representing the ACHP.

6. Lori: was the section 106 process initiated in 2009? Is that correct? I'm hearing for the first time that you did a preliminary finding of no adverse effect.

Answer: Yes, this was correct, and section 106 entities invited to participate in 2009 and 2011. Yes, we do this as part of the GMP process, but we are consulting with SHPD for their concurrence.

7. This is an issue because from 2009 I have been a stakeholder in this process. I was never notified of preliminary findings of an effort. That is my concern and my feedback. I didn't get any notification. What are the other criteria the agency had in reaching the finding of no adverse effect?
8. We didn't have any findings of effect prior to this stage because we had not gone through the analysis of environmental consequences. This process we are doing right now is the process on the preliminary finding.
9. Would like to know why I am not being included in this discussion. I received a letter on April 10, 2015 initiating formal consultation on the draft GMP. Concern about the 60 day comment period and that it is too short; also that today's call is too late for the section 106 consultation call, leaving fewer than 30 days for comment. I have not seen areas of potential adverse effect and have not had time to engage with the park about these adverse effects. How will the NPS engage with me in the remaining days? This is why I think you need to extend June 8 deadline. Would like to begin my 106 process with the park.

Answer: The June 8 deadline is based on NEPA review of the GMP. The 106 can go on as long as it needs to. In the April 10 letter, we outlined the Area of Potential Effect. This presentation today indicates what we think will be the Area of Potential Effect: the whole Kalaupapa NHP boundary; the historic properties potentially affected = all the properties that are contributing to the NHL (historic properties, archeological sites)

10. What about the NNL boundary? So the areas of the landmark are not in the areas of effect right now?

Answer: It is the whole NNL boundary and right now it does not include the boundary modification. In recent discussions we have been talking about that though. We want to hear from you if the area needs to be extended out there. We are not aware of historic properties out there, but there could be some.

11. Who are the stakeholder agencies that represent my interest on the 106? In the end are you going to enter into a multi-agency programmatic agreement?

Answer: Right now we have a programmatic agreement with NPS, ACHP, the SHPD, and that covers a lot of the actions that we are already engaged in (historic preservation work), and we can share that with you. In regards to a programmatic agreement for this process, we are finding that there will be no adverse effect to historic properties, so we do not need a programmatic agreement. These are not actual undertakings just yet: this is just a planning process.

Answer: The plan is overall framework, a vision: we can't put every possible action in the next 15 years into a single programmatic agreement, because we can't predict what all the actions will be, and we don't have the funding available. It didn't make sense to undertake a PA until we had the project funding and were prepared to use it. The Advisory Council encourages us to use the 2008 Programmatic Agreement as a blanket PA for the work that we do.

12. Lori: If the agencies can't wrap their heads around the plan because it is at such a broad-level, how can stakeholder engagement occur? Can we have further engagement relating to access and cultural resources. We need to work through this further. Need to further explain the number of designations in the park. For stakeholders to understand and engage, they need to fully grasp what each of these designations mean and what the park is proposing. They are separate entities with different issues and it is hard to wrap your head around all of it.
13. Jessica: Echoing Walter's question and Lori's questions about task force and consultation, it would be helpful to the ongoing Section 106 consultation process for NPS at Kalaupapa to look into establishing a kaku of descendants, patients, and Hawaiians to participate in current and future consultation. Perhaps NPS should consider amending the GMP to include the framework for establishing such a group and how they will be consulted on a monthly, quarterly, yearly basis and make it an action item among all alternatives.

Answer: We want to consult more, and it is becoming clear to me that this is a deficiency that we have right now, but it is something that we can absolutely begin to incorporate into our regular park management. We understand that it feels like this timeline is very short. And I hear you that you don't agree with a finding of no adverse effect and that you would like more consultation. We will get together with our team and decide on what our next steps will be for section 106 consultation.

14. Lori: I have been actively engaging with the process on my own initiative, and each time I found that it was challenging. I have a lot of concerns about the size of the plan and making sure that I can effectively engage with the process in such a short time. I am unhappy with the process.
15. DeGray: Question following up on the difficulty understanding the 106 process: Right now we are facing the 106 process on the Kalaupapa Memorial. When we met with NPS and DLNR in January, the Deputy AG (Linda Chow) was going to meet with Erika to figure out about the 106 process and get back to us. This has been delayed. Could you explain the rough timelines and how the 106 process would work for an individual process like the Memorial?

Answer: In terms of following up with Linda Chow, she informed us that if the memorial design follows same criteria as outlined in earlier SHPD letter, everything would be fine--it would still be no adverse effect.

Answer: In terms of the typical section 106 process, once the design is apparent and if it follows the SHPD guidelines as laid out, it would be simple: we would identify the

Area of Potential Effect and the historic properties affected. We could have a separate discussion on the memorial and compliance later if this is of interest, outside of the GMP call.

11. De Gray: If it does fit within the criteria of the SHPD letter that was sent, then what?
12. Jessica Puff: As long as the project scope of work is identical to what was reviewed and the stipulations are identical, all that is needed are the final design drawings to determine that nothing has changed. If something has changed, they would have to re review the project and the 106 process would start over from the beginning. To my understanding the memorial came to our office for review and the public has already been consulted. The first step is that the public agency needs to identify the scope of work and whether or not the proposed project will negatively affect adjacent properties. The second step is initiating consultation: listen to concerns and address those concerns in the plans. Step three is to bring to SHPD, which reviews the project and identifies any additional concerns. Step four is revisions based on those concerns. Now have made it through steps 1-4; have drawings. There is a letter, there has been the site move to slightly higher ground because NPS located the memorial in a natural flood hazard area. it has been moved out of that area. The initial letter did not agree with the initial finding, so NPS changed the finding to show that it will not be an adverse effect if they follow the guidelines. Hopefully it will go through with these slight changes.
13. Jessica: In the case of moving the memorial, there would need to be additional consultation on the new location. We might not have to go back to step one, but we would have to identify this on a case-by-case basis. There has been a lot of data recovery from the memorial site.
14. Jessica: but if the memorial site is on an archeological site, this is a concern and we would potentially recommend moving outside the site.
15. Morgan Davis (SHPD archeologist): aware of the change and have been in discussion with DeGray. Hasn't received anything from NPS yet.

Answer: Erika: when we have the design we'll be able to determine the extent of the effect to move the memorial. We should have a separate call to discuss memorial compliance. But the design will be a good step to get back on the same page and decide what our next steps will be.
16. Megan Borthwick: For the memorial, a letter discussing the Draft EA under ch 343 also just went out last month. Additionally, based on the information available in PEPC, there was a FONSI from NPS for the memorial with a completed AIS. How do these all relate? It seems like it may help to streamline the process if all paperwork is available together to go through the final steps
17. Jessica: PA for the GMP: That is a potentially really good idea for setting the stage for continued consultation through implementation of the GMP. One concern that SHPD has had is the nationwide programmatic agreement may not be that effective. There has been concern from some in the office that some people should have come to them for

consultation on the cemetery. Need to look at the programmatic agreement (nationwide) and see what changes may be needed, before looking at a PA specifically for this the GMP.

18. Megan: Historic Hawaii Foundation encourages a park specific PA which could include management actions similar to all alternatives and that sets up consultation process for different groups of stakeholders.
19. Lori: is it the responsibility of SHPD to relay this information to the preservation office?
Answer: It is everyone in the historic preservation office in the SHPD: she will be made aware of this.
20. Jessica (SHPD): the way we typically conduct the reviews, the three branches of our office are represented, and each branch reviews these documents and makes recommendations. When it comes to PAs and GMPs, we consult with our Dr. Downer, who the consults with Susan. Please contact us directly with any questions or concerns as well.
21. Lori: I like the idea of having a separate PA, as Megan was suggesting.
22. Walter: One of the questions we have is how are we going to be able to use the valley and the other green areas in this plan. Is it going to be see and don't touch, so we don't have any use of these places? Right now it is DLNR who manages these and we need to be able to talk to them about how they will be managed, how they will be involved in the decision making and how they will allow the community to be involved in the decisions about management and resource use in these areas. This is another reason why we need a task force.
Answer: We did mention this to DLNR, and they did show up at the O'ahu meeting, but those topics did not come up again. We will reach out to DLNR to raise these issues, and we encourage you to do the same. In terms of the green areas you describe, for example the valleys, we don't see it as being more prohibitive in the future than it is now. For example, visiting with a sponsor. But if there was a change in use, i.e., farming, the three parties would need to more clearly define the various uses and make sure the appropriate agreements are in place.
23. Walter: That is what we are hoping for. We have been saying this since 2009 and there has been no moving forward, no seriousness, no special management areas where these are happening. Nobody is addressing the issue. I don't know how we are going to engage, I just know we need to. We are not going to stop being involved and thinking about how these are going to be used by future generations. The culture is surviving. We don't know how to incorporate our vision into the park service's plan.
Answer: There is nothing prohibiting this in our plan right now, but the NPS can't make this call. Probably the reason this hasn't moved forward is because the patients set the rules right now: if you want to do this in the short term, suggest you engage with the Patient Council.
24. Looking long-term, you told us in the beginning there are short-term things and long term things. What term are we talking about? I am looking for long-term uses. There are no special management areas to allow these kind of things. Do we have to wait 30 years to see

it put into the plan? For long-term use, I want to see something put in the plan to make us feel like we are moving down this road. Want to see special-use areas or focused areas where these things could happen, to allow us to feel there will be some kind of living culture down there.

Answer: Right now, speak with the Patient Council and DLNR (landowner).

Internally, we've discussed supporting the idea of this use. I think it needs to be more clear in our document.

25. DeGray: As far as talking with the patient council about long-term changes and them being in charge of those kind of things, isn't the patient council just advisory to DOH? How would it work if we talk to the Patient Council, would they then take it to DOH as a recommendation or how would it work?

Answer: I think so, we go through the commission for our formal advisory, so the patient council advises the state. The patients would make their recommendations to the DOH, then the mayor of Kalawao County, who has that authority, would make that call.

26. Valerie: Walter raises a lot of really good issues. Seriously recommend talking to him more about this. The Ohana has been organized for 12 (or 20) years and it really feels like we have only made inroads very recently. We raised the issues of homesteading, working with beneficiaries, native Hawaiian issues, adding on of the land. It seems like those issues have not been addressed/actions have not happened. We are hoping that Erika can take the messages to superiors and let them know about these concerns because if they are not addressed, they will just keep festering.

Answer: Erika: The public meeting process for this GMP has been very enlightening and a great opportunity to hear what people really think. It is obvious to me that the park needs to engage more with communities: not only Topside but the other islands as well. We are already talking about ways to adjust our park processes: one idea is to host regular meetings with the community Topside to engage and consult. One reason this may be feeling somewhat ignored is because the general management plan is overall guidance, large scale: not operational, more detailed actions. The park wants to be a good neighbor and a good steward, and we want to represent the concerns that the community is sharing. I am looking at ways to have more regular meetings with the communities and stakeholders.

27. Lori: Working on the Big Island, I was part of a cultural advisory council that was called upon to meet on a regular basis as a liaison on cultural issues. That was a structured way to do it. As Superintendent, NPS (Erika) likely has the same purview to set up a committee like this similar to the Commander who has established this. It can be informal and cover a variety of issues. Gives the community a direct line to the leadership and vice versa.
28. Memorial issue is an example of a breakdown in communication. I have been tracking the issue over several years. This is a sore spot for the community. If this is any indication of

what communication is going to look like, it is a reason not to support moving ahead with the plan.

29. Valerie: I enjoy working with Erika. The Ohana has spent thousands of dollars in travel to O'ahu to meet with the park service, but it feels like nothing happens as a result. Meetings not only have to happen, but progress needs to occur. Are our voices being heard? We have felt that our voices have not been heard, despite spending a lot of money and time going to these meetings. I think things will improve and we will do everything we can to move forward together.

30. Lori: I was hoping that you could set up another consultation date. Agree with Valerie -- would like to see more implementation. I would like to request a hard copy of the Programmatic Agreement from 2008. If we work together to identify the APE and plan from there, this could result in progress. I would like you to set up further section 106 consultation with myself and anyone else who wants to participate

Answer: We will absolutely be having more 106 meetings on this. We need to figure out who the participants will be and set up some dates, potentially end of May or June. If you get your comments to us outside the June 8 deadline, we will continue to take them. Continuing consultation will be reflected.

31. We haven't agreed on what the APE is-- that is my concern. Want someone from ACHP to be included in the 106 consultation.

32. If you have metadata definitions on Reserve, Preserve, etc. please provide those. Would like to know who you are talking to at DLNR.

Answer: Right now the main people are with state parks, but are representing DLNR for the specific issues - Steve Suarez, Curt Cottrell, Dan Quinn, director of State Parks. NPS/SHPD will get a hard copy of the 2008 PA to Lori. NPS will begin process of organizing the next consultation. Is there a day or time that is better? We will send out a doodle poll to get a time on the calendar.

33. DeGray: are the DLNR staff who have been involved with the memorial involved with GMP?

Answer: NPS will be in touch with DLNR so that they can decide who should be a part.

34. DeGray: we want to move the memorial along while there is still a living community. Hopefully this will be supported both by NPS and DLNR.

35. Lori: Because you want to include the forest reserves, I would want to engage with heads of appropriate departments: Lisa Hadway, and Randy Kennedy, who is retiring soon. Important to be in touch with affected divisions. Fern Duvall, new person for Maui.

36. Jessica Puff can send the nationwide PA to anyone who wants it. Contact her at : jessica.l.puff@hawaii.gov