

PUBLIC ACCESS, OPEN SPACE, AND NATURAL RESOURCES
PRESERVATION COMMISSION

MINUTES

March 9, 2026

Public Meeting
West Hawai'i Civic Center
74-5044 Keohokalole Hwy., Kona Council Chambers
Kailua-Kona, HI 96740

I. CALL TO ORDER:

On March 9, 2026, the Public Access, Open Space, and Natural Resources Preservation Commission (PONC) meeting was called to order at 9:30 a.m. by Chair Chang, who welcomed all in attendance and introduced the Commissioners and PONC Staff. Those who were present constituted a quorum.

Present: Deborah Chang, Chair (Chr.) CD-1
Lokelani Brandt, Commissioner CD-3
Amedeo Markoff, Commissioner CD-4 (arrived at 9:39 a.m.)
Jodie Rosam, Commissioner CD-6
Janet Britt, Vice Chair (V. Chr.) CD-7
Jennifer Lawson, Commissioner CD-9

Absent: N/A

Vacant: District 2
District 5
District 8

Support Staff: Jean Campbell, Deputy Corporation Counsel Representative (DCC)
Benjamin Schapiro, Program Manager, Department of Finance
Eva Braman, Commission Secretary
Athena Kahaiali'i, Program Support Technician

II. STATEMENT(S) FROM THE PUBLIC:

Chr. Chang opened the floor for public testimony and explained that testimony may be made at the beginning of the meeting or immediately preceding the agenda item being opened for deliberation by the Commission.

DEBORAH WARD, commented on the Finance Department Report

III. DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE REPORT:

1. Fund balance reports, status of acquisitions and stewardship grants, status of Annual Report to Mayor.

No testifiers.

Mr. Schapiro reviewed the fund balances reflected in the board packet. He stated that the maintenance fund balance was about \$3.2 million and is used for stewardship grants, and that the acquisition fund balance was about \$23 million and is used for land acquisitions.

He stated that the County recently closed on the purchase of Keakealaniwahine on Ali'i Drive and recently held a blessing ceremony with the Mayor and community groups at Kawainui Makai to celebrate that acquisition. He thanked those in attendance who were instrumental in the acquisition, future stewardship, and the blessing ceremony.

Mr. Schapiro stated that the County is working toward closing on Honolulu Landing and is still working through the paperwork on its side, but that progress is being made.

Regarding the 2026 stewardship grants, he stated that Finance was finalizing its review with the Director of Finance that week. Once finalized, the Director will transmit her recommendations to the County Council for action.

He also stated that the annual report prepared by the Commission was submitted to the Mayor at the end of the prior year and had since been forwarded to the County Council. He noted that the report is available online on the County's website through Laserfiche.

IV. DEPUTY CORPORATION COUNSEL REPORT:

1. Overview of County acquisition process for Preservation Fund spending, including Commission requirements for reviewing repetitive suggestions and suggestions that have been given favorable resolutions in the past and are being suggested again.

No testifiers.

DCC Campbell explained that the purpose of her report was to orient the new commissioners and reorient the existing commissioners to the acquisition process and how it works. She stated that the County Charter allows the public to suggest properties for possible acquisition through the preservation fund, and that the meeting was part of the Commission's initial review of the suggested properties. She noted that the commissioners would be asking questions of the nominators in attendance.

DCC Campbell stated that the Commission's rules do not prohibit repeated suggestions and that one of the suggestions received this year appeared to be a repeat. She explained that she intentionally does not review the suggestions before the meeting so as not to influence the Commission's consideration of them.

She outlined the general acquisition process following the meeting. She explained that, after gathering information from nominators, commissioners generally conduct site visits and report

back at the next meeting, which would be in May. She noted that site visits are not required, but they help commissioners better experience the properties. She further explained that scoring would take place at the July meeting using the scoring sheet and criteria set out in the rules, and that any property meeting the required threshold would be placed on the prioritized list. That list would then be included in the annual report submitted to the Mayor, who has 60 days to forward it to the County Council. She stated that, once received, the Council may review the report and adopt a resolution authorizing the Department of Finance to negotiate with a property owner for a potential purchase.

DCC Campbell then explained the difference between a fee simple purchase and a conservation easement. She stated that the Charter allows the County to acquire property either in fee simple or through an easement, and that all easements acquired to date have been conservation easements. She explained that a fee simple purchase is the more typical form of acquisition, in which the County purchases the property outright, subject to the requirement that the County obtain its own appraisal and not pay more than the appraised value.

With respect to conservation easements, DCC Campbell explained that the County does not become the fee simple owner of the property but instead acquires certain development rights for the purpose of restricting or eliminating future development. Using Mahukona as an example, she stated that rights such as hotel development, commercial use, and subdivision can be acquired through a conservation easement so that those uses cannot occur. She explained that the value of a conservation easement is determined by comparing the value of the property before and after the easement restrictions are applied, with the difference representing the value of the rights being given up. She noted that the County currently holds four conservation easements purchased with Preservation Fund monies.

DCC Campbell stated that conservation easements are more complicated than fee simple acquisitions because the terms of each easement must be negotiated based on the specific property and the rights being given up, and because the County assumes ongoing enforcement and oversight obligations after purchase. She explained that, in the transactions completed so far, the anticipated grantor of the easement often did not yet own the property at the time negotiations began, and instead relied on the County's easement purchase funds to help complete its own acquisition. She stated that this results in a coordinated back-to-back closing process through escrow.

She further noted that, although the fee simple owner of a property subject to a conservation easement may change over time, the easement remains in place and continues to bind future owners. She used Mahukona as an example and explained that, if Hawaiian Islands Land Trust were no longer the fee simple owner, any subsequent owner would still be subject to the terms of the conservation easement held by the County.

Chr. Chang asked whether, in the case of a conservation easement, the property would be assessed based on its value after removal of the development rights.

DCC Campbell explained that the County hires a professional appraiser to determine the value of a conservation easement. She stated that the appraiser first determines the value of the property with all development rights intact, then determines its value after accounting for the rights that would be given up under the proposed conservation easement. She explained that the difference

between those two values represents the value of the conservation easement.

Using a simplified example, DCC Campbell stated that if a property were worth \$10 million with all development rights and \$2 million after certain development rights were removed, the value of the conservation easement would be \$8 million. She noted that the figures were hypothetical and used only to illustrate the appraisal method.

Chr. Chang stated that, under that example, the \$8 million figure would be the amount the County would be able to pay. DCC Campbell confirmed that the amount would represent the maximum the County could pay for the conservation easement.

MEETING RECESSED: 9:57 a.m.
MEETING RECONVENED: 10:01 a.m.

V. RULE MAKING:

1. Rulemaking: Discussion and adoption of amendment to Rule 4(b) of the Rules of Practice and Procedure.

DEBORAH WARD, testified in opposition of the Rule change

DEBBIE HECHT, testified in opposition of the Rule change

MOTION:

Cmr. Rosam moved to adopt the proposed rule amendment as published, increasing the scoring threshold in Rule 4(b) from 50 points to 70 points. Seconded by Cmr. Markoff.

Chr. Chang opened the floor for discussion.

V. Chr. Britt stated that she reviewed the projects under consideration using the Acquisition Assessment Form and identified several she considered important that did not meet the proposed 70 percent threshold. She expressed concern that increasing the threshold to 70 percent would be unfair to agricultural conservation easements, which she said may be significant even if they do not score highly in areas such as forest resources, species, or other biological elements. For that reason, she stated that she opposed changing the threshold to 70 percent.

Cmr. Rosam stated that she supported the rule change and noted that she had originally suggested it. Referring to the Kaloko Makai property, she said she did not believe only 10 percent of the property was worth saving, as it included extensive dry forest and trail systems, but she felt that placing it on the list had effectively served as a bail-out for the property owner. She also stated that the U.S. Fish and Wildlife had not upheld the restrictions in the memorandum of understanding and said she was not proud that the property had made the list. Cmr. Rosam further stated that, based on her review of the criteria assessment forms, the range of available scoring made her believe that a 70 percent threshold would not eliminate properties she would be proud to support.

Chr. Chang reminded the Commission that the minutes from the January meeting contained important information from the prior discussion of the proposed change. She stated that

Corporation Counsel had found that the original threshold at the start of the program had been 80 percent, that it later changed to 70 percent, and that in 2015 it was reduced to 50 percent, where it had remained for about 10 years.

Cmr. Rosam also stated that she did not believe a blanket resolution was the proper approach and felt that maintaining checks and balances was helpful. She added, however, that future political circumstances could change depending on the County Council and the Mayor, and she believed the higher threshold could reduce internal or political influence in PONC acquisitions. She stated that a 70 percent threshold, which she characterized as a solid C grade, was reasonable.

Chr. Chang stated that the Commission had no control over what the County Council or the Mayor ultimately chose to do. She said that the Commission's control was limited to receiving suggestions, rating them, and prioritizing them, after which the matter moved to the County Council and the Mayor.

Cmr. Markoff stated that he believed the scoring system made the process more democratic. He further commented that, if some of the ideas discussed during the PONC summit were implemented, including removing the Mayor's involvement from the process, the acquisition process would become more streamlined and more democratic in how parcels are selected.

V. Chr. Britt then asked how the Commission should treat agricultural conservation easements under the scoring system, specifically whether those properties would need to be informally boosted in order to qualify or whether anything scoring below 70 percent would simply not be considered.

Chr. Chang clarified that 70 percent would be the minimum threshold. V. Chr. Britt acknowledged that anything below 70 percent would effectively not proceed. Chr. Chang responded that a property would not receive a score allowing it to gain priority status if it fell below the threshold. She also noted that this would not prevent resubmittal of a property in a later year, although that could result in the Commission seeing the same properties again.

V. Chr. Britt stated that she had initially agreed with the 70 percent threshold, but after reviewing the properties under consideration, she found it more difficult to support. She added that the Commission could still try the change.

Cmr. Lawson stated that, in her view, a 70 percent threshold would better reflect Commission consensus that a property belongs on the priority list than a 50 percent threshold.

Cmr. Rosam responded that, even with conservation easements in mind, the scoring criteria still allowed meaningful points in areas such as acquisition feasibility and availability, which together account for 30 points, as well as support, maintenance, and management, which account for 20 points. She added that protection of agricultural lands could also receive points and stated that she did not think conservation easements would be negatively impacted by the higher threshold.

After asking if there was any further discussion and hearing none, Chr. Chang called for the roll call vote.

VOTE:

Ayes: Commissioners Brandt, Markoff, Rosam, Lawson, V. Chr. Britt, Chr. Chang
Noes: None.

VI. NEW BUSINESS:

1. 2026 Suggestions: Commision’s review, discussion, and interviews of the nominators of each suggestion.

**a. Sugg. 26-01, Kaumana Caves State Park Extension, South Hilo, Hawai’i
TMK: (3) 2-2-006:003**

KENT TSUTSUI (nominator), testified in support of the nomination and provided additional information about the property.

Mr. Tsutsui provided additional information he had gathered after submitting his nomination. He stated that he recently visited the area and observed two visitors exiting the south side of the cave network. According to Mr. Tsutsui, the visitors told him that portion of the cave was about 900 feet long and walkable, and that when they exited, the surrounding forest was so dense that they had to return the way they came. He stated that he wanted to provide this information regarding the condition of the cave.

Chr. Chang confirmed that the nomination involved an extension of Kaumana Caves State Park. She also asked whether the portion of the cave being discussed was technically not open. Mr. Tsutsui responded that, based on what he observed, it appeared open and accessible, with no gates or obstructions, and that people seemed to know about it because it is visible on Google Earth.

V. Chr. Britt stated that, after reviewing the proposal, she was unclear what would be protected through a conservation easement, particularly because the application also referenced a building or service area hub for emergency services. Mr. Tsutsui responded that those uses were secondary and that the primary purpose was to protect the cave, specifically the exit area located on the subject property. He explained that the cave appeared to be a popular destination and that he was concerned that development in the area could encroach into the cave network. When asked again what the easement would protect, he stated that it would protect the Kaumana cave network. He also stated that other community uses, such as garden plots, orchards, or buildings, would be secondary to the goal of cave protection.

Cmr. Rosam asked whether Mr. Tsutsui had spoken with State Parks about his intent. He responded that he had not. Cmr. Rosam noted that, if the State is the current owner, the matter might be something more easily addressed internally within the State rather than through PONC. Mr. Tsutsui responded that the County Department of Parks and Recreation currently maintains the other side of the cave area and suggested that the protected area could be extended. He also stated that expanding the area might help address safety concerns, as the parking lot becomes overcrowded, vehicles park along the roadside, and pedestrian activity has increased with the addition of crosswalk beacons.

Cmr. Markoff asked whether Mr. Tsutsui was aware that his application would be stronger if he had a nonprofit partner to help facilitate or steward the parcel. Mr.

Tsutsui responded that he was not familiar with the process. Cmr. Brandt then asked whether he had obtained any community support for the nomination. Mr. Tsutsui stated that the idea had come up over the years and that he decided to submit the nomination after seeing an article about the process.

Cmr. Rosam referred to the application form, noting that Mr. Tsutsui had checked “yes” to the question asking whether he had partnered with government agencies or nonprofit organizations. She asked whether he had been working with anyone. Mr. Tsutsui responded that he had not and reiterated that the process was new to him. In response to further questions, he stated that he had not spoken with Parks and Recreation, even though he believed the area could become a Parks and Recreation responsibility, and confirmed that restrooms are available at Kaumana Park.

Cmr. Rosam then advised Mr. Tsutsui that the Commission would conduct site visits and return in July for final ranking. She encouraged him to reach out to the State and State Parks, build connections, and submit any additional information before the July meeting so the Commission could better understand whether PONC would be an appropriate fit. Chr. Chang added that it would also help if he connected with others interested in the project who might be willing to help steward portions of it. Mr. Tsutsui acknowledged the suggestions and thanked the Commission.

Chr. Chang noted that Ms. Deborah Ward repeatedly raised her hand during the discussion and asked whether she wished to testify on that item. Ms. Ward confirmed that she did and explained that she had accidentally left it off the sign-in sheet. Chr. Chang then allowed her testimony to proceed.

DEBORAH WARD, testified in support of the nomination.

**b. Sugg. 26-02, Ka’awali’i Gulch Beach & Estuary, North Hilo, Hawai’i
TMK: (3) 3-6-005:014-0002, 015; (3) 3-9-001:017**

CHRISTIAN GIARDINA, testified in support of the nomination

BLAKE MCNAUGHTON, President of Makahanaloa Fishing Association, testified in support of the nomination.

V. Chr. Britt asked about the purchase price for the property, noting that although the nomination contained a strong narrative, she had not been able to find that information in the materials. Phaethon Keeney responded that the purchase price was \$3.2 million.

Chr. Chang asked whether Nā Ala Hele had confirmed that the Ala Loa trail was located where it appeared on the map included in the nomination. Ms. Keeney stated that, based on her discussions with Jackson Bauer, the historic maps supported that alignment, but questions remained as to whether any public access rights may have been affected by the later construction of the highway. She explained that she had been attempting to find someone to research the deeds and determine whether the route had ever been legally extinguished. She further stated that, from the information she had reviewed, there did not appear to be documentation showing that the road had

become private.

Chr. Chang then asked about a map in the application dated 1891 and noted that the date was important in evaluating whether the State could claim the Ala Loa as a government road. Ms. Keeney stated that one map in the application was dated 1891 and another appeared to be from 1859. Chr. Chang stated that it would be helpful to see full copies of any maps dated 1892 or earlier rather than excerpts. Ms. Keeney agreed to provide better copies. She added that, even if Ala Loa access rights were reestablished, access to the beach itself would still require crossing private property. She explained that the nomination was also focused on protecting the large growing area at the bottom of the stream and the resources there.

In response to Cmr. Rosam's question about what had happened with a prior 2015 nomination, Ms. Keeney stated that she did not know. She said she had been told there had been an earlier nomination and an access issue, but she had been unable to locate documentation showing exactly which parcel had been nominated or what the issue had been.

Cmr. Markoff asked whether direct lineal descendants and cultural descendants of the area had been identified. Ms. Keeney stated that they had not yet been identified. She explained that she was trying to work through a nonprofit group and community members to identify those descendants, but had encountered difficulty, in part because the land had been Crown land and the historical ties were less clear in the records she had reviewed. Cmr. Markoff commented that, as noted by the Chair and Vice Chair, applications are stronger when key partnerships are identified and observed that there were still several months remaining to gather that information.

Cmr. Brandt asked about testimony cited in the nomination and whether it came from Boundary Commission testimony or kuleana testimony. Ms. Keeney responded that it came from Boundary Commission testimony. Cmr. Brandt noted that, even on Crown lands, there may still be descendants connected through kuleana claims and suggested that those records could be a useful starting point.

Chr. Chang asked how the property would be accessed from the house area to the beach and valley. Ms. Keeney explained that access was by way of the old Ala Loa route, or former sugar road, that is currently overgrown but walkable. She stated that entry would be through the driveway to the house and then through a gate into the valley.

V. Chr. Britt asked about a rectangular strip shown on the map extending from the highway to the property and asked whether it was an access easement. Ms. Keeney explained that it appeared to be land associated with an old oil pipe or utility line serving the pump at the bottom of the valley, and that it was owned rather than merely an easement. V. Chr. Britt asked about dotted yellow lines shown on the map, and Ms. Keeney explained that they marked the division involving the house and pool area, which was part of a CPR. Ms. Keeney confirmed that this portion was included in the overall purchase price.

Chr. Chang asked whether the properties could be purchased separately. Ms. Keeney

stated that her understanding was that the owner was open to discussing options with the nominating group and through the PONC process, but that the property was currently being marketed as a package and the owner was primarily interested in selling it that way.

Cmr. Brandt asked whether Ms. Keeney had observed canoe plants, fruit trees, or archaeological features in the gulch. Ms. Keeney responded that the valley contained fruit trees, other vegetation, and remnants of past use, including plantation-era features and other significant physical remains. Cmr. Brandt commented that gulches along the Hāmākua Coast often contain a mix of pre-contact, early historic, and plantation-period resources, and noted that the nomination included photographs of plantation-era infrastructure. Cmr. Markoff then asked whether the lauhala groves referenced in the application were still intact, and Ms. Keeney responded that they remained present along both pali sides and near the valley floor.

Chr. Chang asked whether any archaeological survey had been conducted on the property. Ms. Keeney stated that she had not found any such survey despite searching available resources, including the University of Hawai'i library. Chr. Chang then remarked on the substantial remnant of a sugar-era pump station located in the valley, and Ms. Keeney clarified that it was a water pump structure.

Cmr. Rosam asked what Ms. Keeney envisioned for the house and pool if the property were acquired through PONC. Ms. Keeney stated that Laupāhoehoe Charter School or nonprofit might use the area for meetings, student excursions, cleanup efforts, tool storage, educational purposes, or possibly teacher housing, depending on what would be acceptable. Cmr. Rosam commented that, if PONC were to support the nomination, the Commission would need to consider all of the TMKs involved.

**c. Sugg. 26-03, Haina Makai, Hāmākua, Hawai'i
TMK: (3) 4-5-002:081**

TAWN KEENEY (nominator), testified in support of the nomination.

PHAETHON KEENEY, testified in support of the nomination.

BLAKE MCNAUGHTON, President of Makahanaloa Fishing Association, testified in support of the nomination.

V. Chr. Britt requested that maps included with nominations contain a compass, so the viewing orientation is clear.

Chr. Chang asked where the owner's right of access to the property was located. Nominator, Tawn Keeney explained that there were two access points. He stated that one access was from the mauka side, off Spencer Road and then onto the lower Cane Haul Road, and that this was the route used by the realtor to bring prospective buyers to the property. He also stated that another access used by fishermen was from the west side, near Haina Landing and the sewage treatment plant. He explained that both routes ultimately involved dirt roads and four-wheel drive access.

Chr. Chang then asked whether the realtor could confirm the owner's official access from the nearest public road and whether Spencer Road was a public road. Mr. Keeney stated that Spencer Road is not a public road. Chr. Chang expressed concern about what legal access would attach to the property if the County were to purchase it and what assurance there would be that the access routes could not later be closed. Mr. Keeney responded that the owners of the residential properties below the lower Cane Haul Road have an easement over Spencer Road. Phaethon Keeney (nominator's daughter) added that she believed the subject parcel also had the same easement, and Mr. Keeney agreed that the parcel had legal easement access from Spencer Road. V. Chr. Britt noted that legal access must be reflected in the title report and cannot be merely practical access. Cmr. Markoff then asked that the nominators provide deeded legal access information in an amended application or at a later meeting, and Mr. Keeney agreed.

In response to Cmr. Rosam's question, Mr. Keeney stated that the property had been listed for sale about one year earlier at \$2.5 million and had been reduced about two months earlier to \$1.9 million. He stated that he did not know whether there had been active interest in the listing.

Cmr. Markoff commented that he had previously camped on the property and believed it warranted preservation. He also noted that the application did a good job identifying potential partners. He requested that the nominators provide information on cultural and lineal descendants and their willingness to partner in future stewardship of the area. Mr. Keeney responded that the grandson of William Rickard serves on the board of the Honoka'a Heritage Center and that the director of the Hāmākua Youth Center is also believed to be related to William Rickard. He stated that both were represented through the stewardship group being formed for the property. He further stated that questions regarding what legal rights those descendants might have in the property itself were complicated and that he did not know the answer.

When Chr. Chang noted that time was running short and asked whether there was anything further the Commission should know, Mr. Keeney stated that the nominators were in the process of forming a 501(c)(3) for stewardship of the property. He described the group as including representatives from the Honoka'a Heritage Center, Hāmākua Youth Foundation, Honoka'a High School, the Haina Community Association, and others with forestry and nonprofit experience. He stated that the vision for the property included restoration of native forest and food forest or agroforestry uses, including possible educational opportunities for Honoka'a High School students.

Cmr. Brandt asked whether the nominators had reviewed the archaeological survey for the neighboring property. Phaethon Keeney stated that they had recently obtained it and that, according to that report, no heiau was identified on the adjoining property, although she expressed uncertainty about relying on an archaeological report funded by the property owner. She stated that if the heiau was not on the neighboring parcel, then it should be on the nominated property. Mr. Keeney then explained that when the property was originally ceded to William Rickard, the heiau shown on the map was located on the boundary of the property. He stated that after plantation ownership and the later reorganization of the parcel boundaries in 1995, the heiau ended up on an

adjoining property. He said that, based on that boundary change, he believed the heiau was no longer located on the property being nominated.

d. Sugg. 26-04, Hīlea, Kaʻū, Hawaiʻi
TMK: (3) 9-5-018:001

LORI-LEE LORENZO, Field Coordinator – The Nature Conservancy, testified in support of the nomination.

NOHEALANI KAʻAWA, testified in support of the nomination.

CHRISTIAN GIARDINA, testified in support of the nomination.

JOHN REPLOGLE, testified in support of the nomination.

IKAIKA GRACE, testified in support of the nomination.

COMMISSIONER DISCLOSURE:

Before additional testimony was taken on Sugg. 26-04, Chr. Chang noted that Cmr. Rosam wished to make an announcement. Cmr. Rosam stated, for disclosure purposes, that she works for The Nature Conservancy, but that she had been very strict about not participating in the application process. She stated that she did not believe she had any conflicts specifically. In response, V. Chr. Britt asked whether Cmr. Rosam was currently working there, and Cmr. Rosam confirmed that she was. V. Chr. Britt noted that she had worked for The Nature Conservancy for 20 years, though not here. Cmr. Rosam further stated that, if the acquisition were to go through, it would not financially benefit her in any way, shape, or form.

SHALAN CRYSDALE, Director – The Nature Conservancy (Nominator), testified in support of the nomination.

V. Chr. Britt asked about the current listing price for the property. Nominator Shalan Crysdale responded that the property was not listed and stated that he did not feel it was in his best interest to disclose the price at that time. He stated, however, that the nominators had received \$2 million from the Legacy Land Fund.

Chr. Chang asked how long the Legacy Land Fund monies would remain available. Mr. Crysdale responded that he did not know the answer with certainty because the parties were still in the signing process, but stated that the nominators had advised the State that they were undergoing a title search that could take as long as two years, and that the landowner was aware of that timeline.

Cmr. Markoff asked whether the property owner was willing to sell the property. Mr. Crysdale responded that the matter had progressed to the point where The Nature Conservancy might receive a letter of intent giving it a right of first refusal before a sale. Cmr. Markoff then commented that the application would be stronger with fuller disclosure regarding price, partnerships, and available funding, particularly because the application gives favorable priority to properties with partner funding. Mr. Crysdale

clarified that the uncertainty involved what price the landowner would be willing to accept and stated that he had not received any verbal acceptance that the owner would agree to fair market or appraised value.

Cmr. Lawson asked whether there had been any updates regarding U.S. Fish and Wildlife funding. Mr. Crysdale stated that an application had been submitted to receive U.S. Fish and Wildlife Recovery Land Funds in February of the prior year, but their contact had indicated that nothing was likely to come from that application and no funds were awarded. He added that the nominators had discussed resubmitting this year, but had not received any indication whether funding would be more likely.

Chr. Chang asked whether there were any known historic trails on the property. Mr. Crysdale stated that there is a trail coming up from the coast along the bank of Hīlea Gulch on the Pāhala side and that it formerly continued along the tail of Makanao to access the top of Makanao and Kohaikalani Heiau. He stated that part of that route had been cut by development of the old Cane Haul Road and that he did not know whether the trail remains in use. He added that he had not seen it on a map and that his understanding came from information previously shared with him.

V. Chr. Britt asked whether cattle grazing would continue if the property were acquired. Mr. Crysdale responded that it would. He stated that one of the strengths of the application was that each of the three ranches had indicated support for the nomination and had no interest in making an offer of their own. He explained that the intent would be to continue managing the former sugar lands with cattle grazing to reduce invasive weed tree introduction into the forest reserve and lessen wildfire fuel loads during the dry season.

Chr. Chang asked for more information about the three water sources referenced in the nomination. Mr. Crysdale stated that one spring is recognized and numbered by the Commission on Water Resource Management (CWRM) and that improvements had been made to the floor of the water tunnel within the last ten years. He stated that a second source is also registered and numbered, while the third appears to be an old spring that does not show up in the documentation they had located. He further explained that the property also comes with a stated ownership interest in 50 percent of the output of an old plantation spring tunnel located on The Nature Conservancy's Kaiholena parcel upslope in Hīlea. He noted that, although water is a public trust, the title refers to ownership of 50 percent of the output of that spring.

Cmr. Rosam asked about other interested parties. Mr. Crysdale stated that they had been told by contacts leasing the property that one interested individual had other lands on the island and ties to the cattle meat processing industry. He also stated that the landowner's representative had advised them of interest from a development entity based in Colorado that has a history of purchasing properties capable of further subdivision and that the entity had obtained an appraisal of the property. Cmr. Rosam commented that, although she understood why Mr. Crysdale did not want to disclose the appraised prices, the existence of that interest showed a level of urgency regarding the property. Chr. Chang added that the Commission does not require that information, but that the availability of matching funds, such as those from the Legacy Land Fund,

helps because properties with such funding receive greater priority.

**e. Sugg. 26-05, Ka'alāiki Kula, Ka'ū, Hawai'i
TMK: (3) 9-5-016:008, 010, 011, 024, 026, 031, 033, 034. 035**

KAMUELA KAAPANA, Trust for Public Land (Nominator), testified in support of the nomination.

KALĀ MOSSMAN, Edith Kanakaole Foundation (Nominator), testified in support of the nomination.

HUIHUI KANAHELE-MOSSMAN, Edith Kanakaole Foundation, testified in support of the nomination.

Chr. Chang asked about the use of the two names, ʻĪmakakāloa and ʻĪmakakōloa. Kalā Mossman explained that both versions are documented in the literature, but stated that they use ʻĪmakakāloa because the name is understood to combine the names of the parents, with the mother's name shortened from Kanaloa to Kāloa and the father's name being ʻĪ. Huihui Kanahele-Mossman added that the mother's name was Kanaloa.

V. Chr. Britt asked about the cost of the property. Kamuela Kaapana stated that the nominators had only recently begun discussions with Olson Trust and that an appraisal had not yet been conducted. He explained that, based on the tax assessed values, the total value of the nine parcels was estimated at about \$6.5 million, but noted that PONC would only be acquiring a conservation easement, which would represent only a portion of that value.

Chr. Chang noted that a Department of Hawaiian Home Lands letter stated that the heiau was one of only two intact hula heiau in the State. Mr. Mossman confirmed that the other was located on Kaua'i. Chr. Chang then asked what was known about the heiau when stewardship began about 10 years earlier. Mr. Mossman stated that it had been documented in Tom Dye's heiau book, and Huihui Kanahele-Mossman added that Joseph Ilala'ole, a well-known kumu hula, had identified the location to Kawena Puku'i. In response to Chr. Chang's question about whether the site had been heavily overgrown, Mr. Mossman stated that it had been covered with invasive vegetation and that the surrounding area still has the same issue, requiring substantial maintenance work.

Cmr. Brandt asked about the size of the area covered by the nomination and how much of it the nominators currently maintain. Mr. Mossman stated that the nomination covers about 1,700 acres, but that they currently maintain only about five acres. He explained that the remainder had been leased to a rancher and that a new lessee would now be running cattle there. He also stated that they would be looking to increase the size of the area they maintain. He emphasized that, for a heiau, the surrounding landscape is critical because visibility of features such as sunrise, sunset, and the rising and setting of stars is important to the practice associated with the site.

Cmr. Rosam asked whether the nominators envisioned hiring a specific Ka'ū position,

and Mr. Mossman responded that they did, stating that a large area like that would require significant help. In response to a further question from Cmr. Rosam, he stated that they go up to ʻĪmakakāloa every week. V. Chr. Britt then asked about the anticipated timeline, and Mr. Mossman responded that the sooner the better, explaining that the longer the land goes without active management, especially with no cattle currently running, the more difficult it will become to maintain.

Chr. Chang asked whether the property was for sale. Mr. Mossman responded that it was not listed for sale, but that the owner had approached them, which he believed was related to their existing stewardship relationship with the area. V. Chr. Britt asked whether an easement had begun to be drafted, and Mr. Mossman stated that it had not.

Before the Commission took a break, DCC Campbell clarified the Commission’s earlier questions regarding pricing. She stated that, under Hawai’i County Code, the Commission is directed to give priority to properties that have leveraged or matching funds from other sources, such as Legacy Land or donations. She explained, however, that the Commission is not involved in negotiating the purchase price, and that the County would obtain its own appraisal if a determination were made to purchase a property. She further stated that, for that reason, whether a landowner has a separate appraisal, is willing to share it, or has set a listed price should not be a primary concern for the Commission.

MEETING RECESSED: 12:08 p.m.

MEETING RECONVENED: 12:34 p.m.

**f. Sugg. 26-06, Shoreline Hakalau ʻIki, South Hilo, Hawai’i
TMK: (3) 2-9-002:001**

PHAETHON KEENEY, testified in support of this nomination.

CHRISTIAN GIARDINA, President of Kāmaulihou (Nominator), testified in support of this nomination.

BLAKE MCNAUGHTON, President of Makahanaloa Fishing Association (Nominating partner), testified in support of this nomination.

Chr. Chang asked how the ocean is accessed from the property. Blake McNaughton explained that fishermen currently use an old railroad easement, then cross an adjoining lot near a cemetery before reaching the nominated property and following the fence line down to the trail. He indicated that this route involves crossing private property and stated that preservation of the easement was one reason for the nomination.

In response to further questions from Chr. Chang, Mr. McNaughton explained that access to the water is by way of a cut in the pali. He stated that the drop is about 50 feet, but can be navigated without rappelling because it consists of multiple levels. He

stated that a rope is usually used for safety, particularly at night or when conditions are muddy, although it may not be necessary in daylight and dry conditions.

Chr. Chang also asked how boggy the property is. Mr. McNaughton stated that, although there is a spring and a perennial stream on the Hilo side, the property itself is generally not boggy and appears suitable for agriculture. Christian Giardina added that older photographs suggest the area had previously been used almost entirely for agriculture, and Mr. McNaughton noted that it had formerly been bulldozed for sugar cane.

Cmr. Rosam asked about plans to pursue state and federal funding, including possible Legacy Land funding. Mr. Giardina stated that these were still initial conversations, but they had met with the U.S. Forest Service regarding the Community Forest and Open Space program, which he understood to have a half-million-dollar cap and a 50 percent match requirement that might be met through a conservation easement. He also stated that Legacy Land was being considered as another opportunity. He explained that, because the proposal contemplates a conservation easement along the shoreline and agricultural use on the back portion of the property, other conservation funding sources might also be available. He further noted that strand vegetation is highly endangered in Hawai'i and stated that the property presents restoration opportunities, including possible integration of canoe plants, traditional agroforestry, and strand vegetation restoration. Mr. McNaughton added that there are existing pockets of naupaka, milo, and niu along the shoreline that could be built upon. He further stated that there are also many hala along the shoreline and 'āhinahina near the spring areas, which help support the fishing grounds.

Chr. Chang then asked about a reference in the nomination to new mills being built in connection with possible timber harvest. Mr. Giardina stated that Pacific Tonewoods was working to establish a mill in the Honoka'a area and that Kamuela Hardwoods had already built a mill and was working to expand its capacity.

Chr. Chang also asked about a reference in the nomination to 50 acres of fencing in the upland, noting that the property itself is smaller than that. Mr. McNaughton stated that the figure was an error and should have referred to approximately 31.1 acres.

**g. Sugg. 26-07, Lyman Point Property, North Kona, Hawai'i
TMK: (3) 7-7-004:025**

Chr. Chang noted that no representative appeared to be present to answer questions and stated that the Commission had received an email indicating that no one would be attending for this suggestion. She further noted that the Commission had reviewed the same proposal the previous year, that she had compared the two submittals page by page and found them to be identical, and that the proposal had received a score of 49 percent the prior year. She questioned whether there was a point in further discussion if no changes had been made and raised the question of whether a site visit should occur.

DCC Campbell advised that the Commission should not be discussing the merits of the proposal at that stage because the item was limited to questions and answers. She recommended that, since there was no public testimony and no one present to answer

questions, the Commission move on and later determine whether to conduct a site visit when organizing its site visit groups.

h. Sugg. 26-08, Hōkūliʻa, South Kona, Hawaiʻi
TMK: (3) 8-1-027:021

DEBORAH WARD, testified in support of the nomination.

TOMISLAV GRACANIN, testified in support of the nomination.

CHUCK FLAHERTY, Sierra Club of Hawaiʻi, testified in support of the nomination.

KEALOHANUI KINNEY (Nominator), testified in support of the nomination.

LEE COCHRAN (Property owner), testified in support of the nomination.

Cmr. Rosam asked whether there was any new information since the application was submitted on January 31. In response, Kealohanui Kinney stated that a return visit to the site had been conducted with geologist Frank Trusdell who studies lava flows and their age. He explained that this further review led to additional observations about the area as a “time capsule,” including evidence of a former forest preserved in stone. He stated that tree molds of various sizes were identified in the rock, including some thought to resemble ‘ie’ie and loulou. He also stated that they were able to locate the contact layer between lava flows and recover charcoal from that layer, which he described as a significant discovery. He emphasized that the site contains information not only in the sediments and biological remains, but also in the lava itself.

V. Chr. Britt commented that the project was very exciting and asked how the site could be protected, including whether public access should be allowed, whether fencing should be used, and how protection of such a small but important area could be achieved. Mr. Kinney responded that the question was complex, but stated that any path forward should begin with lineal descendants from the area and their collaboration with the Hōkūliʻa Parks Association. He stated that the association had helped change the way significant sites at Hōkūliʻa were treated and said that the larger goal should be not only to protect the biological remains, but also to protect Native Hawaiian interpretations and understanding of the landscape. He added that his own role was to help ensure the site remained protected long enough for those broader conversations to occur.

Cmr. Markoff asked about the timeline and referred to earlier comments about moving operations to the parcel. Property owner Lee Cochran responded that his operations had already been moved there and that excavation had begun and was about halfway finished. He stated that his prior property was complete and listed for sale, and that his intent was for the parcel to be purchased so he could move on to another parcel. Cmr. Markoff noted that the PONC process takes time and carries no guarantee of selection or purchase authorization, and asked whether Mr. Cochran was committed to waiting for the process to be completed so the Commission could evaluate the property. Mr. Cochran responded that, at that point, he was.

Cmr. Brandt stated that she had been excited to read about the findings to date and asked whether the lava tube extends beyond the current property boundaries. Mr. Kinney responded that it does extend onto an adjacent property on one side. He explained that the makai portion of the deep system had been explored extensively and that, while only a very small sample of the sediments had been taken, the findings already showed considerable diversity, including extinct organisms and others not previously documented. He stated that there was strong indication that more remained to be discovered in those sediments. He also stated that discussions had taken place with the Hawai'i Cave Conservancy, whose members could assist with full cave mapping, noting that although archaeologists had mapped the cave, it had not yet been mapped in the manner used by specialized cave mappers.

Cmr. Brandt then asked about the State Historic Preservation Division's status with respect to the cave. Mr. Kinney stated that SHPD had written about the site in Ka Wai Ola and had been kept informed of new findings as they arose. He stated that he had asked SHPD to reconsider its earlier determination regarding the site, but was told that once the original review process had been completed and signed off, that determination remained final. He stated that Mr. Cochran had done everything required of him and commented that the situation exposed a gap in policy and in the Cave Protection Act because pre-human sites such as this one lack the same protections that would apply if human remains or certain other cultural materials were present.

Chr. Chang asked how access to the cave is currently being restricted. Mr. Cochran responded that there are two signs stating that entry is prohibited and that the property is located behind two gates, one at the entrance to the Hōkūli'a subdivision and another at the village where the parcel is located. When Chr. Chang asked whether that was sufficient, Mr. Cochran stated that anyone determined to get in would likely find a way, but that he had consulted with an attorney regarding his risks and understood that, so long as the dangers were disclosed, the cave remained on private property and unauthorized entry would be trespassing. Mr. Kinney added that the Hōkūli'a development has both a security component and public ocean access, and that the site is located at a corner near a main street area, making it relatively accessible.

Cmr. Lawson commented that, given the nature of the resource and its location within a neighborhood, public access did not appear to be a good long-term solution. She asked whether the Hōkūli'a Parks and Cultural Sites Association might be an appropriate owner or steward for this parcel and potentially other parcels if the cave system extends beyond the current boundary. Mr. Cochran responded that he does not work for the association but interfaces with it regularly. He stated that the association already maintains numerous heiau and other significant cultural sites, with access managed through a cultural liaison for descendants. He indicated that, although this cave does not contain human remains, he believed it would likely fall within the association's general area of responsibility. Cmr. Lawson then stated that her concern was long-term stewardship and identifying the appropriate caretaker if the parcel were acquired through PONC or otherwise. Mr. Kinney responded that, while he was not speaking on behalf of Hōkūli'a, he believed the intended caretaker would be the Parks Association, which he said had demonstrated the capacity to care for sensitive sites.

Chr. Chang asked whether the nominators were actively seeking partnerships with scientific organizations or institutions that could assist with the site. Mr. Kinney responded that they were and listed several entities, including the Smithsonian Museum of Natural History, Arizona State University, the Center for Global Discovery and Conservation Science, the USDA Forest Service, and the University of Hawai'i at Hilo. He stated that the work to date had focused on characterizing how significant the site is, raising awareness, and protecting it long enough to develop a broader plan involving lineal descendants, community members, scientists, and natural resource managers. He added that the site presents substantial educational and research opportunities at many levels.

As discussion time concluded, Chr. Chang commented that the matter presented a challenge because, as Cmr. Lawson had pointed out, the public nature of the PONC program raised questions about how well the site could ultimately be protected, and that protection was key. Mr. Cochran responded that public access, in his view, related more to preserving and sharing the materials and information from the cave for public learning than to allowing people to enter the lava tube itself. Chr. Chang observed that greater public knowledge of the site could also increase curiosity about it and noted that one of the photographs showed a very large opening into the cave. Mr. Cochran stated that the opening was located at the confluence of two tubes and is approximately 25 feet wide by 25 feet tall. Chr. Chang thanked the speakers and stated that the Commission would be following up with a site visit.

2. Form Permitted Interaction Groups (PIInG) for site visits to the properties of the 2026 Suggestions, select commission members, discuss the reporting process of the Permitted Interaction Groups, and establish the deadline for the reports.

MOTION:

Cmr. Rosam moved to form Permitted Interaction Groups to conduct site visits, and to aid in the review of this year's Suggestions. Seconded by Cmr. Markoff.

Chr. Chang stated that each commissioner was encouraged to participate in more than one site visit if their schedule allowed. She stated that each site visit group should include at least two commissioners, but no more than four. She also reminded the Commission that written permission from the landowner is required before entering private property and that such permission must be provided to the department. Chr. Chang further stated that site visit reports were due to Eva no later than April 27.

The commission members took turns volunteering to sign up for each of the site visits.

AMENDED MOTION:

Cmr. Rosam moved to amend the current motion to describe the composition of the Permitted Interaction Groups as follows:

- 26-01: Markoff, Brandt, Britt
- 26-02: Markoff, Lawson
- 26-03: Chang, Lawson

26-04: Chang, Markoff, Britt, Rosam (alternate)
26-05: Chang, Markoff, Rosam
26-06: Rosam, Brandt, Chang, Markoff, Lawson (alternate)
26-07: Britt
26-08: Brandt, Rosam, Britt, Lawson

Seconded by Cmr. Markoff.

VOTE TO AMEND THE MOTION:

Ayes: Commissioners Brandt, Markoff, Rosam, Lawson, V. Chr. Britt, Chr. Chang
Noes: None.

VOTE ON MOTION AS AMENDED:

Ayes: Commissioners Brandt, Markoff, Rosam, Lawson, V. Chr. Britt, Chr. Chang
Noes: None.

Chr. Chang reminded the commissioners that written site visit reports were due no later than April 27. She stated that an optional format was available for use and added that the Mayor's annual report from the prior year could also be reviewed for examples of how site visits were presented. She noted that the optional format generally covered what was needed.

VII. OLD BUSINESS:

1. Review and adopt the revised Stewardship Grant Review Worksheet.

MOTION:

Cmr. Rosam moved to adopt the proposed revised Stewardship Grant Review Worksheet drafted by the Permitted Interaction Group. Seconded by V. Chr. Britt.

Chr. Chang provided background on the revised Stewardship Grant Review Worksheet. She stated that the Commission had previously formed a Permitted Interaction Group, which prepared the revised worksheet now before the Commission. She explained that the worksheet is intended to assist the Commission in reviewing stewardship grant applications and noted that, unlike the suggestion review process, it is not a scoring tool used to assign percentages, but rather an assessment tool and guideline for the Commission's use.

Chr. Chang further explained that the proposed revisions included formatting improvements, such as adding more space for the project name. She also stated that a new question had been added on page five asking whether the stewardship group had continued to engage the community and lineal descendants, and noted that this question was intended specifically for repeat applicants. She added that the final amendment was the addition, at the bottom of page five, of an applicant overall assessment section, emphasizing that it was meant to be an assessment rather than a score.

VOTE:

Ayes: Commissioners Brandt, Markoff, Rosam, Lawson, V. Chr. Britt, Chr. Chang
Noes: None.

VIII. COMMISSIONER REPORT – PONC IN PRACTICE – A POLICY SUMMIT

1. Pursuant to HRS § 92-2.5(e), Commissioners who attended the PONC in Practice – A policy Summit, on Thursday, March 5, 2026, reported their attendance and the matters presented and discussed that relate to official commission business.

Cmr. Lawson reported that she attended the PONC in Practice Summit held on March 5, 2026, and found it helpful in providing context about PONC, its procedures, and the relationship between the Commission and stewardship partners. She stated that it was also valuable to have Department of Finance staff and former commissioners present to share their perspectives.

Cmr. Lawson stated that the summit included an overview of the laws governing PONC, including the Charter, County Code, and Rules, and that participants were able to ask questions regarding those authorities. She noted that concerns were raised regarding procedural inconsistencies, particularly with respect to the Mayor's influence in the process, the prioritized list, and the manner in which prioritization occurs. She also stated that there was significant discussion regarding the blanket County Council resolution that approved multiple properties at once and whether that approach should be corrected or reconsidered.

Cmr. Lawson further reported that discussion at the summit emphasized the spirit and purpose of PONC, namely, identifying and prioritizing especially significant places, regardless of whether acquisition is ultimately able to move forward. She stated that this perspective was helpful to keep in mind as a guiding principle for the Commission's work.

She also stated that much of the day was spent discussing stewardship and the PONC Maintenance Fund. She reported that participants reiterated the need for a list, map, or similar tool identifying all PONC properties, their status, and their stewardship partners, and noted that Finance staff indicated such a tool would be developed. She stated that there was also discussion of the \$3 million cap on the Maintenance Fund and whether that limit remains appropriate.

Cmr. Lawson further reported that concerns were raised about the lack of a mechanism for the Commission to provide oversight through reporting, even when commissioners may be aware of conditions in the community. She stated that there was also discussion regarding support for stewardship partners in developing management plans and regarding responsibility for needed surveys, such as archaeological surveys. She noted that possible solutions were discussed, although no decisions were made.

Finally, Cmr. Lawson stated that one point that remained with her was that, although the PONC process cannot function as a rapid response tool, it can move somewhat more quickly when a property has already been identified, placed on the prioritized list, and authorized by resolution before becoming available for sale. She stated that she found the summit very useful overall and that there appeared to be interest in holding similar meetings in the future.

V. Chr. Britt commented that the summit was well described, but stated that the amount of discussion at the event should have been more limited. She noted that many points were repeated and suggested using time limits for speakers to reduce unnecessary repetition.

Cmr. Rosam stated that the summit appeared to have drawn approximately 40 to 50 participants and noted that one topic not yet mentioned was a possible rebranding of the PONC program,

including discussion of a new name that would be more 'āina-based. She also reported that Ashley's primary focus was to identify what changes might be needed to the Charter and that follow-up meetings were expected to occur frequently in advance of the May 14 charter filing deadline. Cmr. Rosam stated that the intent appeared to be to keep the Charter language more general, with greater detail placed in the Code and Rules so changes could be made more easily in the future. She then raised questions about how commissioners could participate in those discussions given Sunshine Law limitations.

DCC Campbell responded that commissioners act in two capacities, both as commissioners and as private individuals. She stated that, as private individuals, commissioners may hold opinions and participate personally, but that the Commission as a body could not readily develop an official position without holding additional public meetings. She explained that, if the Commission wanted to discuss a proposal and formulate a Commission position, it would need to do so through a properly noticed meeting process, and potentially through a Permitted Interaction Group if work outside a meeting were needed. She further cautioned commissioners to be mindful of Sunshine Law requirements and serial communications.

In response to questions from Cmr. Markoff and Chr. Chang, DCC Campbell further explained the limitations on how many commissioners could gather outside a noticed meeting to discuss Commission business. She distinguished the summit itself, which qualified as a third-party event that commissioners could attend under an exception to the open meetings law, from later efforts by commissioners to work together on a position regarding Charter amendments, which would constitute Commission business and require a different process.

Chr. Chang expressed concern that, if Charter or Code amendments result from the summit discussions, the Commission may have limited ability to ensure those changes improve rather than worsen the program. Cmr. Rosam responded that, absent a formal Commission position, the process would likely move forward based on broader community input rather than the Commission speaking as a body. Cmr. Markoff added that Ashley appeared to be conducting thorough research and would likely seek input from individuals in their personal capacities. DCC Campbell again cautioned commissioners to be careful about serial communications and advised that the agenda item was limited to reporting on the summit rather than discussing potential next steps.

Chr. Chang then stated that she had responded to a Doodle poll circulated by Ashley regarding follow-up meetings, but later questioned whether doing so was advisable. Mr. Schapiro stated that, in his role with the Department of Finance, he intended to remain actively involved in the process to the extent his time and role allowed. He stated that he had also responded to the Doodle poll, planned to attend follow-up meetings, and expected to continue discussions with the relevant team. He further stated that, if Charter amendments were ultimately proposed, they would go to the ballot in November for public decision. Chr. Chang then stated that she would withdraw her Doodle response.

Cmr. Markoff added that one item not yet mentioned was a commitment to explore the possibility of Zoom participation for meetings, which he supported. V. Chr. Britt stated that Zoom would be beneficial, but felt that, for meetings like the present one, commissioners should still attend in person. Mr. Schapiro clarified that he had only stated that the possibility of Zoom participation was being explored for a tentative future date. Chr. Chang noted that the discussion was moving

beyond the agenda item and did not continue further on that point.

IX. MINUTES:

1. Approval of the draft minutes from the November 10, 2025, regular meeting.

MOTION:

Cmr. Rosam moved to approve the November 10, 2025, meeting minutes. Seconded by Cmr. Britt.

VOTE:

Ayes: Commissioners Brandt, Markoff, Rosam, Lawson, V. Chr. Britt, Chr. Chang

Noes: None.

2. Approval of the draft minutes from the January 12, 2026, regular meeting.

MOTION:

Cmr. Rosam moved to approve the January 12, 2026, meeting minutes. Seconded by Cmr. Britt.

VOTE:

Ayes: Commissioners Brandt, Markoff, Rosam, Lawson, V. Chr. Britt, Chr. Chang

Noes: None.

X. ANNOUNCEMENTS:

1. The next public meeting is scheduled for Monday, May 11, 2026 at the Hawai'i County Building, 25 Aupuni Street, Hilo Council Chambers, Hilo, Hawai'i 96720.

2. Requests and suggestions for agenda items for the next regular meeting on Monday, May 11, 2026.

Chr. Chang stated that the agenda for the May 11, 2026 regular meeting would include presentation of the site visit reports, but that the Commission would not be able to discuss them at that time and would only receive the reports. She further stated that the May meeting might be one of the few meetings with enough time to discuss matters that usually cannot be addressed during regular meetings because of fuller agendas. She then invited commissioners to suggest additional matters they would like placed on the next meeting agenda.

Other potential items for discussion:

1. Roles and responsibilities for parcels under both Parks and Recreation and PONC, and how stewardship grants work for those parcels
2. Update on Zoom capabilities for PONC meetings
3. Signage
4. Policy on commercial and fundraising activities on PONC properties
5. Update on the new grant website
6. Discussion regarding the Mayor's role in prioritizing PONC property acquisition

7. List of prioritized properties – the list continues to grow
8. Map of acquired properties
9. Commission meeting frequency
10. Management planning of PONC properties – who is responsible, are the properties being properly managed?
11. Discuss Council Member Ashley Kirkiewicz’s proposed changes to the Hawaii County Code and Charter

XI. ADJOURNMENT:

MOTION:

Cmr. Rosam moved to adjourn the meeting. Seconded by V. Chr. Britt.

VOTE:

Ayes: Commissioners Brandt, Markoff, Rosam, Lawson, V. Chr. Britt, Chr. Chang

Noes: None.

Meeting adjourned at 2:17 p.m.

PUBLIC ACCESS, OPEN SPACE, AND NATURAL
RESOURCES PRESERVATION COMMISSION
COMMISSIONER DEBORAH CHANG, Chairperson

Draft posted: April 17, 2026

Approved:

Approved posted: