



University of Hawai'i at Hilo
640 N. A'ohoku Place, Room 203, Hilo, Hawai'i 96720
Telephone: (808) 933-0734 Fax: (808) 933-3208
Mailing Address: 200 W. Kawili Street, Hilo, Hawai'i 96720

**Minutes
Regular Meeting**

Mauna Kea Management Board
Monday July 9, 2007

Kukahau'ula, Room 131
640 N. A'ohoku Place
Hilo, Hawai'i 96720

Attending

- MKMB:** Chair Rob Pacheco, 1st Vice Chair Barry Taniguchi, 2nd Vice Chair Ron Terry, Patricia Bergin, Herring Kalua, and Christian Veillet
- Kahu Kū Mauna:** Ed Stevens
- OMKM:** Stephanie Nagata, Dawn Pamarang, and William Stormont
- Others:** Andy Adamson, Gary Fujihara, Cory Harden, Arthur Hoke, Ron Koehler, Mike Maberry, Tetsuo Nishimura, Cindy Nomura, and Leilehua Omphroy

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Rob Pacheco called the Mauna Kea Management Board (MKMB) meeting to order on July 9, 2007, at 10:00 a.m.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

It was moved by Ron Terry and seconded by Barry Taniguchi that the minutes of the May 10, 2007, meeting of the MKMB be accepted. The motion was carried unanimously.

III. DIRECTOR'S REPORT

A. Pan-STARRS Project Review Update

The pre-design meeting is scheduled for Friday, July 27, 2007. This is the first of four meetings that are part of the Master Plan design review process. Attending will be Ron Terry (MKMB), Sean Naleimaile (Kahu Kū Mauna Council) and representatives from the the Institute for Astronomy (IfA).

B. Canada-France-Hawaii Telescope Restoration Project Update

Director Stormont gave an update on work at the Canada-France-Hawaii Telescope (CFHT):

Grounding wire grid	Installed
Metal Posts to protect Electrical equipment	Installed
Above ground portion of the conduit between CFHT and Gemini	Not installed. Estimated install date – Fall 2007
Build-up of Roadway and roadbed around facility	In progress

IV. COMMITTEE REPORTS

A. Kahu Kū Mauna Council

The Council has not completed their search for candidates to replace three outgoing Council members.

Ed Stevens asked to reserve comments on Old Business as they come up for discussion.

B. Environment Committee

Dr. Terry reported the committee is close to selecting a consultant to prepare the Natural Resources Management Plan. Last week they held video interviews with two companies. Associate Director Nagata is compiling committee member rankings. The Office will review and select the contractor based on the committee's vote. Associate Director Nagata gave a timeline stating the proposal requests the completion of the Natural Resources Management Plan in nine months. Funding for this project is already in place.

Dr. Terry thanked each member of the committee for their hard work: Debbie Ward, Lisa Hadway, Jim Kauahikaua, Susan Cordell, Reggie David, Julie Leialoha, Don Thomas, and Hannah Springer. The committee's next order of business is to review the draft administrative rules.

C. Hawaiian Culture Committee

Director Stormont reported the committee continues to work on the draft administrative rules.

V. OLD BUSINESS

A. Subaru Telescope Request to Install a SODAR System on its Control Building

(See Appendix A for a description and OMKM's review of the project)

Subaru conducted in-house testing and hired an engineering consultant, D. L. Adams Associates for additional sound testing. Dr. Tetsuo Nishimura provided a quick summary of the results of the acoustical tests. For both tests, the SODAR was placed by a cherry picker within a couple of yards from the proposed site. The results of the two tests were similar. Noise impacts were greatest at two sites: 1) catwalk on the enclosure building facing the location of the SODAR site; and 2) the visitor parking area next to the enclosure building. These results are understandable because the SODAR is designed to emit sound upwards and the two sites are higher than the SODAR. Sound from the SODAR is detectable at other locations but is somewhat masked by the wind. In all cases, sound from the SODAR is audible up to about 150 yards, which is not as far as the Keck site.

Discussion

Dr. Terry commended Subaru for their timely and thorough response to the Board's concerns. He thought they are a model for how responsive an observatory can be. Secondly, he stated that anybody else who does something that makes a lot of sound up there are going to be asked the same type of questions. He personally spoke with Reggie David about the impact on birds and invertebrates. Mr. David, an expert on birds, did not believe the frequency and decibel level would pose a problem for the occasional birds that occur up there. Dr. Terry believed that although the extra studies may have caused some delay and expense, this was an important issue to research.

Kahu Kū Mauna Council

Council members had questions regarding how high the sound traveled and direction the sound was aimed at. Mr. Stevens called Mr. Fumihiro Uraguchi for answers. In his discussion with Mr. Uraguchi, he was assured that adequate research was done, and the report by Adams Associates was very well done. It shows without a doubt that the sound measurements are well within reason and that there is nothing to worry about. Mr. Stevens did not have a chance to have a final review with Council members, but he is going ahead with the Council's report rendering that they find no problems with this project and have no further comments.

Action

It was moved by Ron Terry and seconded by Barry Taniguchi to adopt OMKM's recommendation to classify this project Minimal Impact and to approve it with conditions. The motion was carried unanimously.

B. Administrative Rules

Director Stormont apologized for not completing the white paper that he offered to develop, and he would be happy to entertain a deadline set by the Board. Regarding the white paper, Chair Pacheco felt it should include a discussion about bringing entities together such as the Department of Land and Natural Resources (DLNR), the University, the Office, and the Board. Director Stormont stated he has not worked on bringing the groups together. Director Stormont stated he would send an outline by this afternoon.

OMKM has asked the Hawaiian Culture and Environment committees to review some very preliminary rules for comment and modification before the Office takes it out to the public.

Mr. Taniguchi stated that the University has been stonewalled and the promulgation of administrative rules was put on hold until the matter was resolved. He asked that we at least suggest alternatives to try to get something done. We should be more assertive in adopting rules.

Associate Director Nagata commented although the option that Director Stormont suggested – proceeding with rule making under UH authority – an obstacle is the language of the lease. UH system is also exploring with DLNR options for developing rules. One option is to have DLNR develop and adopt rules. A second is to have the University do all the legwork but have DLNR adopt the rules. A third option is amend the lease because of the clause that reserves unto DLNR rights concerning recreation and hunting. Peter Young realized in the last session that something had to be done, and he was open to the idea of UH doing all the legwork for getting the rules done and somehow DLNR would adopt them. Now, Peter Young is no longer there.

Chair Pacheco felt it is important that we get together as soon as possible and requested Director Stormont complete the white paper by the end of July. He also suggested scheduling a meeting for late August or early September with the concerned parties. Director Stormont stated there have been meetings in the past, but there was no clear guidance regarding how to proceed. Now that there is a new chairperson we should have a conversation about this matter.

Mr. Stevens asked specifically what is going on with the lease right now. OMKM is not aware of any discussion between UH and DLNR regarding the lease. Mr. Stevens stated he believes something was going on between the University and DLNR.

Chair Pacheco did not think there was anything going on; everything is at a standstill at DLNR, however, something needs to move forward because of the recent court ruling. This Office could help to move things along and direct it the way we would like to see it, but it is hard to say what is going to come out of all this.

Mr. Stevens agreed there is a need to amend the lease, because it is so poorly written that it needs to be refined. He just wanted to be in touch with what is going on, because there are a number of things that disturb him about the lease. This is an opportunity to address those issues.

Dr. Terry suggested that Director Stormont address these issues in his white paper, as well as some strategy. We will review it at the end of this month. He also suggested that Director Stormont talk to the new DLNR chair and people at UH and tell them the MKMB is pressuring you to get some resolution to these issues. If they are not going to come down and see us, we are going to come up and see them, whatever it is going to take; get back with a report to us.

Mr. Taniguchi asked if it is realistic that we are going to get something. Director Stormont's reply was yes. Chair Pacheco asked if they could have it by July 26th, which is Thursday. Director Stormont answered yes.

Chair Pacheco asked to reconvene the Public Use and Safety Committee; it's been in suspension for quite a while. Dr. Terry asked if Chair Pacheco and Mr. Yada could provide a report before leaving the Board. Chair Pacheco replied it could be done and that he could probably still be available to serve on that committee as a non-Board member.

C. Management Plan Schematic

This was something that the Board requested primarily for new Board members to have a good visual of the management plan and how we perceive it to work. Director Stormont has not worked on it.

He summarized what was reported at the last meeting, that we are proceeding with the cultural and natural resource management plans, and surveys and studies. He has yet to receive any clear direction from the University system that this is our responsibility. There is an assumption that we will do it, and certainly the acknowledgement that we will do a large chunk of it, but the request he has made to get some clear direction from the University system has not been resolved.

Chair Pacheco stated there are two aspects to the development of the management plan. One, as a body, we have always felt the need for a management plan. We embarked on the development of that plan, beginning with surveys and studies way before the court decision about the need for a management plan before development can take place. Chair Pacheco felt we should proceed with a management plan for the Office and MKMB. If this plan can be used by IfA to fulfill its needs, that's fine. We have a charge to manage the mountain, and to do that we need a plan in place. Whether or not we have a clear direction from System or Board of Regents, we should proceed similarly as we are with the development of administrative rules – have a plan ready to go. He felt the components of the plan have been identified; parts of it are in place, so it should be relatively easy to put a

timeline for completing the management plan.

Dr. Terry agreed with Chair Pacheco and added his concern was about who ordered who to do what and how does it relate to all the other entities? He asked for charts, maps and drawings which would help put this issue into perspective. We have a fairly clear picture of a management plan and how that should proceed and the various components. The question is how does the court decision, DLNR, UH, administrative rules, this Board, Kahu Kū Mauna, how they all relate to each other. Mr. Taniguchi confirmed Dr. Terry's request was made a while back to put everything down so we can see how everything relates - action and reaction.

Chair Pacheco clarified he is asking for direction from UH on how to move forward. Where is it coming from? Is it coming from IfA? Does it need to come out of the Regents' office?

Mr. Taniguchi stated we do not know. He thinks everybody has their own different idea. He thought we should come up with a schematic of what we think it should be and have people buy into it. That was one of the earlier strategies to get DLNR, the University, even the cultural groups to review and agree to what needs to be in this management plan.

Dr. Terry asked did the court order say who was to prepare the management plan. Director Stormont explained the court said that without the management plan, no new conservation district use permits were going to be issued. Mr. Taniguchi stated the problem is that DLNR did not define what needs to be in the management plan.

Director Stormont added a concern he has shared in the past is if we, the Office on behalf of the University, comes up with this plan it puts us in a position of having to prepare a document that will allow development to proceed, because the only way it can happen is if this plan is done. He disagrees with the thought of being in the position of having to come up with a document that enables development because of opposition within segments of the community. Dr. Terry added that was not why we started our management plan. Director Stormont agreed.

Dr. Terry questioned: Is it not then incumbent upon those entities that want to develop something on the mountain to prepare that management plan, not us? Why should we even worry about it? Chair Pacheco asked if IfA was working on an aspect of the management plan. Director Stormont stated they are looking at what future development might be. Chair Pacheco asked how was that different than what is already in the Master Plan.

Director Stormont replied the chapter in the Master Plan is a physical planning guide. It says what might happen and what could be planned for. This would be to a higher level of specificity and reflect changes since the Master Plan.

Associate Director Nagata clarified Judge Hara's ruling. The Judge basically said the Board of Land and Natural Resources (BLNR) erred in accepting and issuing the permit because the plan that was approved by the BLNR was not comprehensive. The ruling also states, although given no specifics, the plan needs to address multiple uses. The plan that we are putting together, and hopefully accepted, will address how future development is to take place, not a carte blanche for proposed development.

Dr. Terry agreed saying that is the kind of management plan that he, as a consultant, has submitted to DLNR in the past when it was a requirement of the permit application. It is different from a Master Plan where you develop something. That is what you get your CDUA (Conservation District Use Application) approved for. Your management plan is a separate entity, and he would hope that that is what we are preparing.

Associate Director Nagata stated that is the premise for our management plan because we need to be able to adequately provide for the protection of the resources. If development is one of the uses that takes place on the mountain, then they have to make sure that it is not going to run counter to our management plan and that it adopts all the processes that are set in the management plan.

Chair Pacheco stated we should focus on what we are responsible for. We should not stop because we are concerned that people might be thinking that what we are doing is related to matters taking place on a parallel track. The right thing for us is to have a plan to manage the resources.

Mr. Stevens agreed with Chair Pacheco that we need to be proactive, develop a plan that reflects our attitudes and feelings and then submit it. Let others work around it. At least get it moving. It is worthwhile to hire consultants to do this for us, to gather all the information and put it in a format that is professional. Associate Director Nagata

stated we are not doing it in house. We are hiring consultants to do this.

Chair Pacheco asked if the schematic was still needed. Dr. Terry wanted it as a working document, to understand who is in charge of what on this management plan. Dr. Terry was asked if he would help to write things down and lay it out. Director Stormont has ideas about what he thinks are the components of this management plan - everything from the rules, public use, commercial use, new development, cultural resources, and natural resources. Dr. Terry agreed to help and requested that Associate Director Nagata be included too.

Dr. Terry stated they will get together and report back, hopefully with a diagram, to the full Board at the next meeting.

D. Mauna Kea Support Services (MKSS) Transfer

Director Stormont spoke with Vice President for Research Jim Gaines last week. Dr. Gaines indicated the response from informal discussions with observatory directors varied. Some were in support saying as long as nothing on the ground changes, the University can do what it feels it needs to do. Others expressed concerns from legal and management standpoints. Also if the transfer were to take place, it puts OMKM in the position of being an overseer and a regulator, as well as the entity that is providing support and infrastructure needs.

Dr. Gaines is willing to meet with Board members. Director Stormont related to Dr. Gaines the Board's concern that all of the management functions are not in one place and the perception that the IfA still is in charge of certain management functions on the mountain.

Director Stormont will try and schedule that meeting with Dr. Gaines, Harry Yada and Ron Terry. It would be helpful if some members of the Board would express to Dr. Gaines what he has been trying to tell him. Apparently it is not a simple matter because of a number of issues, including personnel, sublease, and the operating and site development agreements.

Mr. Taniguchi quoted from the March 6, 2007 minutes: "Mauna Kea Support Services Transfer. Director Stormont reported a proposal has been discussed and senior administration indicated it could be done. It was a matter of a stroke of a pen. There still are personnel matters to sort out. There have been no recent discussions with senior administration. Chair Pacheco asked if this matter was being worked on and whether it would be helpful if members of the Board met with Jim Gaines. Harry Yada and Ron Terry volunteered. Director Stormont would arrange a meeting by the end of March." Mr. Taniguchi stated he heard this before and wanted to know when.

Director Stormont explained attempts to contact Dr. Gaines went unanswered for a period of time. He finally had that conversation with him last week. Dr. Gaines was the one that had stated some time ago that it would simply be a matter of a stroke of a pen. Director Stormont does not agree, and he does not think Dr. Gaines actually agrees with that statement either.

Chair Pacheco questioned if this is still a good idea. Does it make sense? What are the benefits? By going through this whole process will it be a better arrangement? Director Stormont stated the benefit would be a change in the perception that the management functions on the mountain sits with this Office. He does not see anything changing on the ground. All of the functions under MKSS will continue and everything remains intact.

Dr. Terry's personal feelings was that things like road grading and the food services and taking care of Hale Pohaku is not necessarily a good function for OMKM, and that is based just on his knowledge, which may be incomplete. The ranger program and the educational programs fall under our supervision, and it might be good to have them here.

Ron Koehler stated all the observatories have a say through the Oversight Committee as to what MKSS is supposed to do. Because of the subleases, all the observatories would have to concur if any changes are made. Personally, he felt similar to what was said about the food and lodging, the road grading, and water hauling, for example. They obviously have to stay within the guidelines of OMKM, but OMKM does not need to get involved with those, unless they are not handled properly.

Dr. Terry stated MKSS has certainly coordinated well with this Board and Office. He did not think that administratively there has been a real issue, but the Office may have a different feeling, and he would respect that since they are the ones having to deal with it on a day-to-day basis.

There are three options. Leave it where it is, split some of it up, or bring the whole thing over. If a change is desired, Director Stormont prefers to bring the whole thing over and leave the entire structure of MKSS intact rather than trying to administratively split some of that up. If the feeling has changed, and if it is no longer a strong desire from this Board or anybody else to make that transfer, then so be it. If there still is that desire to make that transfer to remedy that perception, then fine. We will pursue it.

Chair Pacheco does not recall the Board saying we want MKSS. He thought it was discussions that went on between the Office and MKSS and that this was the natural progression of where it should go. Director Stormont stated it was an issue addressed in the Master Plan and was discussed by this Board several years ago.

Arthur Hoke commented maybe he is the only one in this room that is confused. The Master Plan is the bottom line. Either the Office is managing the resource or it is not. Right now it is not. The problem has always been a huge distrust of the University system, and the University system is still pulling the strings. The intent of the Master Plan will not be accomplished until OMKM is fully recognized and accepted.

Chair Pacheco added that transferring MKSS into OMKM does not take it out of the University.

Associate Director Nagata agreed with Mr. Hoke that the Master Plan is our guide, and it does say that some of the functions of MKSS are supposed to be transferred to OMKM, but we do not know what the real intent and reasons were behind this Master Plan suggestion. She thought at this point in time we need to go back and review what discussions took place at the Board regarding this transfer, because it is possible that having worked with the mountain for the past seven years, it may not be necessary to do the transfer. Or we may find out that after the review the transfer is necessary. No one has really sat down and really said: Okay. These are the pros; these are the cons. Why should we do it or why shouldn't we do it. The Master Plan just states it should happen. .

Mr. Hoke agreed with Director Stormont's statement that there has been considerable change. But the issue, as he recalls during the Master Plan planning days, was who do you blame? And the Master Plan said we are going to blame this thing called OMKM, but OMKM does not have everything under its umbrella. So we still do not know who to blame.

Christian Veillet was not sure what Mr. Hoke meant by who to blame. If the food is not good at Hale Pohaku, should he, as an astronomer blame, OMKM? It is definitely important to clarify what you are addressing. We want to address concerns of the community, one of which is perception. Take for example the road. People use the road, but the observatories are doing a good job of maintaining the road. But from a visibility point, perhaps it would be better to have OMKM maintain the road. But because most of what MKSS does is to meet the needs of the observatories, transferring MKSS to OMKM may not change public perception.

Chair Pacheco stated the answer is in the lease. The lease is held by UH and, therefore, UH is responsible. DLNR holds the land in trust for the public. So those are the two entities that have final responsibility. That is the legal reality. We are not responsible. We are not even a decision-making body, but an advisory board. We are discussing what would be a practical way to better manage the resources on the mountain. Does transferring MKSS into OMKM help us to better manage the mountain? He does not think so and does it make sense. We should be focusing on managing people and interaction with the public rather than infrastructure support and running the Visitor Information Station.

Dr. Terry suggested getting people that are interested in this to get together and talk about it and come up with a plan; the pros and cons that Associate Director Nagata mentioned, and make a decision based on that. His suggestion is to defer this to a group that wants to focus on this. Patricia Bergin felt Mr. Taniguchi's quote from the minutes of the March meeting spelled out the course of action. The first course of action is to start with the people that are directly involved and with Ron Terry and Harry Yada, the Office and the IfA.

Dr. Terry asked to un-volunteer from that committee because he has too many other things to do. He suggested putting together an ad hoc committee whose purpose would be to come up with a recommendation. An ad hoc committee cannot be a quorum of the Board. They have their own meetings scheduled, and they come back with a specific recommendation. Once that recommendation is given, then the committee is dissolved.

Mr. Taniguchi stated the concept of a special committee is something he was thinking of on a different matter but somewhat related to this one. In a conversation he had with Chancellor Tseng about OMKM, she is responsible for overseeing and evaluating OMKM, but she really is not up to date on what is going on. As her advisors,

neither MKMB, nor individual members have been asked to give her an evaluation of what is happening, whether the Board is or is not doing its job or how OMKM performing. What is MKMB's perception of the OMKM/MKMB structure? After talking with her, he requested, and she concurred, that the Board assemble a special committee to look into this matter before we lose all the original Board members. Mr. Taniguchi requested Chair Pacheco appoint a small special committee of the Board. The results of the committee's discussion will be shared with the entire Board and with Chancellor Tseng. It is not unusual to do such a review, for example, the county charter and the State constitution does a review about every ten years. The 2000 Master Plan is seven years old. Maybe we should establish a separate committee to evaluate the Master Plan, since it is the charter we are operating under.

Regarding the MKMB/OMKM evaluation committee Chair Pacheco stated there are three things we should address: the effectiveness of the Office and the Board, awareness, and direction from the Chancellor regarding the administrative rules situation and MKSS transfer. He thinks that would be very productive.

A special committee comprised of Chair Pacheco, Barry Taniguchi, Harry Yada and Christian Veillet was established.

It was moved by Ron Terry and seconded by Barry Taniguchi to create a special committee to evaluate the office and Board, evaluate transfer of Mauna Kea Support Services and the administrative rules situation. The motion was carried unanimously.

The Office should participate in these discussions but the first step is to engage in preliminary discussions with Chancellor Tseng.

E. Natural Areas Reserve System Memorandum of Agreement

Director Stormont reported no progress on the development of the Memorandum of Agreement. He intends to work on it. Summarizing his report from the last meeting the document is basically a communications plan that ensures that when our rangers observe an infraction, there is a clear understanding of who is responsible for that particular area and make sure the right people are contacted. Also the document will address permits in the Natural Area Reserve (NAR) and consultation with Kahu Kū Mauna Council. What is not going to happen is transfer authority of the NAR to UH. Mr. Stevens added that DLNR did agree on a partnership arrangement where we could provide input.

Director Stormont met with Lisa Hadway and the discussion just needs to be written. Chair Pacheco reiterated unless there is something keeping you from doing it, this needs to get done. We've been waiting a long time for this. Director Stormont indicated he would have a draft prepared by the next meeting in September.

It would be up to DLNR if they need to sign the document, if so, it would probably be the chairperson at DLNR and UH President. The MOA would include not only the NAR, but also forest reserve lands, and involve historic preservation and DOCARE.

F. Project Request Timeline

Director Stormont stated there was no progress to report.

Director Stormont was to get it done because information was not being sent out in a timely manner. For example, the Subaru request. Kahu Ku Mauna received it two months after it was received by the office. It was emphasized that it was important to follow a schedule to give people adequate time to review materials prior to the meeting.

Mr. Stevens reported that due to the time limitations for reviewing projects, Kahu Kū Mauna created a subcommittee to review materials. Even though it does not have full council support at least there is an opportunity for review.

Dr. Terry suggested that he and Associate Director Nagata work on this. This timeline would be available to all those who submit a request to OMKM.

VI. NEW BUSINESS

A. Commercial Operators Sunrise Tours

Associate Director Nagata briefed the Board about requests by commercial tour operators to conduct sunrise tours. After reviewing the permits and evaluating vehicle statistics, OMKM will allow sunrise tours. Commercial

operators are allowed by their permits to be on the summit ½ hour before sunrise to a half hour after sunset. Vehicle statistics, including observatory, general public and commercial vans for the morning period over the past two years is very light. OMKM will be monitoring the situation. If it becomes problematic, then we will review the situation.

Chair Pacheco stated although his company is not one of those requesting sunrise tours, if these tours are successful, companies may request an earlier time up on the mountain. Because of the lack of topography blocking the horizon, e.g. mountain, it is fairly lighted before sunrise. On Haleakala, for example, the sun climbs up over the mountain and across the crater creating a more aesthetic view. Companies may want to come up earlier and do some star gazing before sunrise. You will also need to consider the impact of vehicles on the observatories. Mike Maberry stated that the few hours before sunrise and even into sunrise might be the best time for seeing because the air is very still. Dr. Veillet felt the situation should be monitored. The observatories should be notified and they could provide an assessment of the situation in particular the impact of lights and generation of dust. It might be wise for the office to conduct an informal survey.

Director Stormont stated that the oversight committee discussed the situation of headlights and the general feeling was that the occasional headlight was not problematic. Commercial operators were told the law requires the use of headlights. Mr. Koehler stated whether or not it is problematic, it was minor compared to the safety issue of driving only with parking lights. Occasionally, if the lights were to shine directly inside the dome, it would create a problem.

Chair Pacheco suggested looking for other potential sites off the summit to view the sunrise. After the sun rises the vans can drive to the summit. Another thing to consider is where people will stand to watch the sunrise. For viewing the sunset, people are standing on the western side of the summit ridge and are off the road. For sunrise, people are standing next to the guardrail and on the road. This could be a safety problem if observatory vehicles are leaving the summit.

The natural resources plan may recommend a shuttle system for getting people up and down the mountain for various reasons, one of which is potential impact of sunrise tours. A shuttle system and kiosk were recommended in the Master Plan. Mr. Maberry mentioned that Haleakala is seriously looking into this too. The park receives 1.7 million visitors annually and the impact of pollution from vehicles is a serious concern to silver swords and petrels that have burrows close to the road.

Currently there is only one company taking sunrise tours, but with Japanese visitors it could result in a large number of visitors. It is possible that if the number of sunset tours were to increase, there might be less need for sunrise tours. Companies, especially those that only operate Mauna Kea tours, may be looking for more opportunities to utilize their vehicles, i.e. do two trips up the mountain per day.

In the bigger picture, how much are you going to allow this to expand? Consider the total potential number of vehicles per day, including sunset, daytime and morning time and the impact on the road. Associate Director Nagata reported OMKM has intentions to do a study, but funding is an issue right now. The Hawai'i Tourism Authority might be able to provide some funding.

Chair Pacheco asked if Christian Veillet and Mike Maberry could get the word out because now is the time to get comments and feedback.

VII. ANNOUNCEMENTS

There were no announcements.

VIII. NEXT MEETING

The Office will poll Board members for available meeting dates for September and November 2007.

IX. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, Chair Pacheco adjourned the regular meeting at 11:50 a.m.

Respectfully submitted:

Signed by Ron Terry
Dr. Ron Terry, Secretary, MKMB

09/11/07
Date