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HCR 146 HD 1 calls attention to serious deficiencies in the management of certain leased lands at Pu'uwa'awa'a on the Big Island by the Division of Land Management of the Department of Land and Natural Resources (DLNR). Based on these deficiencies, the resolution calls for the Board of Land and Natural Resources to terminate this lease of State lands at Pu'uwa'awa'a immediately and to establish representative portions of these lands as a Natural Area Reserve.

Our statement on this resolution does not represent an institutional position of the University of Hawaii.

As was so thoroughly pointed out in the previous hearing on this resolution and in the subsequent Standing Committee Report no. 1567, the situation at Pu'uwa'awa'a is deplorable. We fully concur with the amendments now proposed for HCR 146 HD 1 and commend this committee on the positive actions they are taking.
The Honorable Ken Hiraki, Chair  
House Committee on Energy and Environmental Protection  
Leiopapa A Kamehameha Building  
State Office Tower, Rm 1301  
235 South Beretania Street  
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Representative Hiraki:

Re: H.B. No. 2391, H.D. 1, S.D. 1, and  
H.B. No. 3946, H.D. 2, S.D. 1

Pursuant to our telephone conversation last week, attached herewith are copies of the Environmental Center testimonies on earlier drafts of the referenced measures. I have also included copies of other related testimonies on bills introduced this session which would have amended Chapter 343, HRS.

Concerning the present drafts of the referenced bills, H.B. 3946, S.D. 1, is identical to S.B. 2721, which we reviewed for the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Environmental Protection on February 25th (RL:1059). Our comments remain unaltered; the fundamental intent of the bill is to preserve the existing 60-day interval for potential legal challenges to an EA. For the reasons stated in our review, this approach is clearly problematic.

S.B. 2391, S.D. 1, has eliminated all proposed amendments articulated in prior drafts and replaced them with a new provision for explicit justification of selection of anything other than the least environmentally damaging alternative. Although we had reservations concerning some of the proposed amendments in the prior draft, we felt, on the whole, that the bill incorporated many of the recommendations of our 1991 EIS System Review and was therefore supportable. The substance of the present draft, while an interesting idea, seems in the balance a poor trade for the multiple provisions of the earlier draft. Perhaps the two could be combined in conference.

Please don't hesitate to call me if I may be of further assistance.

Sincerely,

John T. Harrison  
Environmental Coordinator