

STATE OF HAWAII
DEPARTMENT OF LAND AND NATURAL RESOURCES
OFFICE OF CONSERVATION AND COASTAL LANDS
Honolulu, Hawai'i

May 14, 2021

Board of Land and Natural Resources
State of Hawai'i
Honolulu, Hawai'i

REGARDING: Conservation District Enforcement Case, OA 21-25
Regarding an Alleged Unauthorized Structures Located Along the
Shoreline Within the Conservation District

BY: Wells Trust
245 Portlock Road
Honolulu, HI 96825

And

Maunalua Bay Beach Ohana #29
735 Bishop Street, Suite 433
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

LOCATION: Honolulu, Oahu
TAX MAP KEY: (1) 3-9-002:003 and (1) 3-9-002:029 (Seaward)

SUBZONE: Resource

DESCRIPTION OF AREA:

The subject area is located along the coastline of Maunalua Bay in the Portlock area of eastern Oahu, seaward of TMKs: (1) 3-9-002:003 and (1) 3-9-002:029 (**Figures 1-2**). Lot TMK: (1) 3-9-002:003 is a residential lot owned by the Wells Trust, while lot TMK: (1) 3-9-002:029 is a beach reserve lot, located directly Makai of the subject residential lot. The beach reserve lot is owned by a Hawaii non-profit corporation known as Maunalua Bay Beach Ohana #29, which includes Robert and Christa Wells of the Wells Trust and representatives of the subject residential lot. Lands seaward of the shoreline are located in the Conservation District, Resource subzone, and are considered public land.

As stated within the formal advisory opinion of the Attorney General released on December 12, 2017 (**Exhibit A**), "*The State owns all lands makai of the 'the upper reaches of the wash of waves, usually evidenced by the edge of vegetation or by the line of debris left by the wash of waves'*", and further that, "[b]y definition, if the shoreline moves landward, then the ownership line also moves mauka." In regards to this opinion the Attorney General has stated that, "*Global warming and sea level rise are scientific fact. This opinion emphasizes that Hawaii law plainly*

states that beaches and shoreline features remain our common heritage as part of the public trust when the shoreline moves.”




Figure 1 – Map of Oahu




Figure 2 – East Oahu Map Showing Site Location

ALLEGED UNAUTHORIZED LAND USES:

Staff from the Office of Conservation and Coastal Lands visited the subject property on multiple occasions, including on July 9, 2020 and December 26, 2007 (*Figures 3 and 4, respectively*). On each occasion OCCL Staff observed the presence of rock revetments located seaward of the subject property and adjacent properties.




Figure 3 – Rock Revetment Observed by OCCL Staff on July 9, 2020, Seaward of TMK: (1) 3-9-002:003



Figure 4 –Rock Revetment Observed by OCCL Staff on Dec 26, 2007, Seaward of TMK: (1) 3-9-002:003

On February 8, 2021 Sea Grant staff in coordination with the DLNR OCCL captured aerial imagery showing the subject revetment and adjacent alleged unauthorized structures (**Figure 5**). The subject revetment fronts one of four neighboring properties, each which feature alleged unauthorized erosion control structures that the State is working to resolve; these include TMKs (1) 3-9-002: 002, 003, 004, 005.



Figure 5 – Aerial Imagery Taken on 02/08/2021 Showing the Presence of Rock Revetments Seaward of Subject Property and Adjacent Properties.

PROPERTY HISTORY:

The subject residential lot TMK: (1) 3-9-002:003 is located immediately Mauka of beach reserve lot TMK: (1) 3-9-002:029. The subject beach reserve lot is owned by The Maunalua Bay Beach Ohana 29, a non-profit corporation formed by the owners of lots located directly Mauka of the beach reserve lot. This non-profit corporation, which includes Robert and Christa Wells of the Wells Trust and representatives of the subject residential lot, was formed for the specific and sole purpose of owning the beach reserve lot. The beach reserve lot was acquired via quitclaim deed from KS on May 6, 2005 (*Exhibit B*).

Historic aerial imagery shown in *Figure 6* demonstrates that the coastline was absent of any hardened shoreline features such as seawalls or revetments at the time when the image was captured in 1975.



Figure 6 – Aerial Imagery Taken in 1975 Showing the Absence of Rock Revetments Along the Beach Area.

This absence of hardened shoreline features on the subject beach area changed prior to 1999 as indicated by documentation regarding a shoreline certification request that reported the identification of a revetment/seawall feature seaward of the property. On June 1, 1999, a shoreline certification request regarding the subject property was rejected due to alleged encroachments upon State lands consisting of a CRM wall located seaward of the property (*Exhibit C*). Recommended solutions included removing the alleged encroachments from State lands. On October 28, 1999, a letter was sent to Mr. Wells by the State Land Surveyor (*Exhibit D*) stating that the State of Hawaii should have no objections to adopting the edge of vegetation as the shoreline. Documentation associated with this decision show that portions of the seawall had been removed, however the imagery also shows that not all of the related material was removed from the shoreline including cemented basalt cobbles that had reinforced the subject wall (*Exhibit D, associated documentation*), suggesting that only the CRM wall was removed.

At the time of the certification, HAR rules regarding Shoreline Certifications had not yet been amended to require that all encroaching material be removal prior to certification of a shoreline. Amendments were made in 2003 such that the amended HAR §13-222-19 now states the following:

“The chairperson shall not certify the shoreline in cases where an unauthorized improvement encroaches upon state land or where an unauthorized improvement interferes

with the natural shoreline processes. The property owner shall first resolve the encroachment or violation problem with the applicable department prior to the chairperson certifying the shoreline. [Eff 12/10/88; am and comp MAR 29 2003] (Auth: HRS §§205A-42, 205A-49) (Imp: HRS §§205A-42, 171-6)

On May 14, 2009, a notice of alleged violation was sent to Mr. Wells (**Exhibit E**) regarding work being accomplished on an alleged unauthorized seawall in the shoreline area seaward of the subject property (245 Portlock Road). The letter stated that OCCL has no records of approval for the shoreline use identified. Staff visited the site on April 17, 2009 and May 6, 2009, and found unauthorized rocks and cement seaward of the shoreline fronting the property.

On June 1, 2009, OCCL received a response letter from Mr. Wells (**Exhibit F**), which stated the following:

“The referenced activity was a repair to the natural rock barrier that has exist[ed] on the property for decades. Its presence was obscured for many years by a vertical seawall built about 15 feet seaward of the older barrier. This seawall was removed by me in 1999. Subsequent beach replenishment from the Hawaii Kai dredging further concealed the site. Continuing erosion has exposed the older barrier. We were endeavoring to repair serious damage to the rock barrier that occurred last winter. Mr. Shipman is working on the documentation of these matters. The erosion in this area of Portlock beach has been a problem since the 1940s when the jetty was built. It affects about four properties to the north west of the jetty with the problem becoming less severe as one moves away from the jetty. As you can appreciate, there has been a long history of dealing with the problem in this area of Portlock Beach. A new beach replenishment is anticipated in 2010 in connection with planned dredging of the Marine channel.”

On June 17, 2009, OCCL responded to Mr. Wells letter (**Exhibit G**), stating that OCCL is still investigating the alleged violation and that OCCL has no records of authorization for the rock barrier. Further the letter states that OCCL recommends immediate removal of the rock barrier from the Conservation District.

Every several years the beach fronting the subject property (Portlock Beach) has received sand nourishments as part sand backpassing associated with dredging of the Hawaii Kai Marina entrance channel located at the northern end of the beach. According to the Final Environmental Assessment for Hawaii Kai Marina Entrance Channel Groin Replacement published in 2016, such dredging/sand backpassing projects occurred in 1988, 2004, and 2013 (**Figure 7**). The effect of these projects on altering beach morphology has been noted in shoreline certification documents completed for adjacent properties. Sand placed as part of these projects has the effect of obscuring remnant encroaching features for a period of time until long-term erosion reveals the features once again. The erosion rate along Portlock Beach has been documented by the University of Hawaii Coastal Geology Group as 0.8 ft/yr over a study period spanning from 1967 to 2015. When exposed, the subject property owner has been observed repairing the revetment structure with material stockpiled on the property (**Exhibit G, associated documents**). At this point, ongoing erosion has caused the feature to become exposed as would be expected. Another

dredging/backpassing project is now being designed, which again includes sand backpassing to the subject section of beach.

Year	Entrance Channel Dredging Event
1959	Initial dredging of Keahupua-O-Maunalua fishpond to near the Hawaii Kai Marina's present configuration; approximate dredging depths of -6 feet MSL in the marina and -8 feet MSL in the entrance channel.
1960	Dredged material used to construct Rim Islands Nos. 1 and 2; these islands were intended to serve as disposal site for future dredging in and around the marina.
1969	Construction of the main entrance channel and Kalaniana'ole Highway Bridge finishes; bridge gifted to the State of Hawaii.
1977	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) issued a maintenance dredging permit; dredging area included the marina and entrance channel.
1981	Marina dredged and sediments disposed of along the Maunalua Bay shoreline between Keahole Bridge and Hawaii Kai Bridge.
1985	Entrance channel dredged from Maunalua Bay into the marina inside the Kalaniana'ole Highway Bridge using mechanical means from a landward approach.
1988	Dredged sand placed on Portlock Beach from maintenance dredging of the channel between the marina and Maunalua Bridge; approximately 8,000 cubic yards removed to achieve depths to +6 feet mean lower low water (MLLW).
1994	Hawaii State Legislature passed Act 231, recognizing the marina and associated entrance channel as a navigation channel important to public health, safety, and welfare; State funds were appropriated for maintenance dredging efforts.
2004	Hawaii Board of Land and Natural Resources issues Grant for Perpetual Non-Exclusive Maintenance Easement to the HKMCA for dredging, use, maintenance, and repair of the entrance channel and a to-be-constructed temporary sandbag terminal groin.
2004	Dredging of the entrance channel by the Division of Boating and Ocean Resources (DOBOR) opens a second passageway under the Kalaniana'ole Highway Bridge; sand material placed on Portlock Beach. The project also included construction of an experimental sandbag groin on the east side of the entrance channel to minimize the migration of sediment around the shoreline tip and into the navigation channel.
2013	The HKMCA performed maintenance dredging of the entrance channel and areas in the Hawaii Kai Marina. Entrance channel dredging opened a third passageway under the Kalaniana'ole Highway Bridge. The project also included rebuilding and lengthening the temporary sandbag groin at the entrance channel and nourishing Portlock Beach and Maunalua Bay Beach Park with dredged sand.

Figure 7 – Table from FEA for the Hawaii Kai Marina Entrance Channel Groin Replacement Detailing the History of the Project Area, published in the Office of Quality Control Environmental Notice on December 23, 2016

ALLEGED UNAUTHORIZED LAND USE IN THE CONSERVATION DISTRICT:

The Department and Board of Land and Natural Resources has jurisdiction over the land lying makai of the shoreline as evidenced by the upper reaches of the wash of the waves other than storm and seismic waves, at high tide during the season of the year in which the highest wash of the waves occurs, usually evidenced by the edge of vegetation growth, or the upper limits of debris left by the wash of the waves, pursuant to §205A-1, Hawaii Revised Statutes (HRS).

Staff believes the unauthorized land uses occurred within the Conservation District based upon the location of the work seaward of Well Trust and Maunalua Bay Beach Ohana #29 properties. Further, on July 7, 2000, the DLNR received a determination from the City and County of Honolulu Department of Planning and Permitting (*Exhibit H*) stating that the seawall fronting the subject parcel and adjacent parcels, are located on accreted lands which are within the State Conservation District. The letter goes on to state that, "*Since structures on State District land are not within our department's jurisdiction, we are referring this matter to you for any enforcement action.*" The OCCL believes there is sufficient cause to bring this matter to the Board since it is evident that the unauthorized land uses are within the Conservation District pursuant to the Hawaii Administrative Rules (HAR), §15-15-20 Standards for determining "C" conservation district boundaries:

It shall include lands having an elevation below the shoreline as stated by §205A-1, HRS, marine waters, fishponds, and tidepools of the State, and accreted portions of lands pursuant to §501-3, HRS, unless otherwise designated on the district maps. All offshore and outlying islands of the State are classified conservation unless otherwise designated on the land use district maps.

Chapter 13-5, HAR and Chapter 183C, HRS regulate land uses in the Conservation District by identifying a list of uses that may be allowed by a Conservation District Use Permit (CDUP). The chapters also provide for penalties, collection of administrative costs and damages to state land for uses that are not allowed or for which no permit has been obtained. HAR §13-5-2 defines "land use" as follows:

The placement or erection of any solid material on land if that material remains on the land more than thirty days, or which causes a permanent change in the land area on which it occurs;

The present erosion control structure in the form of a rock revetment within the Conservation District was not authorized under Hawaii Administrative Rules (HAR) 13-5-22, P-15 SHORELINE EROSION CONTROL, "Seawall, revetment, groin, or other coastal erosion control structure or device, including sand placement, to control erosion of land or inland area by coastal waters, provided that the applicant shows that (1) the applicant would be deprived of all reasonable use of the land or building without the permit; (2) the use would not adversely affect beach processes or lateral public access along the shoreline, without adequately compensating the State for its loss; or (3) public facilities (e.g., public roads) critical to public health, safety, and welfare would be severely damaged or destroyed without a shoreline erosion control structure, and there are no reasonable alternatives (e.g., relocation). Requires a shoreline certification.

Installation of the rock revetment was not authorized under Hawaii Administrative Rules (HAR) for Unencumbered Public Lands, in HAR 13-10-221. The work done violates HAR 13-221-23, GEOLOGICAL FEATURES, "No person shall destroy, disturb, or mutilate any geological features or dig, or remove sand, earth, gravel, minerals, rocks, fossils, coral or any other substance on the premises. No person shall excavate or quarry any stone, or lay, set, or cause any blast or explosion, or assist in these acts within the premises, except as provided by law or with the written permission of the board or its authorized representative.", as well as HAR 13-221-28 (a), PUBLIC

PROPERTY, “No person shall destroy, deface, or remove any natural feature or natural resource within the premises.”

DISCUSSION:

Based on the information compiled regarding the subject rock revetment, it is clear that a shoreline structure was built within the shoreline area without authorization from the Department following 1964 when the Board of Land and Natural Resources adopted and administered land use regulations for the Conservation District pursuant to the State Land Use Law (Act 187) of 1961. No State, County, or Federal permits were obtained or even applied for in order to install the revetment or to repair it. Figure 6 of this report indicates (aerial imagery taken in 1975) that the shoreline in the area was natural with no evidence of shoreline hardening.

The beaches of Hawaii are held in trust by the State for the benefit of present and future generations. The State should be involved when individuals need to temporarily use beach areas for construction purposes, and there should be consequences when an individual unilaterally and willfully acts in such a way that endangers a public trust resource.

Chronic coastal erosion is widespread across the Hawaiian Islands. Local studies, have shown that 70% of beaches on Kauai‘i, O‘ahu, and Maui are chronically eroding such that shorelines are progressively receding landward¹. Coastal armoring can degrade and even destroy beaches by impounding natural sand resources, thereby impacting the sediment budget of a beach. Shoreline armoring also increases wave turbulence, wave reflection, and wave refraction, which can accelerate coastal erosion both fronting the coastal armoring and on neighboring properties adjacent to the armoring.

AS SUCH, STAFF RECOMMENDS:

That pursuant to Chapter 183C, HRS, the Board find the Landowner of TMK: (1) 3-9-002:003, who is also partial Landowner of TMK: (1) 3-9-002:029 located along the coastline of Maunalua Bay in the Portlock area of eastern Oahu in violation of Chapter 183-7, HRS and Chapter 13-5-6, HAR, subject to the following:

1. The Landowner of TMK: (1) 3-9-002:003 is fined \$15,000 for construction of an unauthorized shoreline structure, pursuant to Chapter 183C-7, HRS;
2. The Landowner is fined an additional \$5,000.00 for administrative costs associated with the subject violation;
3. The Landowner shall pay all fines (total \$20,000) within thirty (30) days of the date of the Board’s action;

¹ Fletcher, C.H., Romine, B.M., Genz, A.S., Barbee, M.M., Dyer, Matthew, Anderson, T.R., Lim, S.C., Vitousek, Sean, Boicchio, Christopher, and Richmond, B.M., 2012, National assessment of shoreline change: Historical shoreline change in the Hawaiian Islands: U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 2011–1051, 55 p. (Also available at <http://pubs.usgs.gov/of/2011/1051>.)

4. The Landowner shall remove the shoreline protection structure in its entirety within 90 days of the order of the Board;
5. That in the event of failure of the landowners to comply with any order herein, the landowner shall be fined an additional \$15,000.00 per day until the order is complied with; and
6. That in the event of failure of the landowners to comply with any order herein, the matter shall be turned over to the Attorney General for disposition, including all administrative costs.

Respectfully submitted:

Sam Lemmo

Samuel Lemmo, Administrator
Office of Conservation and Coastal Lands

Approved for submittal:

Suzanne D. Case

Suzanne D. Case, Chairperson
Board of Land and Natural Resources

***Exhibit A – Attorney General’s Opinion Regarding Shoreline Retreat,
Released on December 13, 2017***



DEPARTMENT OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

DAVID Y. IGE
GOVERNOR

DOUGLAS S. CHIN
ATTORNEY GENERAL

For Immediate Release
December 13, 2017

News Release 2017-176

**ATTORNEY GENERAL OPINES THE PUBLIC INTEREST
REMAINS PROTECTED AS THE SHORELINE RETREATS**

HONOLULU – Hawaii Attorney General Doug Chin issued a formal advisory opinion today stating that when the shoreline migrates landward (or *mauka*) due to erosion or sea level rise, the dividing line between public and private ownership also migrates *mauka*.

Attorney General Chin said, "Global warming and sea level rise are scientific fact. This opinion emphasizes that Hawaii law plainly states that beaches and shoreline features remain our common heritage as part of the public trust when the shoreline moves."

The opinion, supported in part by the Hawaii Supreme Court's recent decision in *Gold Coast Neighborhood Association v. State (2017)*, states that "[t]his migration does not give rise to a constitutional claim by the former owner ... this result is not affected by laws relating to the acquisition of real property, [and] the Attorney General does not need to give prior approval in connection with such land." The opinion further provides that the Board of Land and Natural Resources should charge former owners fair market value in return for an easement interest in the land.

The opinion was issued as a result of a request for advice from Suzanne Case, Chair of the Board of Land and Natural Resources about the Land Board's practice of requiring private owners of coastal properties to obtain easements for structures that were originally constructed on private property but are now located on State-owned land due to the landward migration of the shoreline.

Attorney General Opinion 2017-01 is attached.

###

DAVID Y. IGE
GOVERNOR



DOUGLAS S. CHIN
ATTORNEY GENERAL

STATE OF HAWAII
DEPARTMENT OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
425 Queen Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

RUSSELL A. SUZUKI
FIRST DEPUTY ATTORNEY
GENERAL

December 11, 2017

The Honorable Suzanne D. Case
Chairperson, Board of Land and Natural Resources
State of Hawai'i
1151 Punchbowl Street, Room 130
Honolulu, Hawai'i 96813

Dear Chairperson Case:

RE: Shoreline Encroachment Easements

INTRODUCTION

By memorandum dated August 10, 2017, you asked for our advice regarding the Board of Land and Natural Resource's practice of requiring private owners of coastal properties to obtain easements for structures that were originally constructed on private property but are now located on State-owned land due to the landward migration of the shoreline.

QUESTIONS AND SUMMARY ANSWERS¹

1. What is the dividing line between public and private property with respect to oceanfront property?

Short answer: The State owns all lands makai of the "the upper reaches of the wash of waves, usually evidenced by the edge of vegetation or by the line of debris left by the wash of waves." For convenience, we refer to this description as the

¹ The intent of your memorandum is clear even though it does not directly ask specific questions. We have taken the liberty of setting out questions we believe are raised.

Op. No. 17-1

The Honorable Suzanne D. Case
December 11, 2017
Page 2

"shoreline." This use of the term "shoreline" is closely related to but not exactly the same as the "certified shoreline" described in chapter 205A, Hawaii Revised Statutes (HRS). This line (the shoreline) is identical to -- and indeed defines -- the dividing line between public and private property (the ownership line).²

2. How is the ownership line affected when there is landward migration of the shoreline caused by erosion or sea level rise?

Short answer: By definition, if the shoreline moves landward, then the ownership line also moves mauka.³

3. What, if anything, is the effect of statutes that require the Board of Land and Natural Resources (Board) or the Attorney General to approve "acquisition" of real property?

Short answer: The State already owns an inchoate interest in land that might be gained through erosion or sea level rise. Ripening of this inchoate interest is not "acquisition" of land covered by these statutes. This result is fortified by the Supreme Court's decision in *Gold Coast Neighborhood Ass'n v. State*, 140 Haw. 437, 403 P.3d 214 (2017). The Court held that the statutes do not "imperatively require" abrogation of common law rules or "evinced an express legislative intent to do so."

4. Does this result violate private owners' due process rights or constitute a "taking" of private property?

Short answer: No. The Hawai'i Supreme Court has specifically considered and rejected such claims. As to federal

² The shoreline and ownership lines are the same where the shoreline is not affected by structures. No Hawai'i case or statute addresses the question of where the ownership line is when the shoreline is affected by a seawall or other man-made structure. We have not found it necessary to address that question in providing this advice.

³ The term "mauka" means "inland." *Leslie v. Bd. of Appeals of County of Hawai'i*, 109 Haw. 384, 386, 126 P.3d 1071, 1073, note 3 (2006). A "mauka" movement of the ownership line means toward the mountain or (equivalently) away from the sea.

The Honorable Suzanne D. Case
December 11, 2017
Page 3

taking law, the State's inchoate rights in the property existed prior to private ownership. The interest lost was not part of private title to begin with and cannot be the basis of a taking claim.

5. Is the Attorney General required to give prior approval to State ownership of land by reason of erosion or sea level rise? Is the Attorney General required to approve as to legality and form documents relating to land owned by the State by reason of erosion or sea level rise?

Short answer: No. Ownership of land by erosion or sea level rise is not an acquisition of land and the State is not acquiring land within the meaning of those statutes. Therefore the statutes requiring that the Attorney General review and approve land acquisitions do not apply.

6. Can the Board require the former landowner to pay fair market value in order to obtain an easement or other interest in land now owned by the State?

Short answer: Yes, applicable statutes specifically provide for the payment of fair market value in most cases.

DISCUSSION

1. What is the dividing line between public and private property with respect to oceanfront property?

It is the uniform law of every coastal state that land below (seaward or "makai" of) the shoreline is owned by the State and held in public trust⁴ for the people of the State.⁵

⁴ The public trust doctrine is a common law doctrine, inherited from England and dating back to Roman law, dictating that all submerged lands are the property of the state and held in trust for the people. *Shively v. Bowlby*, 152 U.S. 1 (1894). The seminal United States case for the public trust doctrine is *Illinois Cent. R.R. Co. v. State of Illinois*, 146 U.S. 387 (1892). The seminal case in Hawai'i is *King v. Oahu Ry. & Land Co.*, 11 Haw. 717 (1899). In Hawai'i the public trust is also recognized in the Constitution, article XI, section 1.

⁵ The same issue can arise as to rivers, lakes, or other bodies of water. Indeed *Illinois Cent. R.R. Co.*, see *supra* note 4,

The Honorable Suzanne D. Case
December 11, 2017
Page 4

Most states define the shoreline/ownership boundary as the mean high tide mark. *Purdie v. Attorney Gen.*, 143 N.H. 661, 666, 732 A.2d 442, 446-47 (1999):

The few States that reject the mean high tide mark as the public-private shoreland boundary do so on distinct histories not applicable to our State. See, e.g., *Application of Ashford*, 50 Haw. 314, 440 P.2d 76, 77 (1968) (Hawaii boundary based on Hawaiian King's issuance of royal patents in 1866); *Bell v. Town of Wells*, 557 A.2d 168, 171-72 (Me.1989) (Massachusetts and Maine adopted mean low water as boundary line based on 1647 Massachusetts ordinance); cf. *Opinion of the Justices (Public Use of Coastal Beaches)*, 139 N.H. at 88-89, 649 A.2d at 608 (refusing to adopt Massachusetts rule for New Hampshire).

See also Margaret E. Peloso & Margaret R. Caldwell, *Dynamic Property Rights: The Public Trust Doctrine and Takings in a Changing Climate*, 30 Stan. Envtl. L.J. 52, 57 (2011) ("In nearly all cases, the lines for defining the limits of private title and public access are the mean high water and mean low water marks.")

Purdie rightly identifies Hawai'i as a state with a unique approach to defining the shoreline. This approach was initiated and explained in three landmark cases, all authored by then Chief Justice William S. Richardson.

In *Application of Ashford*, 50 Haw. 314, 440 P.2d 76 (1968), the Court considered the ownership line in the context of a request to register land title in the land court:

Clinton R. Ashford and Joan B. S. Ashford, the appellees, petitioned the land court to register title to certain land situate on the Island of Molokai. The lands are the makai (seaward) portions of Royal Patent 3004 to Kamakaheki and Royal Patent 3005 to Kahiko, both issued on February 22, 1866.

concerned sale of land filled land reclaimed from Lake Michigan. Freshwater shorelines present some extraneous complications and are not further considered in this letter.

Op. No. 17-1

The Honorable Suzanne D. Case
December 11, 2017
Page 5

The question before this court is the location of the makai boundaries of both parcels of land, which are described in the royal patents as running 'ma ke kai' (along the sea). The appellees contend that the phrase describes the boundaries at mean high water which is represented by the contour traced by the intersection of the shore and the horizontal plane of mean high water based on publications of the U. S. Coast and Geodetic Survey.

50 Haw. at 314-15, 440 P.2d at 76-77.

The Court held that the boundary (ownership line) was not the mean high water mark. Rather the boundary -- pursuant to Hawaiian custom as established by kama'aina⁶ testimony -- is further mauka, specifically:

along the upper reaches of the wash of waves, usually evidenced by the edge of vegetation or by the line of debris left by the wash of waves, and that the trial court erred in finding that it is the intersection of the shore with the horizontal plane of mean high water.

50 Haw. at 14, 440 P.2d at 77 (1968). That landmark ruling was confirmed and elaborated on in *Hawaii County v. Sotomura*, 55 Haw. 176, 517 P.2d 57 (1973), and *Application of Sanborn*, 57 Haw. 585, 562 P.2d 771 (1977). See *Sotomura*, 55 Haw. at 182, 517 P.2d at 62:

We hold as a matter of law that where the wash of the waves is marked by both a debris line and a vegetation line lying further mauka; the presumption is that the upper reaches of the wash of the waves

⁶ "Kama'aina" is defined as "Native-born, one born in a place, host." Other relevant senses include "acquainted [with], familiar." M. Pukui & S. Elbert, *Hawaiian Dictionary* 9 (rev. ed. 1986).

Leslie v. Bd. of Appeals of County of Hawai'i, 109 Haw. 384, 386, 126 P.3d 1071, 1073 (2006), as amended (Feb. 28, 2006).

Op. No. 17-1

The Honorable Suzanne D. Case
December 11, 2017
Page 6

over the course of a year lies along the line marking the edge of vegetation growth. The upper reaches of the wash of the waves at high tide during one season of the year may be further mauka than the upper reaches of the wash of the waves at high tide during the other seasons. Thus while the debris line may change from day to day or from season to season, the vegetation line is a more permanent monument, its growth limited by the year's highest wash of the waves.

See Sanborn, 57 Haw. at 182, 562 P.2d at 773 (1977):

The law of general application in Hawaii is that beachfront title lines run along the upper annual reaches of the waves, excluding storm and tidal waves.

2. How is the ownership line affected when the shoreline moves landward or mauka because of erosion or sea level rise?

These same cases address and resolve the issue of whether and how ownership changes when the shoreline moves landward or mauka due to erosion or rising sea levels.

Sotomura is particularly relevant. In that case, the private owner indisputably owned the land in the past. In fact, the private owner had registered the property in the land court. The land court had determined the seaward boundary of the property and described it by distances and azimuths. The shoreline moved mauka due to erosion. The Court framed the question as "whether title to land lost by erosion passes to the state." The Court noted that this was an issue of first impression in Hawai'i.

The Court held that the answer was "yes," making clear that the ownership was fluid and specifically that it changed with erosion:

We hold that registered ocean front property is subject to the same burdens and incidents as unregistered land, including erosion. HRS § 501-81. Thus the determination of the land court that the seaward boundary of Lot 3 is to be located along high water mark remains conclusive; however, the precise

Op. No. 17-1

The Honorable Suzanne D. Case
December 11, 2017
Page 7

location of the high water mark on the ground is subject to change and may always be altered by erosion.

55 Haw. at 180, 517 P.2d at 61.

Even the previous determination of boundaries in land court was not binding where the actual shoreline was altered by erosion:

This court recently rejected the position that the state cannot subsequently challenge title to registered land where the state later discovered that the seaward boundary was located further mauka than shown on the maps, and a portion of the property had become submerged by erosion.

55 Haw. at 181, 517 P.2d at 61 (citing *In re Application of Castle*, 54 Haw. 276, 277, 506 P.2d 1, 3 (1973)).⁷

⁷ *Sotomura* has a complex and murky path after the Hawai'i Supreme Court decision. The United States Supreme Court rejected the owners' petition for certiorari. 419 U.S. 872 (1974). Landowners then sued the County and State officials in federal court. The federal district court judge was the Honorable Dick Yin Wong. Judge Wong was previously the state land court judge. It was his decision that the Hawai'i Supreme Court reversed in *Application of Sanborn*, 57 Haw. 585, 562 P.2d 771 (1977).

Judge Wong ruled in federal court that the Hawai'i Supreme Court deprived landowners of due process by deciding the case on a basis not presented by the parties or actually litigated. Judge Wong also held that the Hawai'i Supreme Court's decision "ignore[ed] vested property rights" and "was so radical a departure from prior state law as to constitute a taking of the Owners' property by the State of Hawaii without just compensation in violation of rights secured to them by the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution." *Sotomura v. Hawaii County*, 460 F. Supp. 473, 482-83 (D. Haw. 1978).

Although Judge Wong wrote the decision, it appears that Judge Samuel King entered the judgment. Defendants appealed but the

Op. No. 17-1

The Honorable Suzanne D. Case
December 11, 2017
Page 8

Importantly, the Court based its ruling on the common law principle that loss of land by erosion is an inherent aspect of littoral property:

The loss of lands by the permanent encroachment of the waters is one of the hazards incident to littoral or riparian ownership. . . . [W]hen the sea, lake or navigable stream gradually and imperceptibly encroaches upon the land, the loss falls upon the owner, and the land thus lost by erosion returns to the ownership of the state. *In re City of Buffalo*, 206 N.Y. 319, 325, 99 N.E. 850, 852 (1912).

55 Haw. at 183, 517 P.2d at 62.

One reason for that common law rule (now abrogated in part by statute, section 171-2, HRS) is the tradeoff between accretion and erosion: "since the riparian owner may lose soil by the action of the water, he should have the benefit of any land gained by the same action." *Id.* (citing 65 C.J.S. *Navigable Waters* § 82(1), at 256 (1966) (footnotes omitted)). See *Application of Banning*, 73 Haw. 297, 303-04, 832 P.2d 724, 728 (1992), where the Court explained that accretion belongs to the littoral landowner.

Sotomura also relied on the public trust doctrine, citing to *King v. Oahu Ry. & Land Co.*, 11 Haw. at 723-24, for the proposition that:

The control of the state for the purposes of the trust can never be lost, except as to such parcels as are used in promoting the interests of the public therein, or can be disposed of without any substantial impairment of the public interest in the lands and waters remaining.

55 Haw. at 184, 517 P.2d at 63. Public policy therefore "favors extending to public use and ownership as much of Hawaii's shoreline as is reasonably possible." 55 Haw. at 182, 517 P.2d 61-62.

appeal was untimely. See *Sotomura v. Hawaii County*, 679 F.2d 152 (9th Cir. 1982).

Op. No. 17-1

The Honorable Suzanne D. Case
December 11, 2017
Page 9

This public policy remains in effect as the Court has repeatedly ruled. *Application of Banning*, 73 Haw. 297, 309-10, 832 P.2d 724, 731 (1992); *Diamond v. Dobbin*, 132 Haw. 9, 26, 319 P.3d 1017, 1034 (2014); *Gold Coast Neighborhood Ass'n v. State*, 140 Haw. 437, 458, 403 P.3d 214, 235 (2017).

The Court reached the same result in *Application of Sanborn*, 57 Haw. 585, 562 P.2d 771 (1977). *Sanborn* also concerned property registered in the land court where the shoreline moved mauka from the land court boundary. The Court framed the issue as:

In addressing the issue of the Sanborns' beachfront title line, the primary question is whether the line is to be determined according to Hawaii's general law of ocean boundaries, or whether certain distances and azimuths contained in the Sanborns' 1951 land court decree of registration are to prevail.

57 Haw. at 588, 562 P.2d at 773.

The Court specifically held that the land court boundary was subject to change in the event of erosion:

We hold that, regardless of whether or not there has been permanent erosion, the Sanborns' beachfront title boundary is the upper reaches of the wash of waves. Although we find that the State is bound by the 1951 decree to the extent that the decree fixes the Sanborns' title line as being 'along the high water mark at seashore', we also find that the specific distances and azimuths given for high water mark in 1951 are not conclusive, but are merely prima facie descriptions of high water mark, presumed accurate until proved otherwise.

57 Haw. at 590, 562 P.2d at 774.

The Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals made the same ruling in *Napeahi v. Paty*, 921 F.2d 897 (9th Cir. 1990). The court there considered ownership of land that was mauka of the shoreline when ceded land was granted to the Territory in 1898. The land later became makai of the shoreline because of erosion. The court specifically held that the property moved from private to public ownership.

Op. No. 17-1

The Honorable Suzanne D. Case
December 11, 2017
Page 10

[T]he holdings in *Sotomura* and *Zimring*⁸ require us to conclude that if the 1.75 acres became submerged land because of natural erosion after 1898 and before being altered by the actions of the property owner, then that property would be ceded lands subject to the terms of the trust.

Napeahi v. Paty, 921 F.2d 897, 903 (9th Cir. 1990).

For these reasons and based on the cases cited above, we advise that the law in Hawai'i is that when the shoreline boundary migrates landward or mauka because of erosion or sea level rise, the State owns the additional submerged land that results from the migration.

3. **What, if anything, is the effect of statutes that require the Board of Land and Natural Resources (Board) or the Attorney General to approve "acquisition" of real property?**

A concern has been raised as to a trio of statutes that require Board and Attorney General approval of acquisitions of real property or interests in real property. The statutes are sections 26-7, 107-10, and 171-30, HRS.⁹

⁸ *State by Kobayashi v. Zimring*, 58 Haw. 106, 566 P.2d 725 (1977). This case is discussed in more detail below.

⁹ Section 26-7, HRS provides in relevant part:

The department [of the attorney general] shall . . . approve as to legality and form all documents relating to the acquisition of any land or interest in lands by the State

Section 107-10, HRS, provides in relevant part:

No real property or any right, title, or interest therein shall be acquired by agreement, purchase, gift, devise, eminent domain, or otherwise, for any purpose, by the State or any department, agency, board, commission, or officer thereof, without the

Op. No. 17-1

The Honorable Suzanne D. Case
December 11, 2017
Page 11

We advise that those statutes are not applicable to change in the ownership line caused by landward or mauka migration of the shoreline due to erosion or sea level rise. As we now show, the possibility of boundary changes due landward or mauka migration of the shoreline due to erosion and accretion is already part of the State's ownership of public trust land. That possibility already encumbers private littoral land. *Sotomura*, 55 Haw. at 183, 517 P.2d at 62. When the State comes into possession of land because of erosion or sea level rise, the State is not "acquiring" property within the meaning of the statutes.

State by Kobayashi v. Zimring, 58 Haw. 106, 566 P.2d. 725 (1977), is a key case supporting this proposition. *Zimring*

prior approval of the attorney general as to form, exceptions, and reservations.

Section 171-30, HRS, provides in relevant part:

- (a) The board of land and natural resources shall have the exclusive responsibility, except as provided herein, of acquiring, including by way of dedications:
 - (1) All real property or any interest therein and the improvements thereon, if any, required by the State for public purposes, including real property together with improvements, if any, in excess of that needed for such public use in cases where small remnants would otherwise be left or where other justifiable cause necessitates the acquisition to protect and preserve the contemplated improvements, or public policy demands the acquisition in connection with such improvements.
 - (2) Encumbrances, in the form of leases, licenses, or otherwise on public lands, needed by any state department or agency for public purposes or for the disposition for houselots or for economic development.
- The board shall upon the request of and with the funds from the state department or agency effectuate all acquisitions as provided under this section.

Op. No. 17-1

The Honorable Suzanne D. Case
 December 11, 2017
 Page 12

addressed ownership of lands newly created by a 1955 lava flow that extended the shoreline and added 7.9 acres of land in the Puna area. One of the issues in that case was whether the lava extension was ceded land acquired by the State from the federal government. The State argued that the federal government transferred the lands to the State under section 5(b) of the Admission Act. The opponents countered that the only lands that passed to the State under section 5(b) were those lands ceded to the United States by the Republic of Hawaii in 1898. They argued that the lava extension did not exist in 1898, and could not have been ceded to the United States. The Hawaii Supreme Court disagreed with the opponents and sided with the State. The Court held that the term "property," as used in the Joint Resolution of Annexation, is "extremely broad," and includes "property which is real, personal and mixed, choate and inchoate, corporal or incorporeal." *Id.* at 122-23, 566 P. 2d at 736.

The lava land was an inchoate property right in 1898. When the lava land was later created, that circumstance resulted in the ripening of State ownership of ceded land even though the land did not exist in 1898.

Napeahi v. Paty, 921 F.2d 897 (9th Cir. 1990), is on point for the proposition that an inchoate property interest in the possibility of erosion was also "public property" under the Joint Resolution of Annexation. In that case, a native Hawaiian sued the State, alleging that the State had a trust duty under the Admission Act to claim ownership of 1.75 acres shorefront property Kona. It was undisputed that "at the time the public land was ceded by the Republic of Hawaii to the United States in 1898, it did not include the 1.75 acres in contention." 921 F.2d at 902. However, that did not "end the inquiry." Relying on *Zimring* and *Sotomura*, the Ninth Circuit ruled that the land passed from private to public ownership because of erosion -- automatically and as a matter of law:

There is no reason to distinguish the inchoate property interest in submerged land that could be acquired by the State as the result of erosion from that which could be acquired by a lava extension. Both were inchoate property interests which *Zimring* held to be property that was ceded to the United States and then returned to the State in 1959. Thus, the holdings in *Sotomura* and *Zimring* require us to

Op. No. 17-1

The Honorable Suzanne D. Case
December 11, 2017
Page 13

conclude that if the 1.75 acres became submerged land because of natural erosion after 1898 and before being altered by the actions of the property owner, then that property would be ceded lands subject to the terms of the trust.

921 F.2d at 903.

We therefore conclude that under Hawai'i law, the State holds an inchoate right to land that may pass to it by erosion or sea level rise. This is an inherent aspect of the State's ownership of land, already owned by the State (and by the Territory before it). Ripening of that inchoate right is not "acquiring" or "acquisition" of real property under any of the statutes cited above.

This conclusion is bolstered by the Hawai'i Supreme Court's recent ruling in *Gold Coast Neighborhood Ass'n v. State*, 140 Haw. 437, 403 P.3d 214 (2017). The issue in that case was whether the State owned seawalls and land under the seawalls because the general public used the seawalls as a walkway. The State argued that under section 264-1, HRS, property could only be dedicated to the State by "deed of conveyance" accepted by the State. The State also cited to and relied on the other statutes cited above. The Court rejected this argument, holding that an "implied dedication" is not a "dedication" covered by section 264-1, HRS.

Instead implied dedication is a common law doctrine, not addressed or abrogated by section 264-1, HRS, or by the other statutes discussed above. The Court articulated a strict standard for statutory abrogation of common law rights:

The Hawaii Revised Statutes, and in particular, HRS §§ 264-1(c)(1), 171-30, 26-7, 107-10, and 520-7, do not "imperatively require" abrogation of common law implied dedication, nor do they evince an express legislative intent to do so. Minneapolis Fire & Marine Ins. v. Matson Nav. Co., 44 Haw. 59, 67-68, 352 P.2d 335, 340 (1960); Burns Int'l Sec. Servs., Inc. v. Dep't of Transp., 66 Haw. 607, 611, 671 P.2d 446, 449 (1983).

140 Haw. at 452, 403 P.3d at 229.

Op. No. 17-1

The Honorable Suzanne D. Case
December 11, 2017
Page 14

We believe the Court would view the statutes in the same way with respect to land gained by erosion or sea level rise -- there is no express intention to abrogate common law principles to the effect that the State owns the land without the need for affirmative action by either the Land Board or the Attorney General.

This conclusion is consistent with case law from other jurisdictions which have generally viewed a state's interest in land that may come to the public trust in the future as either a vested or contingent future interest. For example in *Severance v. Patterson*, 370 S.W.3d 705, 718 (Tex. 2012), the Texas Supreme Court said:

A person purchasing beachfront property along the Texas coast does so with the risk that her property may eventually, or suddenly, recede into the ocean. When beachfront property recedes seaward and becomes part of the wet beach or submerged under the ocean, a private property owner loses that property to the public trust.

Similarly in *Nies v. Town of Emerald Isle*, 780 S.E.2d 187 (N.C. Ct. App. 2015), cert. denied, 2017 WL 1550808 (U.S. Oct. 2, 2017) the court ruled against a taking claim. Under North Carolina common law the dry sand portion of plaintiffs' property had always been encumbered by the public trust. Thus enforcement of that public trust did not interfere with or "take" any pre-existing right. See generally Margaret E. Peloso & Margaret R. Caldwell, *Dynamic Property Rights: The Public Trust Doctrine and Takings in A Changing Climate*, 30 Stan. Envtl. L.J. 51, 87 (2011).

4. Does this result violate private owners' due process rights or constitute a "taking" of private property?

In *Application of Sanborn*, 57 Haw. 585, 596, 562 P.2d 771, 777-78 (1977), the Sanborns argued that the Court's ruling raised constitutional issues, including a takings claim.

The Sanborns contend that both the Hawaii and federal constitutions would be violated if this court fixes the Sanborns' title line along the upper reaches of the wash of waves. It is contended that such an adjudication would be a taking of private property for

Op. No. 17-1

The Honorable Suzanne D. Case
December 11, 2017
Page 15

public use without just compensation and also, by allegedly denying *res judicata* to the 1951 decree, would be a violation of due process *per se*.

The Court rejected these arguments, because its ruling was simply an application of existing Hawai'i law:

Under our interpretation of the 1951 decree, we see no constitutional infirmity. The 1951 decree recognized that the Sanbors' [sic] title extends to a line 'along high water mark'. We affirm the holding in *McCandless*, *supra*, that distances and azimuths in a land court decree are not conclusive in fixing a title line on a body of water, where the line is also described in general terms as running along the body of water.

Id. This ruling resolves the issue in state courts.

Nor are there viable federal claims, notwithstanding the suggestion to the contrary in *Sotomura v. Hawaii County*, 460 F. Supp. 473 (D. Haw. 1978). As explained in the previous section of this opinion, the possibility that private littoral land may pass into public ownership is an inherent part of the State's ownership of land. And conversely, the possibility that the seaward boundary may migrate inherently burdens private shoreline property.

This is important to the putative taking claim because the threshold question in any taking case is whether "private property" is being taken at all. As the Supreme Court put it in *Lucas v. South Carolina Coastal Council*, 505 U.S. 1003, 1027 (1992), compensation need not be paid "if the logically antecedent inquiry into the nature of the owner's estate shows that the proscribed use interests were not part of his title to begin with."

Similarly, in *Esplanade Properties, LLC v. City of Seattle*, 307 F.3d 978, 985 (9th Cir. 2002), the Ninth Circuit denied a taking claim after determining as a threshold issue that "plaintiff's claimed property right never existed" in the first place. See also *Maritrans Inc. v. U.S.*, 342 F.3d 1344, 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2003) (In deciding whether governmental action constitutes a taking of private property without just compensation, "[f]irst, a court must evaluate whether the

Op. No. 17-1

The Honorable Suzanne D. Case
December 11, 2017
Page 16

claimant has established a 'property interest' for purposes of the Fifth Amendment."); *Conti v. U.S.*, 291 F.3d 1334, 1339 (Fed. Cir. 2002) ("However, if a claimant fails to demonstrate that the interest allegedly taken constituted a property interest under the Fifth Amendment, a court need not even consider whether the government regulation was a taking."); *Raceway Park, Inc. v. Ohio*, 356 F.3d 677, 683 (6th Cir. 2004) ("[T]here is no taking if there is no private property in the first place.").

Property rights are protected by the federal and state constitutions. They are not, however, "created by the [federal] Constitution. Rather they are created and their dimensions are defined by existing rules or understandings that stem from an independent source such as state law -- rules or understandings that secure certain benefits and that support claims of entitlement to those benefits." *Board of Regents of State Colleges v. Roth*, 408 U.S. 564, 577 (1972). *Cf. Stop the Beach Renourishment, Inc. v. Florida Dept. of Env'tl. Prot.*, 560 U.S. 702, 707 (2010) ("State law defines property interests.").

As noted above, the Hawai'i Supreme Court has definitively ruled:

The loss of lands by the permanent encroachment of the waters is one of the hazards incident to littoral or riparian ownership.

Sotomura, 55 Haw. at 183, 517 P.2d at 62.

It follows that "the logically antecedent inquiry into the nature of the owner's estate shows that the proscribed use interests were not part of his title to begin with." *Lucas*, 505 U.S. at 1027. Thus there is no taking.

5. **Is the Attorney General required to give prior approval to State ownership of land by reason of erosion or sea level rise? Is the Attorney General required to approve as to legality and form documents relating to land owned by the State by reason of erosion or sea level rise?**

As shown by the discussion of question 3, ownership of land by erosion or sea level rise occurs pursuant to the common law and is a ripening of a pre-existing inchoate right in the land. This ripening is not an acquisition of land and the State is not acquiring land within the meaning of those statutes. It follows

Op. No. 17-1

The Honorable Suzanne D. Case
December 11, 2017
Page 17

that the Attorney General does not have to review the ownership change and does not have to review or approve "documents relating to" the ownership.

We note that all of the cases discussed above (*Ashford*, *Sotomura*, *Sanborn*, and *Napeahi*) were decided after enactment of the three laws. None of the cases imposed the additional requirement that the Attorney General or the Board approve State ownership. In light of those cases, we do not believe the Supreme Court would require Attorney General approval. See *Gold Coast*, 140 Haw. at 455, 403 P.3d at 232: "These provisions express no intent to abrogate common law implied dedication, nor have they ever been mentioned by our courts as having any relevance to the doctrine."

Conversely, we do not believe the Court would uphold a hypothetical refusal by the Attorney General to approve ownership by reason of change in the shoreline.

6. Can the Board require the former landowner to pay fair market value in order to obtain an easement or other interest in land now owned by the State?

Not only can the Board require a former landowner to pay fair market value, but it must do so under current law. Applicable statutes specifically require fair market value in most cases. See, e.g., section 171-13, HRS (requiring that easements be sold for fair market value determined pursuant to section 171-17(b), HRS).

This requirement could be changed by the Legislature. We understand that the Department has introduced appropriate legislation but has not been successful.

CONCLUSION


For these reasons, we conclude that the State owns additional public land resulting when the shoreline has migrated landward or mauka due to erosion or sea level rise, that this migration does not give rise to a constitutional claim by the former owner, that this result is not affected by laws relating to the acquisition of real property, that the Attorney General

Op. No. 17-1

The Honorable Suzanne D. Case
December 11, 2017
Page 18

does not need to give prior approval in connection with such land, and that the Board can and should charge former owners fair market value in return for an easement interest in the land.

Very truly yours,



William J. Wynhoff
Deputy Attorney General

APPROVED:



Douglas S. Chin
Attorney General

WJW:w

Op. No. 17-1

**Exhibit B- Documentation of Land Acquisition Regarding
the Subject Beach Reserve TMK: (1) 3-9-002-029**



R-369
STATE OF HAWAII
BUREAU OF CONVEYANCES
RECORDED
MAY 06, 2005 08:01 AM
Doc No(s) 2005-090885



/s/ CARL T. WATANABE
REGISTRAR OF CONVEYANCES
CONVEYANCE TAX: \$1.00

40 2/25 Z6

LAND COURT SYSTEM REGULAR SYSTEM
AFTER RECORDATION, RETURN BY MAIL[XX] PICKUP[]G:\Client
Files\Maunaloa Bay Beach Ohana\DEED HBBO 29 4-13-2005.wpd

Kamehameha Schools
P.O. Box 3466
Honolulu, Hawaii 96801

354364A
TGOH 200522081
TGES AS-101-1166
BARBARA PAULO

This Document contains 40 pages.

Tax Map Key No. (1) 3-9-002-029

**QUITCLAIM DEED WITH COVENANTS;
AGREEMENT AND LIEN**

KNOW BY ALL MEN THESE PRESENTS:

That DIANE JOYCE PLOTTS, ROBERT KALANI UICHI KIHUNE, JAMES DOUGLAS KEAHOUE ING, CONSTANCE HEE LAU and CHARLES NAINOA THOMPSON, as Trustees of the Estate of Bernice Pauahi Bishop, whose post office address is 567 South King Street, Kawaiahao Plaza, Suite 200, Honolulu, Hawaii 96813 ("Grantor"), in consideration of TEN AND NO/100 UNITED STATES DOLLARS (U.S. \$10.00) and other valuable consideration paid by MAUNALUA BAY BEACH OHANA #29, a Hawaii non-profit corporation, having its address at 735 Bishop Street, Suite 433, Honolulu, Hawaii 96813 ("Grantee"), receipt whereof is hereby acknowledged, does hereby remise, release and forever quitclaim all of that certain real property more particularly described in Exhibit "A" attached hereto and incorporated herein by this reference, together with all sea walls and other improvements located thereon

Jeffrey S. Grad
Attorney At Law
A Law Corporation

A 000825

EXHIBIT "G"

("Property"), unto Grantee, as Tenant in Severalty, in fee simple.

AND the reversions, remainders, rents, issues and profits thereof and all of the estate, right, title and interest of Grantor, both at law and in equity, therein and thereto;

TO HAVE AND TO HOLD the same, together with all rights, easements, privileges and appurtenances thereon and thereunto belonging or appertaining or held and enjoyed therewith, unto Grantee, absolutely and forever, according to the tenancy set forth hereinabove, forever.

AND Grantee acknowledges and agrees that this conveyance is "AS IS, WHERE IS," and Grantor has not made and does not make any warranties or representations of any kind, expressed or implied, as to Grantor's title in or to the Property or any other property or rights quitclaimed hereby, as to the conditions, merchantability or state of repair of the Property or any other property or rights quitclaimed hereby, or fitness of the Property or any other property or rights quitclaimed hereby, for any particular purpose;

AND Grantee hereby acknowledges that Grantor is not responsible for any latent defects, hidden defects or defects which time may reveal with respect to said Property;

AND Grantee, Grantee's successors, assigns, agents and representatives, generally, fully completely and unconditionally, absolutely and irrevocably agree to indemnify, defend and hold harmless, and to release, acquit and forever discharge Grantor and its trustees, officers, directors, attorneys, agents, affiliates, employees, subsidiaries, divisions, representatives, successors and assigns, of and from any and all claims, demands, causes of actions, obligations, damages and liabilities of every kind and nature whatsoever, in law, equity or otherwise, known or unknown, suspected or unsuspected, disclosed or undisclosed, contingent or matured, asserted or unasserted (collectively, "Claims"), which Grantee or any other person may have, arising out of or relating to (i) the Property or any other property or rights quitclaimed hereby, (ii) the use or improvement of the Property for any purpose inconsistent with land use or other laws, ordinances and regulations applicable to the Property, (iii) any breach of Grantee's covenant regarding public use of the Property, and (iv) any failure by Grantor to enforce any provisions of this Deed (but excluding any Claims which accrued prior to the recordation of this Deed);

AND Grantor hereby reserves easements in the Property for access, electrical, gas and other utility purposes and for sewer, drainage and water facilities over, under, along, across

and through such Property, together with the right to grant to the State of Hawaii, City and County of Honolulu, Board of Water Supply of the City and County of Honolulu or any other appropriate governmental agency or to any public utility or other corporation or to any entity or individual, easements for such purposes over, under, across, along and through the Property, provided, however, that (1) such easement rights must be exercised in such manner as not to interfere unreasonably with the use of such Property by the owners thereof and those claiming by, through or under such owners; and (2) in connection with the installation, maintenance or repair of any facilities pursuant to any of said easements, the Property shall be promptly restored by and at the expense of the person owning and exercising such easement rights to the condition of the Property immediately prior to the exercise thereof;

AND the Grantee hereby agrees that the Property shall not, without Grantor's prior written consent, be further subdivided or consolidated and resubdivided so as to create any additional lots used for residential purposes; provided, however, that the Property or portions thereof may be consolidated with the residential lots and beach access lots immediately abutting the Property and which are listed in Exhibit "B" attached hereto and incorporated herein by this reference ("Abutting Lots"), and thereafter resubdivided to enlarge such Abutting Lots (Grantee hereby acknowledging that Grantor makes no representations, warranties or assurances with respect to such consolidation or resubdivision); and provided further, that the restrictions set forth herein shall not apply to any subdivision, consolidation, or resubdivision required to effect a public use or purpose, such as water or sewer line easements;

AND Grantee hereby acknowledges that its members and such members' respective predecessors-in-interest, exclusive of Grantor, have, upon acquisition of the Abutting Lots, been in continuous possession and made use of the Property described in Exhibit "A" and therefore: (1) Grantee is fully aware of any past or present conditions existing on the Property; (2) Grantee has conducted or has been allowed to conduct a full visual inspection of the Property, and has not been denied reasonable access to any portion of the Property; (3) Grantee has investigated to Grantee's own satisfaction the condition of the soil, water, groundwater and any structures on the Property, and any equipment or material stored on the Property; (4) Grantee's review and investigation of the condition of the Property has included consideration of the applicability and effect of all applicable laws, including hazardous materials laws; (5) Grantee acknowledges that Grantor has no liability or responsibility for any improvements currently located on the Property, including, but not limited to, any presently existing seawalls, and Grantor shall have no obligation for maintaining such seawalls or other improvements nor for making any repairs thereto; and (6) Grantee

accepts the Property in its current condition, but disclaims any obligation to maintain, repair or replace any existing seawalls comprising the Property.

AND Grantee hereby agrees that part of the consideration paid by Grantee to Grantor for the conveyance of the Property, includes the provisions of the Agreement and Lien attached hereto and made a part hereof as Exhibit "C", which are incorporated herein by reference as if fully set forth herein.

AND Grantee and its members acknowledge that Grantor's intent in conveying the Property to Grantee includes preserving the status quo regarding current public rights and uses of the Property, and therefore Grantee and its members hereby covenant that the Property which is currently being used by the public for access, customary beach activities and related recreational and community purposes, may continue to be used for such purposes in perpetuity (the "Permitted Uses"), but subject to reasonable rules established by Grantee and its members to ensure that the public does not unreasonably interfere with the use and enjoyment of the Property by Grantee's members ("Rules"), as long as the Rules do not circumvent the Permitted Uses. Grantee is not required to permit any activities which alter the above-referenced status quo. Grantee understands that no improvements are required to be provided, modified or removed in order to satisfy the covenants contained in this paragraph.

Any dispute regarding the Rules which cannot be resolved by mutual agreement, shall be submitted to binding arbitration before one neutral arbitrator agreed to by the parties within thirty (30) days following notice from the party requesting arbitration of the dispute. If the parties are unable to agree upon an arbitrator, then the arbitrator shall be selected under the Arbitration Rules, Procedures and Protocols of Dispute Prevention & Resolution, Inc., or a similar organization in effect at the time ("DPR's Rules"). The decision of the arbitrator shall be final and binding on both parties, their respective legal representatives, successors and assigns, and judgment may be entered thereon in an appropriate court of law pursuant to Hawaii Revised Statutes Chapter 658A, as amended ("Chapter 658A"). The parties each shall pay one-half (2) of the arbitrator's fees, and the dispute resolution organization's charges. The parties agree that the arbitrator shall have the authority to award attorneys' fees and costs, and if the arbitrator decides not to award attorneys' fees and costs, the parties shall each bear its own expenses of arbitration, including their own attorneys' fees and costs. Notwithstanding any provision contain in DPR's Rules or Chapter 658A, the parties and the arbitrator shall be bound by the following: (a) the arbitrator shall not have the authority to determine an award of punitive damages or other exemplary relief and the parties waive any right to seek the same, or (b) the arbitrator shall not have

the authority to determine any dispute involving other parties, (c) the parties waive any right to discovery and each party agrees that it shall not request that the arbitrator issue a subpoena to compel a deposition or other discovery, and (d) the arbitrator shall issue its decision based on submissions by the parties without the need for a hearing. In furtherance of the foregoing, each party hereby voluntarily and knowingly waives and relinquishes any right to a trial by jury in any action, proceeding or counterclaim brought by any party against the other as to any dispute regarding the Rules.

AND this instrument has been approved or executed by the Trustees of the Estate of Bernice Pauahi Bishop in their fiduciary capacities as said Trustees, and not in their individual capacities. No personal liability or obligations under this instrument shall be imposed or assessed against said Trustees in their individual capacities;

AND the undersigned hereby agree that this instrument may be executed in counterparts, each of which shall be deemed an original, and said counterparts shall together constitute one and the same instrument, binding all of the parties hereto, notwithstanding that all of the parties are not signatories to the original or the same counterparts. For all purposes, including, without limitation, recordation, filing and delivery of this instrument, duplicate, unexecuted and unacknowledged pages of the counterparts may be discarded and the remaining pages assembled as one document.

The covenants of Grantee and its members contained herein shall run with the Property, shall be jointly and severally binding upon the person, or persons identified above as "Grantee" and Grantee's members, and their respective successors and assigns, and shall run in favor of and inure to the benefit of the person or persons identified above as "Grantor" and Grantor's successors in trust and assigns. The covenants of Grantee and its members regarding the Permitted Uses of the Property shall also run in favor of and inure to the benefit of the public, including without limitation, the Grantee, the Portlock Community Association, the City and County of Honolulu and the State of Hawaii. Notwithstanding the foregoing, (a) the covenants of Grantee contained herein shall terminate as to any portion of the Property that is conveyed in any condemnation action, provided that such conveyance shall not operate to release Grantee from any claims with respect thereto and which accrued prior to such conveyance, and further provided that such termination of Grantee's covenants shall not affect the remainder of the Property not so conveyed, and (b) upon any other conveyance of fee title to the Property, if the grantee expressly assumes Grantee's covenants hereunder, then the grantor shall be released of liability therefor (except for claims which accrued

prior to such conveyance), from and after the date of such conveyance.

The use herein of the singular in reference to a party shall include the plural and the use of a pronoun of any gender shall include all genders. The term "person" shall include an individual, partnership, association or corporation, as the context may require.

[The remainder of this page is intentionally left blank - signature page follows]

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties hereto have executed
these presents this ____ day of APR 22 2005, 2005.

TRUSTEES OF THE ESTATE OF
BERNICE PAUANI BISHOP, as
aforesaid

Approved as to Content,
Authority,
and Compliance with KS Policy:

Philip Nere
Manager

BT, Edve
Vice President/Director

Approved as to Form:

US
Legal Group

Ken P. P.
Retained Counsel

By *Louanne K. L. Kam*
Name: LOUANNE KAM, Director
Their Attorney-in-Fact

By *Dana K. Sato*
Name: DANA SATO, Sr. Counsel
Their Attorney-in-Fact

Grantor

**MAUNALUA BAY BEACH OHANA #29, a
Hawaii non-profit corporation**


By: Bruce Chin
Its Secretary

By: _____
Its _____

"Grantee"

STATE OF HAWAII)
) SS.
CITY AND COUNTY OF HONOLULU)

On this 26th day of April, 2005, before me personally appeared Daniel Rubin and _____ and I being duly sworn, did say that such person(s) executed the foregoing instrument as the free act and deed of such person(s), and if applicable, in the capacity shown, having been duly authorized to execute such instrument in such capacity.



Notary Public,
above mentioned State NORTH M. Iba.
My Commission expires: 10/12/07

MAUNALUA BAY BEACH OHANA #29, a
Hawaii non-profit corporation

By:

Mary Chin Dang

MARY CHIN DANG, as Trustee under
that unrecorded Mary Chin Dang 1998
Qualified Personal Residence Trust

"Owner of 7005 Kalaniana'ole Hwy."

ASSOCIATED HOLDINGS LIMITED, a
Turks & Caicos Islands corporation

By

Its

By

Its

"Owner of 7015 Kalaniana'ole Hwy."

JAMES T. LEAVITT, JR.

HAI LUEN C. LEAVITT

"Owners of 7017 Kalaniana'ole Hwy.
and 201 Portlock Rd."

PORTLOCK PROPERTIES LLC, a Nevada
company

By

Its

"Owner of 207 Portlock Rd."

-B-

A 000833

MAUNALUA BAY BEACH OHANA #29, a
Hawaii non-profit corporation

By:

MARY CHIN DANG, as Trustee under
that unrecorded Mary Chin Dang 1998
Qualified Personal Residence Trust

"Owner of 7005 Kalaniana'ole Hwy."

ASSOCIATED HOLDINGS LIMITED, a
Turks & Caicos Islands corporation

By

Gloria Gau
Its Vice President

By

Its

"Owner of 7015 Kalaniana'ole Hwy."

James T. Leavitt, Jr.
JAMES T. LEAVITT, JR.

Hai Luen C. Leavitt
HAI LUEN C. LEAVITT

"Owners of 7017 Kalaniana'ole Hwy.
and 201 Portlock Rd."

PORTLOCK PROPERTIES LLC, a Nevada
company

By

BD
Its Member

"Owner of 207 Portlock Rd."

-8-

A 000834

10

KOKO HEAD HOLDINGS, LLC, a Nevada
limited liability company

By Tracey R.
Its Member

"Owner of 219 A Portlock Rd."

POP INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION, Co.
Ltd., a Japan corporation

By Takeshi Tanaka
Its PRESIDENT
TAKESHI TANAKA

By _____
Its _____

PI CO., LTD., a Japan corporation

By Takeshi Tanaka
Its PRESIDENT
TAKESHI-TANAKA

By _____
Its _____

GALERIE DE POP CO., LTD., a Japan corporation

By Tanaka
Its PRESIDENT
TAKEISHI, TANAKA

By _____
Its _____

POP CO., LTD., a Japan corporation

By Tanaka
Its PRESIDENT

By Tanaka
Its TAKESHI TANAKA

~~POP GROUP CORPORATION CO., LTD., a~~
~~Japan corporation~~

By _____
Its _____

By _____
Its _____

U.P. COMPANY, CO., LTD., a Japan corporation

By Tanaka
Its PRESIDENT

By Tanaka
Its TAKESHI TANAKA

"Owners of 227 A Portlock Rd. and
237 Portlock Rd."

ROBERT S. WELLS

CHRISTA B. WELLS

"Owners of 245 Portlock Rd."

POP CO., LTD., a Japan corporation

By _____
Its

By _____
Its

POP GROUP CORPORATION CO., LTD., a
Japan corporation

By _____
Its

By _____
Its


U.P. COMPANY, CO., LTD., a Japan
corporation

By _____
Its

By _____
Its

"Owners of 227 A Portlock Rd. and
237 Portlock Rd."


ROBERT S. WELLS


CHRISTA B. WELLS

"Owners of 245 Portlock Rd."

SIMONS HAWAII LLC., a Delaware
limited liability corporation

By Andre M. Simons
its Manager

"Owner of 251 Portlock Rd."

DWB 1 LLC, a Hawaii limited
liability company

By _____
Its

"Owner of 255 Portlock Rd."

Grantee

-11-

A 000838

14

SIMONS HAWAII LLC., a Delaware
limited liability corporation

By _____
Its

"Owner of 251 Portlock Rd."

DWB 1 LLC, a Hawaii limited
liability company

By  DwB LLC
its Managing Member

"Owner of 255 Portlock Rd."

Grantee


-11-

A 000839

15

STATE OF HAWAII)
) ss.
CITY AND COUNTY OF HONOLULU)


On this 22 day of April, 2005, before me personally appeared LOUANN KAM, Director and DANA SATO, Sr. Counsel, to me personally known, who being by me duly sworn, did say that they are two of the attorneys-in-fact for DIANE JOYCE PLOTTS, ROBERT KALANI UICHI KIHUNE, JAMES DOUGLAS KEAHOUE ING, CONSTANCE HEE LAU and CHARLES NAINOA THOMPSON, Trustees of the Estate of Bernice Pauahi Bishop, duly appointed under Limited Power of Attorney and Revocation of All Previous Powers of Attorney effective February 1, 2004, recorded in the Bureau of Conveyances of the State of Hawaii as Document Nos. 2004-012327 and 2004-012328 and in the Office of the Assistant Registrar of the Land Court of the State of Hawaii as Document Nos. 3057130 and 3057131; and that the foregoing instrument was executed in the name and on behalf of DIANE JOYCE PLOTTS, ROBERT KALANI UICHI KIHUNE, JAMES DOUGLAS KEAHOUE ING, CONSTANCE HEE LAU and CHARLES NAINOA THOMPSON, Trustees of the Estate of Bernice Pauahi Bishop, by such persons in their capacities as attorneys-in-fact; and they acknowledged the instrument to be the free act and deed of the Trustees of the Estate of Bernice Pauahi Bishop, as aforesaid.



Lori Kaneshiro
Notary Public, in and for said
State
LORI KANESHIRO
Notary Public, State of Hawaii
My commission expires September 14, 2007
(Print/Type Name)
My Commission Expires: _____

STATE OF HAWAII)
) SS.
CITY AND COUNTY OF HONOLULU)

On this 10th day of April, 2005, before me personally appeared MARY CHIN DANG, as Trustee under that unrecorded Mary Chin Dang 1998 Qualified Personal Residence Trust, to me known to be such person described in and who executed the foregoing instrument and acknowledged that such person executed the same as such person's free act and deed as Trustee aforesaid.



Emily L. Foster, Notary Public,
above mentioned State
My Commission expires: February 14, 2007

(ASSOCIATED HOLDINGS)

STATE OF HAWAII)
CITY AND COUNTY OF HONOLULU) SS.

On this 4th day of April, 2005, before me personally appeared Alicia Yab and _____, to me personally known, who, being by me duly sworn or affirmed, did say that such person(s) executed the foregoing instrument as the free act and deed of such person(s), and if applicable, in the capacity shown, having been duly authorized to execute such instrument in such capacity.



Greg S. Honda, Notary Public,
above mentioned State

My Commission expires: 7/20/2007

A 000842

STATE OF HAWAII)
) SS.
CITY AND COUNTY OF HONOLULU)

On this 4th day of April, 2005, before me personally appeared JAMES T. LEAVITT, JR. and HAI LUEN C. LEAVITT, known to me to be such persons described in and who executed the foregoing instrument and acknowledged that such persons executed the same as such persons' free act and deed.



Greg S. Stone, Notary Public,
above mentioned State

My Commission expires: 7/20/2007

(PORTLOCK PROPERTIES)

STATE OF HAWAII

)
) SS.

CITY AND COUNTY OF HONOLULU

On this 4th day of April, 2005, before me personally appeared Bruce Robt and Greg S. Honda to me personally known, who, being by me duly sworn or affirmed, did say that such person(s) executed the foregoing instrument as the free act and deed of such person(s), and if applicable, in the capacity shown, having been duly authorized to execute such instrument in such capacity.



Greg S. Honda, Notary Public,
above mentioned State

My Commission expires: 7/20/2007

A 000844

(KOKO HEAD HOLDINGS)

STATE OF HAWAII)
CITY AND COUNTY OF HONOLULU) SS.

On this 4th day of Apr, 2005, before me personally appeared Bruce Robin and to me personally known, who, being by me duly sworn or affirmed, did say that such person(s) executed the foregoing instrument as the free act and deed of such person(s), and if applicable, in the capacity shown, having been duly authorized to execute such instrument in such capacity.



Greg S. Honda, Notary Public,
above mentioned State

My Commission expires: 7/20/2007

JAPAN)
CITY OF TOKYO) SS:
EMBASSY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA)

Yoshiaki Gotoh
Consular Associate

Before me, _____, Consul of the
United States of America at Tokyo, Japan, duly commissioned
and qualified, personally appeared

**** Takeshi TANAKA ****

who, being duly sworn, deposes and says:

That he/she is the President

of POP INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION, Co., Ltd.,

and that the foregoing instrument was signed in behalf of
said corporation by authority of its board of directors and
that said officer acknowledged said instrument to be the
free act and deed of said corporation.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF I have hereunto set my hand and official
seal this _____ day of _____, A.D. APR 12 2005.

Yoshiaki Gotoh
Consular Associate

Consul of the United States of America at Tokyo, Japan, duly
commissioned and qualified

A 000846

JAPAN)
CITY OF TOKYO) SS:
EMBASSY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA)

Carl Watson

Before me, American Vice Consul, Consul of the
United States of America at Tokyo, Japan, duly commissioned
and qualified, personally appeared


TAKESHI. TANAKA

who, being duly sworn, deposes and says:

That he/she is the president
of PI. CO, LTD

and that the foregoing instrument was signed in behalf of
said corporation by authority of its board of directors and
that said officer acknowledged said instrument to be the
free act and deed of said corporation.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF I have hereunto set my hand and official
seal this _____ day of _____, A.D. APR 14 2005.

 Carl Watson
American Vice Consul

Consul of the United States of America at Tokyo, Japan, duly
commissioned and qualified

A 000847

JAPAN)
CITY OF TOKYO) SS:
EMBASSY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA)

Carl Watson

Before me, American Vice Consul, Consul of the
United States of America at Tokyo, Japan, duly commissioned
and qualified, personally appeared

TAKESHI. TANAKA

who, being duly sworn, deposes and says:

That he/she is the president
of GALERIE DE POP. COLTD

and that the foregoing instrument was signed in behalf of
said corporation by authority of its board of directors and
that said officer acknowledged said instrument to be the
free act and deed of said corporation.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF I have hereunto set my hand and official
seal this _____ day of _____, A.D. APR 14 2005.

Carl Watson

Carl Watson
American Vice Consul
Consul of the United States of America at Tokyo, Japan, duly
commissioned and qualified

A 000848

JAPAN)
CITY OF TOKYO) SS:
EMBASSY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA)

Carl Watson
Before me, American Vice Consul, Consul of the
United States of America at Tokyo, Japan, duly commissioned
and qualified, personally appeared

TAKESHI. TANAKA
who, being duly sworn, deposes and says:

That he/she is the President
of P.O.P CO LTD

and that the foregoing instrument was signed in behalf of
said corporation by authority of its board of directors and
that said officer acknowledged said instrument to be the
free act and deed of said corporation.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF I have hereunto set my hand and official
seal this _____ day of _____, A.D. APR 14 2015.

 Carl Watson
American Vice Consul
Consul of the United States of America at Tokyo, Japan, duly
commissioned and qualified

A 000849

JAPAN)
 CITY OF TOKYO) SS:
 EMBASSY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA)

Carl Watson

American Vice Consul

Before me, _____, Consul of the
 United States of America at Tokyo, Japan, duly commissioned
 and qualified, personally appeared

TAKESHI. TANAKA

who, being duly sworn, deposes and says:

That he/she is the president
 of V.P COMPANY CO. LTD

and that the foregoing instrument was signed in behalf of
 said corporation by authority of its board of directors and
 that said officer acknowledged said instrument to be the
 free act and deed of said corporation.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF I have hereunto set my hand and official
 seal this _____ day of _____, A.D. APR 14 2005.

Carl Watson

American Vice Consul

[Signature]
 Consul of the United States of America at Tokyo, Japan, duly
 commissioned and qualified

A 000850

24

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
) SS.
COUNTY OF _____)

On this 4th day of April, 2005, before me personally appeared ROBERT S. WELLS and CHRISTA B. WELLS, known to me to be such persons described in and who executed the foregoing instrument and acknowledged that such persons executed the same as such persons' free act and deed.

Arly S. Honder, Notary Public,
above mentioned State

My Commission expires: 4/20/2005



(SIMONS HAWAII)

STATE OF HAWAII)
) SS.
CITY AND COUNTY OF HONOLULU)

On this 7 day of April, 2005, before me personally appeared Janara M. Simms and _____ to me personally known, who, being by me duly sworn or affirmed, did say that such person(s) executed the foregoing instrument as the free act and deed of such person(s), and if applicable, in the capacity shown, having been duly authorized to execute such instrument in such capacity.

Stacie L. Ikei, Notary Public,
above mentioned State
My Commission expires: 11/6/06

A 000852

(DWB 1 LLC)

STATE OF HAWAII)
CITY AND COUNTY OF HONOLULU) SS.

On this 4th day of April, 2005, before me personally appeared Daniel Jay Roberts and Greg S. Honda, to me personally known, who, being by me duly sworn or affirmed, did say that such person(s) executed the foregoing instrument as the free act and deed of such person(s), and if applicable, in the capacity shown, having been duly authorized to execute such instrument in such capacity.



Greg S. Honda, Notary Public,
above mentioned State

My Commission expires: 7/30/2007

A 000853

EXHIBIT "A"

Beach Reserve A

Tax Map Key: (1) 3-9-002-029

Real property situated at Maunalua, Koolauopoko, Oahu, Hawaii

Being a portion of the Beach Reserve of Maunalua Beach Subdivision, Section A, being also portion of Royal Patent 4475, Land Commission Award 7713, Apana 30 to Victoria Kamamalu and more particularly described as follows:

FIRST: Beginning at the most northerly corner of this parcel of land, being the most westerly corner of Lot 3 of Maunalua Beach Subdivision, Section A, the coordinates of said point of beginning referred to Government Survey Triangulation Station "KOKO HEAD 3" being 6,042.04 feet North and 2,094.35 feet West and thence running by azimuths measured clockwise from True South:

- | | | | |
|----|--------------|--------|--|
| 1. | 330° 30' | 87.70 | feet along- Lot 3 of Maunalua Beach Subdivision, Section A; |
| 2. | 328° 49' 30" | 172.64 | feet along Lot 4, Lane A, and Lot 5 of Maunalua Beach Subdivision, Section A; |
| 3. | 334° 30' | 451.37 | feet along Lot 6, Lane B, Lots 7 and 8, Lane C, Lots 9 and 10, Lane D and Lot 11 of Maunalua Beach Subdivision, Section A; |
| 4. | 346° 29' | 179.10 | feet along Lot 12, Lane E, and Lot 13 of Maunalua Beach Subdivision, Section A; |
| 5. | 79° 00' | 20.00 | feet along the remainder of said Beach Reserve to the High Water Mark; |

6. Thence along said High Water Mark, the direct azimuth and distance between points on said High Water Mark being:

155° 33' 09" 875.93 feet;

A 000854

30

7. 228' 10' 18.00 feet along Lot 2-B of Maunalua Beach Subdivision, Section A, to the point of beginning.

SECOND: Hereby conveying the foregoing and any other right, title or interest of Grantor in the following to the extent that such is not included in the foregoing description:

1. Any interest of Grantor in lands and improvements included in Tax Map Key No. (1) 3-9-002-029;

2. Any interest of Grantor in lands and improvements located between (a) the east (makai) boundaries of the following lots within the Maunalua Beach Subdivision, Section A: Lots 3 through 13 inclusive, and Lanes A through E, inclusive and (b) the mauka boundary of the State's submerged seaward property.

TOGETHER WITH all accreted lands and all rights with respect thereto, including the right to assert the existence of such lands.

SUBJECT, HOWEVER, TO all encumbrances, whether recorded or unrecorded.

END OF EXHIBIT "A"

G:\Client Files\Maunalua Bay Beach Ohana\Beach Reserve A Exhibit A 4-25-2005.wpd

A 000855

31

EXHIBIT "B"

All of those certain parcels of land (being portion of the land(s) described in and covered by Royal Patent 4475, Land Commission Award 7713, Apana 30 to v. Kamamalu) hereafter identified, situate, lying and being at Maunalua, City and County of Honolulu, State of Hawaii, and comprising portions of Block 1, Section A of the Maunalua Beach Subdivision as shown on Bishop Estate Map 1227 -C filed in the Office of Trustees of the Estate of Bernice Pauahi Bishop, Deceased:

Lot Numbers

1-B	7
2-B	8
3	9
3-A	10
4	11
4-A	12
5	13
6	A-E, inclusive

END OF EXHIBIT "B"

EXHIBIT "C"
AGREEMENT AND LIEN

1. Grantee shall not sell, convey or otherwise transfer any interest in the Property, except as follows:

a. Grantee may convey the fee simple interest in that portion of the Property immediately abutting an Abutting Lot (a "Beach Reserve"), to the owner of said Abutting Lot ("Lot Owner"), upon the following conditions:

(i) The Lot Owner must be a member of Grantee ("Member"), if Grantee legally exists as of the date of the conveyance.

(ii) Such conveyance is made for no consideration other than (aa) reimbursement by the Member of its pro rata share of Grantee's costs and expenses relating to the Property, plus interest at the rate of ten percent (10%) per annum from the date that such costs or expenses were incurred (collectively, the "Costs"), and (bb) if Grantee no longer exists of the date of such conveyance, then a payment equal to the "Membership Fee" (together with interest thereon) which otherwise would have been chargeable in accordance with paragraph 2.a below. The amounts received in lieu of Membership Fees will be used solely for the costs and expenses of owning and maintaining the Property, and for no other purpose.

(iii) The Member expressly agrees in the conveyance document from Grantee to the Member, that the Beach Reserve may continue to be used by the public for access, customary beach activities and related recreational and community purposes, in perpetuity, but subject to reasonable rules established by Grantee as set forth in this Deed, as expressed in paragraph 3.b below.

Failure to satisfy all of the foregoing conditions shall render such sale, transfer or conveyance void.

b. Grantee may convey the Property in fee simple to all Members of Grantee as tenants in common, or to a non-profit entity beneficially owned by all Members ("Entity"), upon the following conditions:

(i) Such conveyance is made for no consideration other than the Costs.

(ii) The Members or the Entity (as the case may be) expressly agrees in the conveyance document from Grantee to the Members or the Entity, that the Property may continue to be

used by the public for access, customary beach activities and related recreational and community purposes, in perpetuity, but subject to reasonable rules established by Grantee, as set forth in this Deed.

Failure to satisfy all of the foregoing conditions shall render such sale, transfer or conveyance void.

2. Any Lot Owner may become a Member after the date of recordation of this Deed, upon satisfaction of the following conditions:

a. The Lot Owner shall pay to Grantee a membership fee of Twenty-Five Thousand and No/100 Dollars (\$25,000.00), together with interest thereon at the rate of ten percent (10%) per annum from the date of recordation of this Deed (the "Membership Fee"). Grantee agrees that the Membership Fee will be used solely for the costs and expenses of owning and maintaining the Property, and for no other purpose.

b. The Lot Owner has recorded or shall record at its sole cost and expense, a Declaration of Covenants covering the Abutting Lot, in the form attached hereto as Exhibit C-1.

3. Except for the conveyances of Beach Reserves to Members or the Entity, as described in Section 1 above, all other sales, transfers or conveyances (including by agreement of sale or condemnation) by Grantee of the Property or any Beach Reserve, or any portion thereof or interest therein, shall be subject to the following conditions:

a. At the time of such sale, transfer or conveyance, Grantee shall pay to Grantor an amount equal to the purchase price, condemnation proceeds and other consideration received by Grantee, less all costs and expenses incurred by Grantee in connection with the Property (the "KS Consideration"); provided, however, that if such conveyance is by condemnation occurring after the seventh (7th) anniversary of the date of recordation of this Deed, then the amount payable by Grantee to Grantor shall be one-half (½) of the KS Consideration. To the extent that Grantee improved the Property, and such improvements were recognized as adding value to the Property by the person or condemning authority acquiring the Property from Grantee, the Grantee may deduct such amount from the KS Consideration. If the condemning authority files an action to acquire all or any portion of the Property, and Grantor is not named as a party in the action, Grantee shall, within thirty (30) days of becoming aware of the filing of the action, notify Grantor in writing of the filing of the action and support any request made by Grantor to intervene in the action. Grantee's support of Grantor's request to intervene in the action shall, at a minimum, include a written

statement to or filing with the court that: (i) Grantor should be allowed to appear, plead and defend with respect to Grantor's interest in the property that is the subject of the action, and (ii) Grantor is, within the meaning of Hawaii Revised Statutes Section 101-21, a person having a claim or interest in the property sought to be condemned, or in the damages for the taking thereof.

b. The grantee in such sale, transfer or conveyance shall expressly agree in the conveyance document from Grantee to such grantee, that the Property or Beach Reserve or portion thereof, which is currently being used by the public for access, customary beach activities and related recreational and community purposes, may continue to be used for such purposes in perpetuity, but subject to reasonable rules established by Grantee as set forth in this Deed. The grantee in such sale is not required to permit any activities which alter the above-referenced status quo, and will not be required to provide, modify or remove any improvements in order to satisfy the covenants contained in this paragraph. In addition, if such grantee owns an Abutting Lot, then the grantee shall have recorded or simultaneously records at its sole cost and expense, a Declaration of Covenants covering the Abutting Lot, in the form attached hereto as Exhibit C-1.

c. In order to secure the obligations set forth in this Agreement, a lien on the Property shall exist in favor of Grantor, which lien shall be prior and superior to all other liens except for real property taxes. The lien may be foreclosed by Grantor in like manner as a mortgage of real property. Any judgment rendered in any action filed by Grantor to collect unpaid sums shall include all costs and expenses incurred by Grantor in connection with such action, including reasonable attorneys' fees. Grantor may bid on the Property at foreclosure, and acquire and hold, lease, mortgage and convey the same. An action to recover a money judgment for unpaid sums shall be maintainable without foreclosing or waiving the lien securing the same. The order of application of payments received from such foreclosure or action shall be as follows: (1) attorneys' fees, costs and other expenses; (2) unpaid amounts due to Grantor hereunder; and (3) the balance, if any, to Grantee. If any deficiency remains after such payments are applied, then Grantee shall be personally liable therefor, together with all costs and expenses (including reasonable attorneys' fees) incurred by Grantor in collecting such deficiency.

4. The provisions of this Agreement shall run with the Property, and shall automatically terminate (i) with respect to a Beach Reserve, upon Grantee's conveyance of the fee simple interest in such Beach Reserve to a Member or the Entity as provided in Section 1, or (ii) with respect to a conveyance

described in Section 3, upon such conveyance and the payment to Grantor of the KS Consideration. Grantor agrees to execute a recordable form of release and discharge of the lien ("**Release**") at the request of Grantee, upon a satisfactory showing by Grantee that all obligations secured by the lien have been satisfied, and upon payment by Grantee to Grantor of a reasonable documentation and review fee, and of all costs of recording the Release.

END OF EXHIBIT "C"

-32-

A 000860

74

WHEREAS, the obligations hereunder are intended to run with the land.

NOW, THEREFORE, for good and valuable consideration, the receipt of which is hereby acknowledged, Declarant hereby declares that Declarant's Property shall hereafter be held, leased, mortgaged, conveyed, used, occupied and improved subject to the following covenants.

1. Declarant acknowledges and agrees that under the Declaration of Protective Provisions described in Exhibit "A" attached to the Deed, KS has an easement for access purposes over Lane _____ described in said Exhibit "A" (the "Lane"), together with the right to grant to the State of Hawaii or the City and County of Honolulu, an easement over the Lane for such purposes. Without limiting or otherwise affecting said right, and in order to preserve public rights and uses of the Lane, Declarant hereby agrees that with respect to Declarant's undivided interest in the Lane, the public may use the Lane for pedestrian and pedestrian-related ingress and egress to the beach in perpetuity (the "Permitted Use"), but subject to reasonable rules established and amended by the owners of the Lane from time to time to ensure that the public does not interfere unreasonably with the use and enjoyment by Declarant of the Property ("Rules"), so long as the Rules do not circumvent the Permitted Use. Declarant understands that no improvements are required to be provided, modified or removed in order to satisfy the covenants contained in this paragraph.

Any dispute regarding the Rules which cannot be resolved by mutual agreement, shall be submitted to binding arbitration before one neutral arbitrator agreed to by the parties within thirty (30) days following notice from the party requesting arbitration of the dispute. If the parties are unable to agree upon an arbitrator, then the arbitrator shall be selected under the Arbitration Rules, Procedures and Protocols of Dispute Prevention & Resolution, Inc., or a similar organization in effect at the time ("DPR's Rules"). The decision of the arbitrator shall be final and binding on both parties, their respective legal representatives, successors and assigns, and judgment may be entered thereon in an appropriate court of law pursuant to Hawaii Revised Statutes Chapter 658A, as amended ("Chapter 658A"). The parties each shall pay one-half (1/2) of the arbitrator's fees, and the dispute resolution organization's charges. The parties agree that the arbitrator shall have the authority to award attorneys' fees and costs, and if the arbitrator decides not to award attorneys' fees and costs, the parties shall each bear its own expenses of arbitration, including their own attorneys' fees and costs. Notwithstanding any provision contain in DPR's Rules or Chapter 658A, the parties and the arbitrator shall be bound by the following: (a) the

arbitrator shall not have the authority to determine an award of punitive damages or other exemplary relief and the parties waive any right to seek the same, (b) the arbitrator shall not have the authority to determine any dispute involving other parties, (c) the parties waive any right to discovery and each party agrees that it shall not request that the arbitrator issue a subpoena to compel a deposition or other discovery, and (d) the arbitrator shall issue its decision based on submissions by the parties without the need for a hearing. In furtherance of the foregoing, each party hereby voluntarily and knowingly waives and relinquishes any right to a trial by jury in any action, proceeding or counterclaim brought by any party against the other as to any dispute regarding the Rules.

2. Declarant further agrees that Declarant shall use its best efforts to cause the other owners of undivided interests in the Lane to execute declarations of covenants in the same form as this Declaration, and until such declarations are recorded, Declarant agrees to take all actions against such other owners as required to enforce the public's Permitted Use of the Lane, including without limitation, court action.

3. Declarant and its successors, assigns, agents and representatives, generally, fully completely and unconditionally, absolutely and irrevocably agree to indemnify, defend and hold harmless, and to release, acquit and forever discharge KS and its trustees, officers, directors, attorneys, agents, affiliates, employees, subsidiaries, divisions, representatives, successors and assigns, of and from any and all claims, demands, causes of actions, obligations, damages and liabilities of every kind and nature whatsoever, in law, equity or otherwise, known or unknown, suspected or unsuspected, disclosed or undisclosed, contingent or matured, asserted or unasserted, which Declarant or any other person may have, arising out of or relating to (i) any breach of Declarant's covenants contained in this Declaration of Covenants, (ii) any lack or prohibition of public access through the Lane to the beach, and (iii) any failure by KS to enforce any provision of this Declaration, Declarant hereby acknowledging that KS has no responsibility therefor.

The covenants of Declarant contained herein shall run with the Property, shall be jointly and severally binding upon the person, or persons identified above as "Declarant" and their respective successors and assigns, and shall run in favor of and inure to the benefit of the person or persons identified above as "KS" and KS' successors in trust and assigns. The covenants of Declarant regarding Permitted Use of the Property shall also run in favor of and inure to the benefit of the public, including without limitation, the Maunalua Bay Beach Ohana #29 (the "Ohana"), the Portlock Community Association, the City and County of Honolulu and the State of Hawaii. Notwithstanding the

foregoing, (a) the covenants of Declarant contained herein shall terminate as to any portion of the Property that is conveyed in any condemnation action, provided that such conveyance shall not operate to release Declarant from any claims with respect thereto and which accrued prior to such conveyance, and further provided that such termination of Declarant's covenants shall not affect the remainder of the Property not so conveyed, and (b) upon any conveyance of fee title to the Property, if the grantee in writing assumes Declarant's covenants hereunder, then the grantor thereof shall be released from liability therefor (except for claims which accrued prior to such conveyance), from and after the date of such conveyance.

The use herein of the singular in reference to a party shall include the plural and the use of a pronoun of any gender shall include all genders. The term "person" shall include an individual, partnership, association or corporation, as the context may require.

This instrument has been approved by the Trustees of the Estate of Bernice Pauahi Bishop in their fiduciary capacities as said Trustees, and not in their individual capacities. No personal liability or obligations under this instrument shall be imposed or assessed against said Trustees in their individual capacities.

The undersigned hereby agree that this instrument may be executed in counterparts, each of which shall be deemed an original, and said counterparts shall together constitute one and the same instrument, binding all of the parties hereto, notwithstanding that all of the parties are not signatories to the original or the same counterparts. For all purposes, including, without limitation, recordation, filing and delivery of this instrument, duplicate, unexecuted and unacknowledged pages of the counterparts may be discarded and the remaining pages assembled as one document.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, Declarant has executed these presents this ____ day of _____, 2005.

"Declarant"

END OF EXHIBIT "C-1"

Exhibit C – DLNR Rejection of Shoreline Certification, sent June 1, 1999 and Associated Documents and Imagery



STATE OF HAWAII
DEPARTMENT OF LAND AND NATURAL RESOURCES
LAND DIVISION
P.O. BOX 621
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96809

AQUACULTURE DEVELOPMENT
PROGRAM
AQUATIC RESOURCES
BOATING AND OCEAN RECREATION
CONSERVATION AND
RESOURCES ENFORCEMENT
CONVEYANCES
FORESTRY AND WILDLIFE
HISTORIC PRESERVATION
LAND DIVISION
STATE PARKS
WATER RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

Ref.:LD-PEM

JUN - 1 1999

Mr. James Thompson, LPLS
Walter P. Thompson, Inc.
P. O. Box 3351
Honolulu, Hawaii 96801

Dear Mr. Thompson:

Subject: Shoreline Certification Request
Applicant: Walter P. Thompson, Inc.
Property Owner: Robert Wells
Location - Island: Oahu District: Honolulu
Tax Map Key: 3-9-02:03
Property Description: Lot 303, Ld Ct App 1052, Makaha, Waianae, Oahu
Land Division Case No.: QA-720

This letter is to inform you that the subject shoreline certification request has been rejected due to alleged encroachments upon State lands and to return four (4) shoreline location maps, one (1) set of photos, right-of-entry and application fee (Check No. 217795).


The alleged encroachment consists of a CRM wall located seaward of the property deed boundary.

Resolution of the alleged encroachment must be made before any re-application is accepted for processing. Please correct the alleged encroachments by adhering to the solutions recommended below:

1. Removing the alleged encroachments from State lands; or
2. Contact the Charlene Unoki, Oahu District Land Branch at 587-0433 to investigate possible alternatives to resolve the alleged encroachments.


Should you have any questions regarding this matter, please call Patti Miyashiro of our Honolulu Office at (808) 587-0430.

Very truly yours,


DEAN Y. UCHIDA
Administrator

Enclosures

c: Oahu District Land Office (w/map)
State Surveyor (w/map)



Looking North
5/6/89 1:00 p.m.

#1



Looking South
5/6/89 1:00 p.m.

#2

Exhibit D – DLNR Acceptance of Shoreline Certification, sent Oct 28, 1999 and Associated Documents and Imagery



STATE OF HAWAII
DEPARTMENT OF LAND AND NATURAL RESOURCES
LAND DIVISION
P.O. BOX 821
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96809
OCT 28 1999

AQUACULTURE DEVELOPMENT
PROGRAM
AQUATIC RESOURCES
BOATING AND OCEAN RECREATION
CONSERVATION AND
RESOURCES ENFORCEMENT
CONVEYANCES
FORESTRY AND WILDLIFE
HISTORIC PRESERVATION
LAND DIVISION
STATE PARKS
WATER RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

Ref.: LD-NV
File Number: 20A-742

Mr. James R. Thompson, LPLS
President, Walter P. Thompson, Inc.
Surveying and Mapping
720 Iwilei Road, Suite 425
P.O. Box 3351
Honolulu, Hawaii 96801

Dear Mr. Thompson:


Subject: Shoreline Certification Request
Applicant: Walter P. Thompson, Inc.
Property Owner: Robert Wells
Location - Island: Oahu, District: Maunaloa (Beach Subdivision)
Tax Map Key: 1st/ 3-9-002: 003
Land Division File No. OA-742

This is to inform you that our State Surveyor with the effective date being October 27, 1999 recommended the certification of the shoreline of the above reference property as determined on the shoreline maps submitted to us for certification. However, our transmittal of the Certified Shoreline Maps to you is being held in abeyance until the appeal deadline of November 28, 1999.

Public notice of this action has been submitted for publication in the November 8, 1999 Environmental Notice.

Should you have any questions on this matter, please feel free to contact Nicholas A. Vaccaro at 587-0438.

Very truly yours,


DEAN Y. UCHIDA
Administrator

c: Land Board Member
District Land Branch



STATE OF HAWAII
DEPARTMENT OF LAND AND NATURAL RESOURCES
LAND DIVISION

P.O. BOX 821
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96808

DEC -2 1999

AQUACULTURE DEVELOPMENT
PROGRAM
AQUATIC RESOURCES
BOATING AND OCEAN RECREATION
CONSERVATION AND
RESOURCES ENFORCEMENT
CONVEYANCES
FORESTRY AND WILDLIFE
HISTORIC PRESERVATION
LAND DIVISION
STATE PARKS
WATER RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

Ref.:

LD-NV

File Number: OA-742Final

Mr. James R. Thompson, LPLS
President, Walter P. Thompson, Inc.
Surveying and Mapping
720 Iwilei Road, Suite 425
P.O. Box 3351
Honolulu, Hawaii 96801


Dear Mr. Thompson:

Subject: Shoreline Certification
Applicant: Walter P. Thompson, Inc.
Property Owner: Robert Wells
Location - Island: Oahu, District: Maunalua
(Beach Subdivision)
Tax Map Key: 1st/ 3-9-002: 003
Land Division File No. OA-742


This is to inform you that we have completed our processing of your request for shoreline certification of the subject property.

Attached herewith are four (4) copies of the shoreline certification maps. Should you have any questions on this matter, please feel free to contact Nicholas A. Vaccaro at 587-0438.

Very truly yours,


DEAN Y. UCHIDA
Administrator

c: Land Board Member
District Land Branch
State Surveyor



Looking South
2/1/99 2:00 p.m.

***Exhibit E – DLNR Notice of Alleged Unauthorized Land Use, sent
May 14, 2009***

LINDA LINGLE
GOVERNOR OF HAWAII



STATE OF HAWAII
DEPARTMENT OF LAND AND NATURAL RESOURCES
OFFICE OF CONSERVATION AND COASTAL LAND
POST OFFICE BOX 621
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96809

LAURA H. THELEN
CHAIRPERSON
BOARD OF LAND AND NATURAL RESOURCES
COMMISSION ON WATER RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

RUSSELL Y. TSUIJI
FIRST DEPUTY

KEN C. KAWAHARA
DEPUTY DIRECTOR - WATER

AQUATIC RESOURCES
BOATING AND OCEAN RECREATION
BUREAU OF CONSERVANCIES
COMMISSION ON WATER RESOURCES MANAGEMENT
CONSERVATION AND COASTAL LANDS
CONSERVATION AND RESOURCES ENFORCEMENT
ENFORCEMENT
FORESTRY AND WILDLIFE
HISTORIC PRESERVATION
KAHOOLAWE ISLAND RESERVE COMMISSION
LAND
STATE PARKS

NOTICE OF ALLEGED VIOLATION & ORDER

REF:OCCL:AB

ENF: OA 09-44

MAY 14 2009

CERTIFIED MAIL RETURN RECEIPT

7008 1140 0001 0730 7519

Robert Wells
109 Sugarloaf Drive
Belvedere Tiburon, California 94920

**SUBJECT: Alleged Unauthorized Shoreline Use in the Conservation District at 245
Portlock Road, Honolulu, O'ahu, TMK: (1) 3-9-002:003**

Dear Mr. Wells:

The Department of Land and Natural Resources (DLNR) Office of Conservation and Coastal Lands (OCCL) received complaints regarding an alleged unauthorized seawall construction in the shoreline area located at TMK: (1) 3-9-002:003 (245 Portlock Road). DLNR staff inspected the site of the alleged unauthorized land uses on April 17, 2009 and May 6, 2009, and found unauthorized rocks and cement seaward of the shoreline fronting the property (see attached photograph).

The alleged unauthorized shoreline use appears to be located in the Conservation District, Resource subzone, which is under the jurisdiction of the State of Hawai'i. The alleged unauthorized shoreline use is not authorized by the DLNR under Chapter 13-5, HAR. OCCL has no records of approval for the shoreline use identified in the attached photograph.


This letter serves as a formal Notice of Alleged Violation & Order to stop any further land use within the Conservation District. The Department intends to bring this matter to the attention of the Board of Land and Natural Resources (BLNR) as an alleged violation of Hawai'i Revised Statute Chapter 183C-7 and rules promulgated pursuant to that chapter. If you continue to engage in land use in the Conservation District after receipt of this notice, the Department may ask the BLNR to assess a fine of up to \$15,000 per day in addition to other penalties and remedies that may already or otherwise be applicable.

Robert Wells
Page 2 of 3

ENF: OA-09-44

We recommend immediate removal of the subject material from the shoreline area. Please provide written response to this Notice of Alleged Violation & Order within 30 days. Should you have any questions regarding this matter, contact Audrey Barker of our office at (808) 587-0316 or audrey.t.barker@hawaii.gov.

Sincerely,


for Laura H. Thiesen, Chairperson
Department of Land and Natural Resources

Attachment

c: ODLO
DOCARE
City and County of Honolulu, DPP
Maunalua Bay Beach 'Ohana #29
c/o Bruce Robin
1132 Bishop Street #1406
Honolulu, Hawai'i 96813

Robert Wells
Page 3 of 3

ENF: OA-09-44

ATTACHMENT



photo taken 5/6/09

Exhibit F – Response from Mr. Wells Received by the DLNR on June 1, 2009

64694

Robert S. Wells
109 Sugarloaf Drive
Tiburon, California 94920
Wellshq@yahoo.com

RECEIVED

09 JUN -1 A 9:01

May 28, 2009

Mr. Ken Kawal
Dept of Land and Natural Resources
Box 621
Honolulu, HI 96809

DEPT. OF LAND
& NATURAL RESOURCES
STATE OF HAWAII

Ref OCCL:AB Enf:OA 09-44

Dear Mr Kawal:

RECEIVED
OFFICE OF CONSERVATION
AND COASTAL LANDS
2009 JUN -2 A 9:10
DEPT OF LAND &
NATURAL RESOURCES
STATE OF HAWAII

I recently received your letter. This matter is being handled by my representative, James Shipman, who has been in contact with your offices.

The referenced activity was a repair to the natural rock barrier that has existing on the property for decades. Its presence was obscured for many years by a vertical seawall built about 15 feet seaward of the older barrier. This seawall was removed by me in 1999. Subsequent beach replenishment from the Hawaii Kai dredging further concealed the site. Continuing erosion has exposed the older barrier. We were endeavoring to repair serious damage to the rock barrier that occurred last winter. Mr. Shipman is working on the documentation of these matters. The erosion in this area of Portlock beach has been a problem since the 1940s when the jetty was built. It affects about four properties to the north west of the jetty with the problem becoming less severe as one moves away from the jetty. As you can appreciate, there has been a long history of dealing with the problem in this area of Portlock Beach. A new beach replenishment is anticipated in 2010 in connection with the planned dredging of the Marina channel.

Very truly,

Robert S. Wells

Robert S. Wells

Exhibit G – DLNR Response to Mr. Wells, sent June 17, 2009

LINDA LINGLE
GOVERNOR OF HAWAII



STATE OF HAWAII
DEPARTMENT OF LAND AND NATURAL RESOURCES
OFFICE OF CONSERVATION AND COASTAL LAND
POST OFFICE BOX 621
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96809

LAURA H. THIELEN
CHAIRPERSON
BOARD OF LAND AND NATURAL RESOURCES
COMMISSION ON WATER RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

RUSSELL Y. TSUTSI
FIRST DEPUTY

KEN C. KAWAHARA
DEPUTY DIRECTOR - WATER

AQUATIC RESOURCES
BOATING AND OCEAN RECREATION
BUREAU OF CONVEYANCES
COMMISSION ON WATER RESOURCE MANAGEMENT
CONSERVATION AND COASTAL LANDS
CONSERVATION AND RESOURCES ENFORCEMENT
ENGINEERING
FORESTRY AND WILDLIFE
HISTORIC PRESERVATION
KABOOLAWA ISLAND RESERVE COMMISSION
LAND
STATE PARKS

REF:OCCL:AB

ENF: OA 09-44

JUN 17 2009

Robert Wells
109 Sugarloaf Drive
Belvedere Tiburon, California 94920

**SUBJECT: Alleged Unauthorized Shoreline Use in the Conservation District at 245
Portlock Road, Honolulu, O'ahu, TMK: (1) 3-9-002:003**

Dear Mr. Wells:

The Department of Land and Natural Resources (DLNR) Office of Conservation and Coastal Lands (OCCL) received your letter (dated May 28, 2009) in response to the Department's Notice and Order (dated May 14, 2009) sent to you regarding an alleged unauthorized seawall construction in the shoreline area.

According to your information, you were making repairs to a natural rock barrier that existed on the property for decades. Presence of the subject rock barrier was previously obscured by another vertical seawall built approximately 15 feet seaward of the subject barrier. You removed the seawall in 1999. Subsequent beach replenishment further concealed the rock barrier.

OCCL is still investigating the alleged violation. The rock barrier, which is the subject of the alleged unauthorized shoreline use, appears to be located in the Conservation District,¹ Resource subzone, which is under the jurisdiction of the State of Hawai'i. We have no records of authorization for the rock barrier. We recommend immediate removal of the rock barrier from the Conservation District.

We also inform you that the subject unauthorized material will prevent you from obtaining a shoreline certification should you require one in the future. Shoreline certifications, which are valid for 12 months, are required as a precedent to obtaining permits from the City and County of Honolulu for any work conducted on a shoreline lot. To remedy the situation, the unauthorized material would need to be removed.

¹ The Conservation District includes lands seaward of the shoreline.



"Cheung, Steve H."
<scheung@honolulu.gov>
05/12/2009 11:11 AM

To <Audrey.T.Barker@hawaii.gov>
cc
bcc

Subject FW: Seawall in Portlock TMK 3-9-2:3

History:

This message has been replied to.

Audrey:

Please email me or call me at 768-8114 if you need more information on this Portlock property.

Steve Cheung

From: Challacombe, Arthur D.
Sent: Tuesday, May 12, 2009 10:41 AM
To: Cheung, Steve H.
Cc: Friedel, John M.
Subject: RE: Seawall in Portlock TMK 3-9-2:3

Steve – the owner needs a permit for what he is doing, either one from us or DLNR. Definitely, he should obtain a certified shoreline survey prior to doing any work. Please work with Audrey at DLNR for follow up on this violation. Mahalo.

From: Cheung, Steve H.
Sent: Tuesday, May 12, 2009 10:34 AM
To: Challacombe, Arthur D.
Cc: Friedel, John M.
Subject: RE: Seawall in Portlock TMK 3-9-2:3

Art:

We conducted a site inspection at this Portlock property and did a comparison with the archived photos. As '89 and '91 photos showed, this property indeed had a seawall. But it looks like the old seawall has been destroyed/demolished some time between 1991 and 2007.

Steve C.

From: Friedel, John M.
Sent: Friday, May 01, 2009 2:27 PM
To: Cheung, Steve H.
Cc: Challacombe, Arthur D.; Mabuni, Earl T.
Subject: FW: Seawall in Portlock TMK 3-9-2:3
Importance: High

Steve:

Please follow-up on this matter for Art and OCCL. If needed, work with Earl.

Mike

From: Challacombe, Arthur D.
Sent: Friday, May 01, 2009 2:23 PM
To: Friedel, John M.
Cc: 'Dolan.Eversole@hawaii.gov'
Subject: FW: Seawall in Portlock TMK 3-9-2:3
Importance: High

Mike -- can you have Steve follow-up on this? Mahalo.

From: Audrey.T.Barker@hawaii.gov [mailto:Audrey.T.Barker@hawaii.gov]
Sent: Friday, May 01, 2009 1:58 PM
To: Challacombe, Arthur D.
Cc: Dolan.Eversole@hawaii.gov
Subject: Seawall in Portlock TMK 3-9-2:3

Hi Art,

OCCL received a complaint about a seawall being constructed at 245 Portlock Road (TMK 3-9-002:003). A DOCARE officer ordered the owner (Robert Wells) to cease the work until OCCL could make a determination.

The owner claims that he was not building a new seawall, but rehabbing an existing wall. OCCL has no records of any permits for the existing seawall. Does the seawall have any permits with the C&C Honolulu?

Thank you for your help,

Audrey T. Barker
Planner
State of Hawaii
Department of Land and Natural Resources
Office of Conservation and Coastal Lands
P.O. Box 621
Honolulu, Hawaii 96809-0621
Phone: 808-587-0316
Fax: 808-587-0322
audrey.t.barker@hawaii.gov

NOTICE: The information in this transmittal (including attachments, if any) is privileged and confidential and is intended only for the recipients(s) listed above. Any review, use, disclosure or copying of this transmittal is prohibited except by, or on behalf of, the intended recipient. If you have received this transmittal in error, please notify me immediately by reply email and destroy all copies of the transmittal. Thank you.



"Cheung, Steve H." <scheung@honolulu.gov>
05/12/2009 02:31 PM

To <Audrey.T.Barker@hawaii.gov>
cc
bcc
Subject RE: FW: Seawall in Portlock TMK 3-9-2:3

Hi Audrey:

We also found rocks stockpiling on the beach in neighboring lots 2 & 4.

Steve Cheung

From: Audrey.T.Barker@hawaii.gov [mailto:Audrey.T.Barker@hawaii.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, May 12, 2009 2:02 PM
To: Cheung, Steve H.
Subject: Re: FW: Seawall in Portlock TMK 3-9-2:3

Hi Steve,
Thanks for replying. We went out to the site as well and observed 3 additional violations of adjacent properties. We're sending out notices to all of them, and we'll cc DPP on the notice.

Audrey T. Barker
Planner
State of Hawaii
Department of Land and Natural Resources
Office of Conservation and Coastal Lands
P.O. Box 621
Honolulu, Hawaii 96809-0621
Phone: 808-587-0316
Fax: 808-587-0322
audrey.t.barker@hawaii.gov

NOTICE: The information in this transmittal (including attachments, if any) is privileged and confidential and is intended only for the recipients(s) listed above. Any review, use, disclosure or copying of this transmittal is prohibited except by, or on behalf of, the intended recipient. If you have received this transmittal in error, please notify me immediately by reply email and destroy all copies of the transmittal. Thank you.

"Cheung, Steve H." <scheung@honolulu.gov>

05/12/2009 11:11 AM

To <Audrey.T.Barker@hawaii.gov>
cc
Subject FW: Seawall in Portlock TMK 3-9-2:3

Audrey:

Exhibit H – City and County of Honolulu Determination Regarding Seawall Fronting Subject and Adjacent Properties, received on Jul 13, 2000

10

DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND PERMITTING
CITY AND COUNTY OF HONOLULU
650 SOUTH KING STREET • HONOLULU, HAWAII 96813
TELEPHONE: (808) 523-4414 • FAX: (808) 527-6743 • INTERNET: www.co.honolulu.hi.us/planning



JEREMY HARRIS
MAYOR

July 7, 2000

Mr. Timothy E. Johns, Director
Department of Land and
Natural Resources
State of Hawaii
Kalanimoku Building
1151 Punchbowl Street, Room 130
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Mr. Johns:

Seawalls Built at Portlock Shoreline
Tax Map Key 3-9-002; 003; 004; 005

After a year-long investigation, our department has identified that the above referenced seawalls built on the Portlock Shoreline fronting the above referenced parcels, are located on accreted lands which are within the State Conservation District.

Since structures on State District land are not within our department's jurisdiction, we are referring this matter to you for any enforcement action.

Should you have any questions, please contact Steve Cheung of our Code Compliance Branch at 527-6256.

Sincerely yours,

Randall K. Fujiki
RANDALL K. FUJIKI, AIA
Director of Planning
and Permitting

RKF:ra
g:rd\wishop1.shc

TO:
____ ADMINISTRATOR
____ ASST. ADMIN.
____ DEV. BR.
____ PLAN. BR.
____ RES. MGT. BR.
____ PROJ. CONTROL
____ SW. REC. PLAN.
____ CLERICAL STAFF
____ ADMIN. ASST.
____ INTERP. BR.
FOR:
____ CIRCULATE/POST/STAFF RM
____ COMMENTS & REC.
____ DRAFT REPLY
____ FILE
____ FOLLOW UP
____ INFO.
____ RUSH (DUE _____)
____ SEE ME
____ SEND COPY TO: _____

10/0 24584

RECEIVED
DIVISION OF
STATE PARKS
JUL 11 3 42 PM '00

RANDALL K. FUJIKI, AIA
DIRECTOR

LORETTA K.C. CHEE
DEPUTY DIRECTOR

(SHC)

RECEIVED
DIVISION OF
STATE PARKS
JUL 13 12 12 PM '00

9-00

DEPT. OF LAND
& NATURAL RESOURCES
STATE OF HAWAII

00-111-01-11-001
JUL 11 10 11 AM '00
JUL 11 10 11 AM '00
JUL 11 10 11 AM '00