

**KAKA'AKO MAKAI COMMUNITY PLANNING ADVISORY COUNCIL
MEETING #27 SUMMARY
Tuesday, June 9, 2009
HCDA Conference Room**

Meeting Materials:

- May 12, 2009 CPAC Meeting Summary and Attachments
- Kaka'ako Makai Planning Process
HCR30, 2006
HCDA July 2006 Makai Area Planning Map
HCDA April 2007 Planning Process Diagram
HCDA March 2009 Staff Report and Diagram
CPAC June 2009 Recommendations Summary, Outline and Diagram
- Community-Based Planning
Public Involvement Spectrum of Approaches
Charrette Process Strategies and Cycles

I. Preliminary Business

- A. Welcome and Introductions
CPAC Chair Wong welcomed CPAC participants.
- B. Adoption of the May 12, 2009 CPAC Meeting Summary.
The May 12, 2009 Meeting Summary was adopted by consensus.

II. HCDA Staff Reports

- A. Vision and Guiding Principles Publication Status

HCDA staff reported that in new software is bogged down in a procurement process, so instead of using this software a comment block to receive public comments on the Vision and Guiding Principles will be made available on the HCDA web site.

Comments, questions and answers:

- C. The CPAC will need to sort, review and address the comments received.
 - A. Friends of Kewalo Basin Park Association has supported providing the opportunity for public comment from the outset, and Vice Chair Iwami has suggested a meeting with HCDA and those interested to determine the best way to receive and review public comment.
 - A. (HCDA staff) HCDA staff would be happy to meet with those interested to review the process, which has some limitations. The comment block and public comments would be posted on the web site, and HCDA staff would keep track of the comments and forward them to the CPAC.
- B. Planning Consultant Selection

HCDA staff reported the following:

- The procurement process was completed and three planning consultant finalists were presently being considered through a ranking process.
- Upon selection, the scope of work will be negotiated.
- The HCDA Board has authorized \$600,000 for the Kaka'ako Makai master planning process.

C. Pending Projects Updates

1. Kaka‘ako Makai and Kewalo Basin Improvement Projects

HCDA staff reported the following Kaka‘ako Makai projects and proposals:

- The design plans for Kewalo Basin Park, Gateway Park and Waterfront Park repairs, maintenance and marina improvements and improvements have been completed, and the bidding will begin the week of June 15 for the \$3.5 million project authorized by the HCDA board.
- HCDA staff met with the Kewalo Basin stakeholders’ task force, but this was just an introductory meeting.
- The Kamehameha Schools Asia Pacific Innovation Center planning is progressing.
- Cancer Research Center of Hawaii officials met with the University of Hawaii and a contract with the developer is being negotiated.
- The Honolulu Seawater Air Conditioning project environmental impact statement has been completed and the project is on track.
- The proposed bio-containment lab would require an environmental impact statement prior to proceeding, but it would not require further HCDA approval because it would be part of the medical school complex.

2. Mother Marianne Cope Memorial

HCDA staff reported that the coconut grove fronting the net shed has been tentatively identified as a preferred site for the proposed memorial.

Friends of Kewalo Basin Park Association reported that they had been presented with the idea of placing the memorial at Kewalo Basin Park, in the area at the ‘ewa edge of the net house near the trees, behind the wall at the water’s edge. Most of those consulted have been in favor of this location in contrast to the Point Panic proposal, and the new proposal is presently being considered by Association members as the immediate stakeholders.

Previous discussion of a policy to decline piecemeal placement of features in areas prior to the overall master plan being conceived was noted, and it was recommended that while Kewalo Basin Park may not be affected in the future by the overall master plan, assurance must be retained that procedurally the policy should remain in effect for the other areas. It was also acknowledged that consideration should be given to a solution moving forward if it will not affect the overall master plan or existing established uses.

It was recommended that a CPAC site visit would be helpful once there is complete information on the design of the planned memorial at the proposed site. It was requested that HCDA provide at least two weeks’ notice prior to a regular CPAC meeting for consideration of concurrence with the proposed project.

III. Presentations – Community Based Planning

The Community-Based Planning presentation was jointly provided by two professional Honolulu urban planners:

Bruce Tsuchida, planning principle of Townscapes, Inc., provided an interactive presentation on the public involvement levels of community-based planning. Comments, questions and answers followed. (See Attachment A.)

John Whalen, planning principle of Plan Pacific, provided information on the National Charrette Institute’s charrette strategies and cycles worthy of consideration as an early functional event for the Kaka‘ako Makai planning process. Comments, questions and answers followed. (See Attachment A.)

IV. Kewalo Basin Report

Captain White reported on the May 21 Kewalo Basin stakeholders' first meeting, a discussion on ground rules for the harbor and funding for pier repairs. One problem that remains unaddressed is that it has become unsafe to unload the large boats because of the south-swell surge, and harbor management is not there on weekends.

Comments, questions and answers:

- Q. Is Kewalo Basin now being converted to recreational slips?
- A. Slips are being converted to recreational boat use at the exclusion of the commercial boats. When commercial boats attempted to enter the harbor under Act 79 of 2008, HCDA informed them that they could no longer do this because Kewalo Basin is now a private marina and not under a state agency, and Act 79 does not apply.
- Q. Are commercial boat businesses being jeopardized or compromised by recreational boats being berthed at Kewalo Basin?
- A. This is presently unknown, but it is a clear breach of the Harbors 2020 Master Plan. In addition, the fishing fleet was relocated on the premise that the slips were condemned and could not be occupied, but these slips are now being leased to recreational boats, and it is unknown if the fishing fleet was informed about returning to Kewalo Basin.
- Q. Where are these recreational boats coming from?
- A. This is unknown, they have not been seen before.
- Q. What is the new "Kandoo" operation, which has been claiming in daily full-page ads over the past two months that it offers free para-sailing and jet-skiing, has several slips at Kewalo Basin, and is employing 200 people?
- A. (HCDA staff) Commercial boats are allowed to do business at Kewalo Basin and HCDA regulates which boats can come in, but not what they do if it's an allowable use.
- A. Another operator with six slips went out of business and this new operation took over several of those older boats.
- C. It would be helpful to have the HCDA harbor management attend the next CPAC meeting.
- Q/C. Who installed the green channel marker near Point Panic? This seems like a good idea.
- A. (HCDA staff) HCDA does not install buoys, so this may have been done by DLNR or the Coast Guard.

V. CPAC Communications

Communications Committee Chair Miasnik commented on the draft press release he had prepared and presented to the Steering Committee, and noted that he would forward this to HCDA staff for release when the Vision and Guiding Principles comment block is activated on the HCDA web site.

Chair Wong acknowledged Second Vice Chair Anderson's efforts in coordinating development of a brochure to publicize the Vision and Guiding Principles for Kaka'ako Makai. Second Vice Chair Anderson reported that UH undergraduates had assisted with the project. Chair Wong noted that this work in progress would be discussed by the Steering Committee, and suggested the addition of a map or other identifying illustration to acquaint unfamiliar readers with the subject area. It was further suggested that Point Panic surf photographers could be approached to provide photographs, which would help add color and life to illustrate as much energy in the presentation as in the work behind it.

Secretary Matson noted the June 5 deadline for comments to the Governor's office in support of the enactment of Senate Bill 1069, and explained that the Governor must notify the Legislature by June 30 of any intent to veto bills by the July 15 deadline. She added that several letters of support for Senate Bill 1069 had been sent to the Governor, and suggested that discussion at the June 16 Steering Committee meeting might further address the timing of any CPAC comments if or when needed and for which she had provided a list of points. ***It was agreed by consensus that the Steering Committee would draft comments in support for Senate Bill 1069.***

VI. CPAC Planning Process

Chair Wong reported that the final refinement of the CPAC's recommendations for the master plan consultant's scope of work was pushed forward unexpectedly a few days following the May 19 Steering Committee meeting, when HCDA staff advised that they needed to have the scope of work recommendations before the next CPAC meeting, and a meeting was scheduled with HCDA staff on June 4 to present and discuss the recommendations as provided with this meeting's material. He highlighted the following objectives based on previous CPAC discussions:

- Reiterating the CPAC's role in planning process
- Ensuring that the scope of work reflects CPAC representation of the public's strong position in the planning process
- Stressing that consultant information-gathering and collaborative dialog on sustainability concepts should take place in the process as early as possible to be effective
- Clarifying that the recommended the planning process diagram illustrates the levels of participation in relationship to the various phases

Secretary Matson summarized the following:

- The two-page summary of the scope of work recommendations was developed from comments at Steering Committee and CPAC meetings, and attached to this summary is the more specific scope of work outline and comprehensive planning process diagram.
- Five Steering Committee members who contributed to the recommendations were present to present them to HCDA staff, answer questions and provide any needed clarifications.
- It was agreed that the Vision and Guiding Principles adopted by the CPAC would be used as the foundation for the planning process, and up to five CPAC representatives would participate on the Project Team with the master plan consultants and HCDA staff.

In conclusion she suggested that the Steering Committee might next consider improving the linear diagram format by using the circular example more recently provided by Chair Wong.

HCDA staff commented that the recommendations were well received and noted the following:

- HCDA will incorporate as much as possible from the scope of work recommendations, subject to any funding limitations.
- Some of the rules of engagement in the summary would also apply to roles other than the consultant's role in the scope of work
- The HCDA has an obligation to go to the larger public, and the CPAC cannot be the substitute for the larger public

Several Steering Committee members noted that it has not been the CPAC's intention to take the place of the public because the general public comprises the CPAC, and they pointed out the following:

- The intent of the CPAC is to continue to be inclusive of the general public
- The CPAC can supplement and add to the HCDA's objective of including the larger public if/when the consultant and/or HCDA do not have the time or funds for public meetings, outreach and interaction, which is the purpose of the CPAC
- There would be some concern if the consultant or HCDA were to replace the CPAC with a new public group unfamiliar with the CPAC's work over the past two years
- The Sunshine Law insures that the public is included in the process
- The CPAC's objective is to encourage and increase public involvement

Chair Wong concluded that it had been a very good meeting with a spirit of collaboration and no disagreements. He added that HCDA can rely on the CPAC to make the process run smoothly.

VI. New Business

A. Commitment of Meeting Time

A brief discussion addressed a proposed consolidation of Steering Committee and CPAC meetings, with various views offered:

- The CPAC and Steering Committee have separate monthly meetings, and the forthcoming planning process will require additional meeting time.
- A 45-minute Steering Committee meeting could be followed by a 90-minute CPAC meeting on the same meeting day
- HCDA staff agreed that the meeting room could be made available after 4:30 pm
- The Vision and Guiding Principles have been completed, and these meetings will just fill time before the planning process begins.
- Meeting time is needed for the people who are interested in Kaka‘ako Makai issues and want some very important things to be addressed.

It was pointed out that much of the Steering Committee’s work is in preparation for the next CPAC meeting so the issues and recommendations can be published on the CPAC meeting agenda a week in advance of the meeting, in accordance with the Sunshine Law.

B. Point Panic and Waterfront Park Conditions

A surfing contest coordinator¹ and CPAC public participant presented background on his event² and expressed some concerns about the present condition and appearance of Point Panic and Waterfront Park. He explained the following:

- The body-surfing club is permitted by the HCDA and DLNR DOBOR for surfing events at Point Panic, with the support of many parties.
- They perpetuate the Hawaiian cultural importance of surfing, and for their use of the area they give back by contributing their stewardship to the Kaka‘ako Makai’s shoreline as their kuleana. On June 6 they held a clean-up of the small Point Panic area, where they filled ten 55-gallon trash bags with litter.
- He was present to inform the CPAC about some problematic conditions at Point Panic and Waterfront Park:
 - litter and garbage is collecting and strewn along the entire makai side of the sea wall
 - there is rat infestation in the garbage, and an estimated 1000 feral cats living in the bushes and tall grass, causing a sanitation problem; the cats are fed regularly by cat colony keepers
 - damaged and broken park infrastructure, such as the six light poles with only one out of three working because one has no lamp and one has a lamp with no bulb

HCDA staff indicated that the information would be communicated to the appropriate HCDA administrators.

VII. Announcements

Chair Wong announced the CPAC’s next meeting dates:

Steering Committee Meeting	Tuesday, June 16
CPAC Meeting	Tuesday, July 14

The meeting was adjourned at 8:00 p.m.

¹ <http://www.gregrimagery.com/2009ppp.htm>
http://www.gregrimagery.com/images/P_08-0616_E_p11_0246DSC_1851.jpg
http://www.gregrimagery.com/images/for_WEB0214Fixed_Resize.JPG

² See Attachment B

June 9, 2009, CPAC Meeting Attendance
(and Meetings Attended)

Anderson, Amy	(23)	Loy, Bob	(15)
Crabbe, Kanekoa	(2)	Matson, Michelle	(27)
Crone, Bob	(22)	Miasnik, Geoff	(18)
Dang, Tricia	(5)	Nalua'I, Sol	(17)
Furushima, Scott	(19)	Parkinson, John	(18)
Hagadom, Joe	(7)	Takamine, Wayne	(23)
Hedlund, Nancy	(23)	White, Reg	(10)
Lizama, David	(15)	Wong, Mark	(19)

HCDCA Staff
Neupane, Deepak

Draft CPAC Meeting Summary transmitted by the CPAC Secretary to Steering Committee Members for review on June 15, 2009. Draft CPAC Meeting Summary approved for posting by the CPAC Steering Committee on July 9, 2009.

ATTACHMENT A

COMMUNITY-BASED PLANNING PRESENTATION

A. Public Engagement

Bruce Tsuchida, Townscape Inc. president, highlighted the framework for community-based planning as follows:

- Noting that an online community-based planning search produced 6,100,000 items, he asked those present to provide their interpretations of community-based planning.
 - The results were “transparent... collaborative... a known and jointly-acknowledged community power base... interaction... inclusive... consensus... dialog with compromise possible... community needs assessment... community impacts assessment... identifying needs for change.”
- He then distributed the “Public Involvement Spectrum of Approaches” guidelines, a list of terms and actions to help define the public involvement process under consecutive levels transcending from informing, consulting, involving, and collaborating to empowering. Each of these involvement levels were further defined by their objectives, their promise to the public, example tools, pros and cons. (See Attachment A1.)
- He noted a community-based project covering a small ahupua‘a of 1600 acres on Kaua‘i, where the community had been empowered throughout the planning process. He explained the need for developing objectives for community involvement and gave three examples:
 - In 2007 the community advisory group that later became the CPAC was established by the HCDA, and fifty-six community stakeholders within the area, including community users, government, landowners, and elected officials, were sought and interviewed about their needs and desires prior to collaboration
 - The Ko‘olaupoku district is presently undergoing an update of their sustainable communities land use plan for a population of 110,000 extending through Waimanalo, Kaneohe and Ka‘a‘awa, for which Townscape has been contracted by the City and County for \$30,000 package of community outreach meetings, including a limited number of large community meetings, neighborhood board meetings, and interviews, which also should be supplemented by additional independent community meetings because of the contracts limited scope and fee. Plan Pacific will then write the policy document.
 - The North Kohala and South Kohala Community Development public planning processes were highly collaborative, where Hawaii County appointed a steering committee that represented the interests of the community, and Townscape worked very closely with the county and community throughout a series of public meetings, workshops, focus groups, etc. to bring the community’s needs and desires to the forefront of the planning process on an equal footing of high importance.
- He emphasized that without the attempt to achieve clarity there can be much confusion, and early in the process the agency and advisory group should confer on the objectives of the process.

Comments, questions and answers:

- Q. (HCDA staff) How is the CPAC’s process viewed in relationship to the public involvement spectrum examples?
- A. To date it appears that this process has progressed to at least the middle column, with very substantive involvement. Going forward into the master planning process, it could now be determined whether the CPAC community process would remain at the involvement level or progress to a truly collaborative process, where more time and effort is invested to achieve very rewarding results.
- Q. With the community power base being known and jointly acknowledged, could this acknowledgement also be variable or even absent during this process, or could it be compatible, or lead to conflict?

- A. The HCDA board has the power to make the decisions and it is acknowledged that the CPAC has a very important advisory function.
- C. Having the power base in the community defines the meaning of true community-based planning, i.e., the public empowerment at the advanced end of the spectrum, This can be either consistent with the definition or, if loosely applied, may not be really based on the community.

It was agreed that community-based planning should be brought to the table and acknowledged.

B. Charrette Process and Strategies

John Whalen, Plan Pacific president, described the charrette process developed by the National Charrette Institute, and noted that this process is a good candidate for initiating the planning phase for the Kaka'ako Makai's confined area with clear community and landowner stakeholder interests. He provided an 86-minute NCI CD-ROM disc for the CPAC's use and distributed information from the NCI web site, highlighting the following:

- A charrette can be a successful process to follow as a structured way to achieve broad community involvement and reach resolution.
- The process begins by carefully identifying stakeholders and conducting one-on-one interviews.
- The charrette is a collaborative planning process held as a central event over a four- to seven-day period depending upon the scope of the project, and its success depends upon the degree of preparation prior to the charrette.
 - This model was used to prepare a town plan for Kilauea on the north shore of Kauai, where the town was very divided over whether to expand the town or not, and what purpose this would serve for major landowner stakeholders as well as the Kilauea Point National Wildlife Refuge. Community outreach was conducted by community facilitators in public areas of the town instead of a meeting hall, and the result of the charrette was very successful, with wide endorsement and adherence to the plan.
 - Kaka'ako Makai has experienced some division in the community over what the disposition and use of the state lands should be, and what the regulations affecting private lands should be. The charrette is one way of getting broad community involvement and also reaching resolution.
 - The charrette is an intensive process that can be very demanding, but rewarding - even if there are times of discouragement.
- The implementation phase follows the charrette because the proposals are not completely worked out during the intensive charrette process.
 - This phase provides the opportunity for consultation between parties on practical steps to organize the plan and to advocate for the final steps in implementing the plan.
- Key strategies include:
 - working collaboratively, and intentionally trying to get different points of view to work together to reach solutions
 - compressed work sessions, which stimulate more creativity
 - working at or near the project area to experience it, which is part of the inspiration
 - hands-on involvement by marking resource inventory maps, e.g., for preservation or improvements, leads to a sense of contribution and commitment
 - focus groups to meet and caucus on issues
 - short feedback loops to communicate questions and comments
 - cross-functional design served by multiple disciplines and recommendations of the ultimate users to solve physical design problems that include buildings and facilities, supporting infrastructure, social and functional aspects, etc.
 - feasibility is important address; this does not mean lowering expectations, but determining what can be done to carry out the plan.
- The last page shows the charrette feedback cycles for each phase, and the NCI web site address. (See Attachment A2.)

Comments, questions and answers:

- C. A five-day charrette would be prohibitive for working community members.
- A. The Kilauea town charrette sequence was a succession of three weekday evenings and one weekend.
- An opening presentation was held on Thursday night, and another meeting on Friday night.
 - An open house was held on Saturday as an interactive process for people to drop in over five or six hours to see and mark up maps, ask the stakeholders questions at booths, and talk to each other about different ideas and a very preliminary concept, because most people had thought about the issues and had some ideas.
 - The conceptual plan was presented on Sunday evening, where questions were asked of certain stakeholders and comments were received.
 - The refined plan was presented on Monday evening.
 - All was somewhat tentative because certain things were identified as requiring more information from agencies, e.g., the availability of a desired school site or a park site, and interested residents were encouraged to become participants in the agency interviews so all could be better informed of the information given and received.
- C. The consultant team receives the ideas and works on a preliminary design for interactive comments and refinement, and over the course of developing the flow diagram, conceptual plan and refined plan the consultants would need to prepare the plans and a final report. While 85% of the collaborative decision-making is done in only 15% of the time, adjustments and refinements need to be done in between the phases.
- Q. The diagram shows a series of actions over several phases for the singular charrette event concentrated over a short period of time. Could this series of actions also be applied over a longer duration?
- A. The single charrette helps provide the importance and focus optimum for the result. While Kaka'ako Makai is not a large planning area and there are not many landowner stakeholders, the single charrette opportunity will motivate the diverse larger community's interests to be directly involved early in the planning process.
- Q. What are the pros and cons of a protracted event compared to a compressed event?
- A. Protracted events have the problems of eroding interest levels and difficulty in sustaining enthusiasm, while charrettes animate people through an expedited process.
- A. Fundamental research and preliminary data gathering would be done before the charrette.
- Q. How will those not familiar with the issues be educated broadly as a group on the issues that the CPAC has been educated on?
- A. The opening presentation would be an overview of the planning process and an assessment of the information to date, and how some of the conditions might influence the plan. It might also be a good idea to have some summary material prepared for the opening meeting.
- C. Separate environmental charrettes have addressed sustainability issues, such as resource management, water and energy use, that interface with the planning process.
- A. Instead of adding this extra step, these concepts can be merged with the planning charrette by identifying as part of this process what is desired or what needs to be done, and then following up with the research results and application details at a later time.
- A. First plan the charrette with the consultant, gather the data, and identify the issues. Once any pending issues are decided the consulting team's assigned contact can address the issue, gather agency or other needed information, and work on this while the other tasks are progressing.
- A. The initial presentation is an opportunity to survey the participants to confirm issues and priorities and to seek more information following the fundamental research.
- A. It is possible to commit to sustainable development at the same time as developing the plan.
- Q. How many stakeholders can assure a productive attendance at charrettes?
- A. When there are big issues coupled with community commitment and attachment to the area, the attendance and engagement at the charrette will be greater.

- A. For Kaka‘ako Makai, a well-organized charrette attracting 100 to 200 participants would be a good event.
- C. The JABSOM cafeteria is large enough for this and is directly within in the planning area. Food is also important.
- C. The huge stakeholder base using Kaka‘ako Makai includes Honolulu and other community users from Kailua, Kaneohe, Waianae, Manoa and Hawaii Kai.
- Q. What would be an estimated turn-key fee for a four-day charrette?
- A. The fee for the Kilauea plan was \$140,000, which included inter-island travel, a 120-page plan report and policy document as an amendment to the Kauai General Plan, with a final master plan, an approach for affordable housing using a land trust, and infrastructure development incorporated by reference into the general plan.
- A. A charrette for a Waikoloa affordable housing project included 10-12 professionals, charrette preparation with preliminary research and data gathering, mapping and disseminating information to attendees for a full three-day charrette, and a short report. The fee for this was \$150,000, without a master plan.
- Q. How involved in these projects were the sponsoring government agencies?
- A. The government agencies were involved as being ready to assist, e.g., providing a county booth with brochures at the initial meeting, while allowing latitude to the consultants by not controlling the process.
- Q. (HCDA staff) If the HCDA were to have this type of charrette for the Kaka‘ako Makai planning process, what would the recommendation be for the HCDA’s involvement – elbow-to-elbow or at arm’s length? Or theoretically, would the board of the governing-body stakeholder be part of this process or stay out of it?
- A. The HCDA is a major stakeholder, and if the HCDA board were willing to be more of a participant rather than the orchestrator of the process, more stakeholders might feel invited into the process.
- C/Q. The State agency is intended to be an agent of the people, and like the Legislature would need to consider the people’s needs and desires before making decisions and regulations based on the information received. So how would a decision-maker be a participant?
- A. The HCDA board would be the decision-maker, and the HCDA could participate by sharing information and perspectives, and would be willing to listen to different points of view and withhold judgment. Some board members may feel uncomfortable with this, but the board is diverse with both public and community members.
- C. (HCDA staff) Many charrettes follow the NCI example, particularly on the mainland. One example of the government entity being involved with the public was a Walnut Creek water facility project where the planning department was intensely involved with the community.
- C. It would be important for HCDA board members demonstrate an interest by being present to appreciate the process as a public forum, seeing and allowing the evolution of the process, and becoming stakeholders in the outcome itself.
- C. This would also provide the HCDA board with the opportunity to put their agendas on the table and have that discussion.
- C. Charrette participants are invested in the outcome, and if the decision-making HCDA board participates in the process they may be more likely to approve the product and implement it.
- A. Decision-makers who observe the process, and have an opportunity to engage in it while maintaining some detachment, do become more enthusiastic about approving the result.

Both presenters were thanked by Chair Wong and the meeting participants for sharing their important information and advice so helpful to the planning process.

ATTACHMENT B

THE HAWAII STATE BODYSURFING ASSOCIATION PRESENTS



**HAWAII'S FINEST BODYSURFING 2009
COMPETITION & EXHIBITION**

"To celebrate and perpetuate the Hawaiian art form of he'e umauma and kaha nalu"

Where: Point Panics, Kaka'ako Waterfront Park, Kai Mamala Bay, Oahu, Hawaii

When: A one-time, 2-day (Friday – Saturday) event. Holding period: Jun. 19 – Nov. 7
Opening Ceremony - Friday, 7:30AM. Closing Ceremony - Saturday, 5:30PM.
Check in begins at 6:30AM. 1st heat starts promptly at 8:00AM.

What: An OPEN bodysurfing competition with a 60 person maximum, bodysurfing exhibitions featuring wahine (women), kupuna (age 50+), keiki (18 and under), hui (2-person tandem teams), 'ole (no fins), and ka heihei 'au (Swim race, fins & goggles allowed). 1st day will include 2 rounds of preliminary competition (2 heats for each competitor). Top 16 individuals from 1st day move on to 2nd day of competition. 2nd day will include 30 minute 4-person competition heats, all exhibitions (60 minutes each) and the Swim race.

Entry Fee: \$30 early entry fee (\$40 beach entry) for all competitors. Includes event t-shirt Exhibitions & swim race FREE! Event t-shirt not included.

Awards: 1st-10th place awards for competition finalists. \$500 for 1st PLACE!
Cash awards and trophies for 1st-4th place. Awards for exhibitions yet to be determined. 1st-3rd place trophies for the swim race and a special "Lokahi" award.

Rules: Absolutely No handboards or gloves allowed. No restrictions on swimsuits or swimfins. Top 2 waves with 5 wave limit in all competition heats.
Triangle/interference rule in affect at all times.

Info: Contact Kanekoa Crabbe at (808)443-6026 or email kanekoa78@hotmail.com